Long Session Report: Game Changers

Session Title: Powerless to Powerful: Arming Citizens to Fight Corruption in Defence and Security
Date & Time: Wednesday 7th November, 18:00 – 20:00
Report prepared by: Rachel Davies, Communications Manager, Transparency International UK

Experts:
Leah Wawro, Transparency International UK
Shaazka Beyerie, International Centre for Nonviolent Conflict
Vijay Anand, Founder, 5th Pillar
Ian Andrews, UK Serious Organised Crime Agency
Ernie Ko, Transparency International Taiwan

Moderated by: Mark Pyman
Session coordinated by: Leah Wawro

Main issues raised in kick off remarks. What’s the focus of the session?

This session explores what can be done to tackle defence and security corruption, focusing on how civil society and citizens can demand greater transparency and accountability from defence and security forces.

The session will address the following questions:

- How can citizens and civil society catalyse reform and demand transparency in this often-secretive sector?
- How can they successfully engage with, monitor, and oversee defence and security establishments?
- How can we connect people coming at the problem of defence corruption from different angles – members of civil society, defence & security officers and soldiers, members of governments, and defence companies – who all have a role in building an accountable defence system?
What initiatives have been showcased? Describe the Game Changing Strategies. Please be as detailed as possible, include web urls, name of the initiatives and indicate if local, regional or national.

**Vijay Anand** – 1) 5th Pillar has initiated a bribe-paying alternative – ‘The Zero Rupee campaign’. 5th Pillar distributes fake currency with anti-bribery information printed on one side. Citizens give the ‘money’ to public officials whenever a bribe is demanded. [www.5thpillar.org](http://www.5thpillar.org) 2) Civil society takes on a bridging role between the whistleblower and the investigating agencies, as it is highly dangerous to blow the whistle on corruption in India. The civil society organisation will take the information from the whistle blower and then pass it on to the press or the investigating agency so that the whistle blower can remain anonymous.

**Mark Pyman** – 1) The idea that “it really is possible for civil society to engage constructively with defence, security and police corruption and have positive actions for society” can itself change minds even if it is not action related. This is a game changer because currently, very few people believe it. 2) Research makes a significant difference. The military and ministries of defence are convinced by facts. At present in the world of defence and security corruption, there are few facts. It is possible to conduct original, inexpensive research that can make an impact. 3) A new understanding of how to achieve change in institutions is necessary. It is important to think beyond traditional tactics when approaching the institutions to advocate for change. E.g. TI-DSP’s new indexes on defence corruption are making a difference. [www.defenceindex.org](http://www.defenceindex.org)

**Ian Andrews** – We need the mobilisation of civil society. Organised crime and corruption cannot be handled by government and law enforcement alone. These problems can only exist with the tolerance of civil society. We need to promote a culture within that society which is one of zero tolerance. We must create cultural change, and therefore make it acceptable for people to challenge and report organised crime when it occurs. There is a real challenge here for civil society. This is not something that can be left to law enforcement and the criminal justice system. It needs the mobilisation of all of civil society so that we have a united front lined up to defeat organised crime and corruption.

**Shaazka Beyerie** – The power of a significant number of people makes a
change. People power can be manifested as social, political, or economic pressure that is asserted by a significant number of people who have shared grievances and shared goals on defence and security corruption. This may not just include grievances of citizens, but also the grievances of those from within the corrupt system. Practically, this can bring change with the occurrence of two elements - 1) disruption (disrupting the system) and 2) engagement (winning people over to your side). The strategy must involve both at the same time. E.g. The initiative, Nafodu, is a good example. The initiative disrupted the police system of corruption at the grass roots at the same time as engaging the police. Disruption – they created a system where citizens could report incidences of police corruption by SMS. This enabled the citizens to report the corruption without having to confront the police personally. They also initiated a weekly radio program where citizens could call in anonymously. A senior officer took part in the programme, facilitating both engagement and disruption. Engagement – Nofodu spent a lot of time developing relationships with senior members of the police. They developed an integrity training programme for the officers. They worked with the police to develop the training programme together so that the police had ownership of it – this was very important. Hundreds of police officers were trained through the programme.

