

Democracy In Honduras Since 2009



(Santana, 2017)

Emma Lærke Jensen – Student nr.20122901
Development And International Relations, Latin America
10th Semester, Aalborg University
Supervisor: Oscár García Augustin

16/10-18

Abstract

This thesis is about the democracy in Honduras. Honduras' history states that Honduras transitioned to democracy in 1982, but since their latest democratic election held in Honduras has been all over the news across the world, there has been some doubt as to whether or not the country actually is democratic as they say. The thesis is not about the democracy since 1982 though, the thesis is focusing on the change of democracy in Honduras since the coup d'état in 2009, where the president was removed from office and forced to flee the country. The coup in itself is a very undemocratic act, and therefore it was interesting to see, if there has been other undemocratic, or even corrupt, acts from the government's side up to this day.

The thesis is using empirical data consisting of a homemade Spanish survey sent to a few Hondurans, and they have been able to give another insight in the politics of the country, and that way the surveys have been able to be used in the analysis trying to figure out, if the democracy has changed in Honduras since president Manuel Zelaya was removed from office and up until the latest election that was held in November 2017. This analysis paragraph is not only about the democracy of the country, because in order to reach to a conclusion on the level of democracy in Honduras, it is important to also analyze the elections to find out if the country is corrupt, because this could affect the democracy of the country. To be able to conclude on the level of democracy, the thesis needs a theory. Therefore, there is a theory by Huntington about the democracy and democratization, which also provides a good definition to make sure what the thesis will be based on, democracy wise. There is also a theory by Stepan and Linz, which is about nation-state and democracy because this theory talks about how difficult it is for a regime to become a consolidated democracy, so this theory talks about the difficulties of this. But to be able to conclude on the level of corruption in the country, it was necessary to have a theory on political corruption as well.

This way the thesis can conclude on the democracy in Honduras, because there is both a theoretical framework to base it on, in cooperation with the experiences and perceptions given by the Hondurans in the surveys. But because it is always good to have empirical data from a neutral source as well, I am using a lot of articles from around the world to make sure, the articles are not biased and therefore, they will give a neutral opinion on the case.

Table of Contents

Abstract	1
Introduction	3
Methodology	5
Gathering Of Empirical Data	5
Methods	6
Difficulties With The Project.....	6
<i>Personal Observations And Experiences</i>	6
Theory	8
Democracy According to the Dictionaries	8
Democracy by Samuel P. Huntington	8
Nation-state and Democratization	11
Corruption	16
Corruption in Democratization.....	17
<i>Electoral Competition in New Democracies</i>	18
<i>International Monitoring in New Democracies</i>	19
Analysis	22
What Was Honduras Like Before President Manuel Zelaya and What Happened With Him in 2009?	22
The Current State of Honduras.....	23
<i>The Presidential Election in 2017</i>	24
Has The Democracy In Honduras Changed Since The Coup D'état In 2009, If So, How?.....	25
<i>Sub-conclusion</i>	30
Is Honduras A Politically Corrupt Country?	31
<i>Sub-conclusion</i>	37
Is Honduras A Democratic Regime?	38
<i>Sub-conclusion</i>	45
Conclusion	47
Bibliography	50
Appendix	
<i>Original Spanish Surveys</i>	
<i>Translated English Surveys</i>	

Introduction

Honduras is country kind of in the middle of Central America. It has coastlines to both the Pacific Ocean and the Caribbean ocean as well. It is a country with plenty of forests, as well as plenty of beaches. Looking at pictures of Honduras, one would probably think of it as another vacation paradise in Latin America (Den Store Danske, n.d.). Honduras has an estimation of 9,4 million (World Population Review, n.d.) inhabitants, and their national language is Spanish and different Indian languages. It all seems like a pretty good country with banana plantations and beautiful white sand at the beaches.

But if you dig into the information about the country, Honduras is the exact opposite of a paradise.