**Leah Wawro** – Leah highlighted the damaging impact of the 2001 BAE Tanzania deal. We need to look at defence companies, exporting companies, and importing companies. Two ways TI-DSP works to bring about change 1) Engage directly with the defence ministries. We develop good working partnerships with defence ministries and move them towards the perception that corruption is something that can be tackled – we work with ex-generals to help get us through the door. This brings a lot of credibility and really helps open doors. 2) We conduct in-depth research and comparative studies. This evidence base brings credibility to our work. In January, TI-DSP will be publishing the Government Anti-Corruption Index. The index provides comparison and competition - this pushes companies and institutions towards change. We also sought to make this a collaborative process and invited Governments to be part of it. [www.ti-defence.org](http://www.ti-defence.org)

**Ernie Ko** – TI Taiwan tried to engage with the national Ministry of Defence but had no response. They changed their approach and encouraged people who had influence over the Ministry of Defence to advocate on their behalf. They went to their national security council
(which has authority over the defence ministry) and they went to the Taiwan anti-corruption agency and asked them to talk to their peers in the defence ministry. They also garnered external pressure – they invited TI-UK’s Mark Pyman to visit Taiwan and meet with high-ranking generals, as well as to deliver a workshop to mid ranking officials. They now approach their defence ministry in different ways so that pressure is applied from all sides.

**Highlights: What are the main outcomes of this session? What’s next?**

- The session validated the theory that there is a new way of working towards change which is not just institution-based and not just protest-based. Real change is possible when both methods work together.
- The quality of participation from the attendees demonstrated that there is a lot of interest in the issue and that there are many avenues to tackle defence and security corruption.
- There are a good number of initiatives taking place that are positive. The many positive stories highlighted during the seminar were really encouraging.
- There is great potential to form a network of individuals and organisations who are interested in tackling military, police, and security corruption. TI-DSP could provide tools and research that could be pushed through that network.
- Social networking has huge potential to communicate the anti-corruption message throughout the police and enforcement community.
- The anti-corruption community needs to explore a new model of combining community action with institutional change.
What are the recommendations, follow-up Actions (200 words narrative form)

There is great potential to form a network of individuals and organisations who are interested in tackling military, police, and security corruption. TI-DSP could provide tools and research that could be pushed through that network. The anti-corruption community needs to explore a new model of combining community action with institutional change.
What kind of questions came from the audience? (Please include interesting quotes)

- Can you give us an example of a people power initiative that used both disruption and engagement to combat corruption in the police?
- How would the suggestions highlighted in this session work in an authoritarian political system?
- Virtually everywhere in the world there is a perception of corruption in the police – often with good reason. How do we combat police corruption in light of the relationship between police and society?
- Can you tell me more about what we can actually do to tackle corruption in the defence sector? What do you expect from the military in order to combat this problem?
- Are there any examples from around the world where defence budget information is made available?
- How do you address concerns of national security when advocating on behalf of access to information legislation?

What could be done to promote cross-sector and cross-regional work related to the focus of this game changer session? (If applicable)

Ernie Ko gave a good example of where cross-region and cross-sector work can bring about positive change. TI Taiwan asked the national Anti-Corruption Agency to put pressure on the Ministry of Defence (cross-sector engagement) and invited TI-UK’s Mark Pyman to visit Taiwan and meet with members of the Ministry (cross-region engagement). The occurrence of pressure coming from a variety of different directions enabled TI Taiwan to begin working with the national Ministry of Defence.

What should be done to create opportunities for scaling up the proven solutions discussed in the session? What and by whom?

-
Key Insights Recommended to be included in the IACC Declaration
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