Honduras is among the poorest countries in Central America, it faces huge challenges because of this. More than 60 percent of the inhabitants lived in poverty in 2016 and in some areas of the country even one out of five actually live in extreme poverty, which will also say that one in five, in some areas, live for under 1,90 American dollars per day (World Bank, n.d.). 40 percent of those 60 percent who live in poverty, live in extreme poverty, this number is nationwide (Association For a More Just Society, n.d.).

With the location in the middle of Central America with coastlines to two different oceans, make Honduras an attractive country for drug trafficking coming from the south going north to the United States. The Colombian drug cartels began to use Honduras as a road to Mexico, shortly after Honduras was partly destroyed by the hurricane Mitch (Leith, 2018).

Honduras is a troubled country with some of the world's worst and most dangerous criminal organizations called Mara Salvatrucha, also known as MS13, and Barrio Diesiocho most known as barrio 18 (InSight Crime, 2018). These gangs are the reason why this country is known to be amongst the world's most dangerous counties, especially since it has a homicide rate of 60 per 100.000 inhabitants in 2015. This was one of the highest homicide rates in the world (Martin, 2016).

In 2012 and 2013 the number of murders committed in Honduras actually raised above the number of murders in Iraq, which is a war zone. There were 7100 murders in 2012, and the average of that is a murder rate at 598 murders a month, or it can even be said as 20 murders a day in average. (Leith, 2018) Not only are the murder rates sky high, but the number of trials for these murders are dangerously low, only 40 percent of the murders actually lead to a trial (Association For a More Just Society, n.d.).

The police and the government in Honduras is one of the most corrupt kind, because they are bought by the criminal organizations for once. The country is ranked as number 135 out of 180 countries with a score of 29 out of 100, where 0 is highly corrupt and 100 is a clean country (Transparency International , n.d.).

But not only is Honduras known for its high crime and high position on the corruption index, it is also known for its coup d'état in 2009, where they forced the president at that time, Manuel Zelaya, to leave the country and leave his presidency. Since this happened, the country has been ruled by one party, the National Party. The current president Juan Orlando Hernández was first elected as president in 2014, and then again at a more questionable election in 2017.

All of these things that control Honduras is the reason why I chose this theme to write about in this thesis. It is very interesting to see if and how the democracy has changed in Honduras, since they used democracy as a reason to make the coup d'état in 2009. But to be able to answer this question, it is also very important to find out, if Honduras actually is a consolidated democratic regime. In order to answer the question about the level of democracy in Honduras, it is also very important to look at the huge corruption problem in the country, to see if this affects the democracy.

So this projects will have the object of finding out **if and how the democracy has changed since the coup d'état in 2009, and find out if there actually is democracy in Honduras in 2017/2018.**

Methodology

This chapter will explain how I will do the research to be able to answer the questions mentioned in the introduction. There will be a paragraph on how I gathered the majority of the empirical data, and how it was made. This chapter will also be containing a paragraph that will tell what kind of difficulties there is with a project like this, and with the empirical data that has been gathered. All in all, this chapter will talk about how the project is made and how the research has been done.

Gathering Of Empirical Data

The analysis of this project is primarily based upon the empirical data that I have collected myself. This consisting of eight surveys (which are attached in the appendix, the original survey in Spanish as well as the translated survey in English), that were sent to Honduras with the hope that the surveys would be answered, and that as many surveys as possible would be answered. I sent the survey to a nongovernmental organization in Honduras called Red Viva for them to answer. The survey was also sent to private persons with the same wish. Unfortunately, only eight people had time to answer, but the answers are thorough and the answers are still a good. The surveys have the same questions for everyone, but this was an active choice from my side, to be able to get as many answers to the same question in order to see if they all agree on the same or have different opinions.

The survey is made in a qualitative and open way, so the answers will not just be yes or no, this way the survey is both qualitative and quantitative, as the data received is both (Riis, 2007, pp. 30-31). The questions also prepare the ground for an elaboration, especially because the questions are so open, that a yes and no answer is simply not enough for the survey. Of course there is a few surveys where the person answering the survey did not elaborate despite the encouragement to elaborate or clarify the answers – both to help me but also to help the ones answering, because it is probably an important subject for the Hondurans, and many Hondurans are, as I experienced it, very eager to talk about democracy and the elections in their country, because they feel helpless in their own country.

This kind of survey can in some ways also be called an interview, because it is this thorough, and in the end of the survey there is an opportunity for the person answering the survey to write anything that he or she thinks I should know in order to improve the thesis on this subject. The fact that the survey was sent on email to all the contestants, it also helps on the quality of the answers, since the contestants have the possibility of writing comments to every questions – it is not sent as a PDF-file, just as a word-document. So it was possible to comment on answers even though, the question did

not require this. This is especially seen in survey number four, where the contestant really took advantage of this possibility – she has been able to write all her thoughts and concerns on the subject this way, giving more information to me. But it is not a real interview where I could have asked about the answers given, although it does give more freedom to answer than a regular quantitative survey.

Methods

I have analyzed the democracy in Honduras by using the inductive method of analyzing. Through the inductive method I have been able to take the general theories and apply them to the Honduras case. Applying a theory like this, make the case more general. But when using the empirical data that is collected by myself, then personalizes the case more, and makes it possible to analyze the case with using the surveys as well as articles from all around the world, just to make sure that there was also sources for the analysis that were not biased.

The analysis is made using the hermeneutic spiral, since I had the research questions to base the analysis on, but by applying the theory onto this case, the case was broad and had to be narrowed down in order to make a conclusion on the matter. Using the surveys in the analysis makes it possible to go from the broad case into a narrower and more specific case such as the case of Honduras. This way it was able to make a conclusion on the case of Honduras, by having a general theory and then make it more personal to make it fit the case of Honduras.

Difficulties With The Project

Unfortunately, not all of the surveys were answered, if they were, the answers could have given a broader understanding on democracy in Honduras. If I had known what the subject of my thesis would be, when I was doing my internship in Honduras, I could have made some interviews right when the presidential election in 2017 happened, but I had to make a do with what I could do from Denmark.

The thesis could probably have been written differently if the contestants in the surveys were happier with the current president in Honduras, Juan Orlando Hernández, than the ones who did answer the survey. If I had found people closer to the elite in Honduras and sent them the survey, the answers could have been very different from the answers that I have. The people I asked to answer the survey were regular people, who are not rich, nor very poor, but more of a low middleclass.

Personal Observations And Experiences

I have spent three months in Honduras during my internship in the capital, Tegucigalpa. I was there in the fall of 2017, so I was there when the latest election happened. I saw the proud Hondurans when

they came back from voting, showing off their inked finger to show to people that they voted. I experienced the danger in the capital, when the counting failed.

So when explaining how the election went in 2017, there are some of my own experiences in it as well, but they are primarily backed up by articles on the subject as well. my experiences of the curfew and how dangerous it was with the lootings and protests in the streets, this cannot be told better by a reporter placed far from where it is happening than how I experienced it myself.

Theory

This chapter of the thesis is going to talk about the theory of democratization in a nation-state, and this theory will help form the analysis of the project. The chapter will though start out by defining democracy as a concept, because the whole project will be about democracy in Honduras. So it is important to start out with one specific definition to make sure what it actually is in this context. There are different perceptions of the concept, but the ground idea is supposed to be the same.

After the theory on democratization, there is a paragraph on a theory on corruption in democratization as well, since this is also going to be a part of the project. But before the theory, there is a definition of this concept as well, which will help when reading the theory.

Democracy According to the Dictionaries

Democracy is taken directly from the Greek word; *demokratia* – which is a word made up by two words which are *demos* and *kratia*. *Demos* is the Greek word for people and *kratia* is the word for rule or power. Therefore, democracy is, according to the Oxford dictionary (Oxford Living Dictionary, n.d.), defined by a system government chosen by the population, chosen to be representatives and take care of the interests of the citizens. Every democracy has its own rules as to who can choose representatives for the people, it can be rules about the age of the people who can vote. This democracy can also be called the representative democracy, since there are being elected people to represent the specific country and its citizens.

Democracy by Samuel P. Huntington

Samuel P. Huntington, an American political scientist, who has written several theories on democracy and on how democracy has come in different stages in the world (Betts, n.d.). He explains that there have been three waves of democratization since it started. The latest wave of democratization started in the late twentieth century (Huntington, 1993), and that is the theory that will be explained later in this chapter of theory.

It is important to bring the explanation of democracy by Huntington to be able to understand his processes along the way and to be able to understand that there are different kinds of understandings to this concept.

According to him, democracy is a representative made out of some people, that the population trusts to take care of their opinions. These representatives are elected through an election that is supposed to happen fairly and honest. Everyone is in general allowed to run for a position like this and all adults, capable of voting, have a say in the matter.

For Huntington this is the right way of seeing how representatives are elected in a democracy, it is both contestation and participation that is important for democracy. Although, he is not the only one with this perception of the concept, he is leaning a lot towards another scientist, Robert Dahl. They both agree that democracy provides certain bench-marks that makes it easier to see if a system is actually democratic or at least to what extent. These bench-marks makes it possible to compare one system to another and makes it possible to analyze a system, since there are these marks that sort of “defines” a democracy (Huntington, 1993, pp. 5-6).

These marks can as an example be if a democratic system denies a certain part of the population the right to vote, as it has happened before in some countries, where black people have been denied their voting rights. A bench-mark for Huntington and Dahl is then that all kinds of adults should have the right to vote regardless of their heritage and the color of their skin, otherwise it is simply undemocratic.

A system is also undemocratic if an opposition is not allowed to run for the elections, or if the opposition is allowed to run in the elections but ends up being harassed, have their newspaper censored or if the paper is shut down, then the system is just as well undemocratic, and actually it is more corrupt than democratic. And those two things do not cope with each other, in this bench-mark is manipulated or miscounted votes also places to be an undemocratic system this happens in an election (Huntington, 1993, p. 7).

An election in a democratizing country can be seen as a democratic election, if there are several international observers to make sure everything is going the way it should to be called democratic. The observers have to agree that the election is meeting the minimal standard requirements and that it is fair and honest, not being rigged in any way.

It is not seen as a democratic procedure if the opposition executes a military coup, an election is rigged, if the opposition gets harassed, if political meetings are prohibited or if any political opponents are sent to jail, Huntington states that this is just commonsense to know. International observers are amongst those people who can actually make lists over which countries are democratic and which are not, and they do make lists that also show if a country was less democratic in earlier years – or the opposite. But there are no political regimes that fit perfectly into boxes that are intellectually defined, it is simply just impossible to find a regime that is not a mixed case. Regimes can be mixed between both democratic and for example also authoritarian (Huntington, 1993, pp. 7-8).

It is often a critical point for a regime that is used to choose its leaders through the elites, and then to choose a government chosen by the people in a fair, free and open election. It usually takes a long time for a regime to change this electing approach. It requires that the regime inaugurates democracy and brings the authoritarian regime to an end to be able to consolidate the democracy. Sometimes it does not succeed completely for a regime to become full-scale democratized (Huntington, 1993, p. 9)

There is a risk that a government that is made up by an election can actually be corrupt, inefficient, irresponsible, incapable of accepting the policies that are demanded by the people, or they can even be dominated by any special interest. This does not mean that the government is undemocratic, because it has been produced by a democratic election, it just makes this kind of government undesirable. It does not make it undemocratic either if a group of political leaders are chosen through election and it turns out that they are not actually exercising real power, and that they are actually just the front or some kind of puppets of another group than the people elected. A democratically chosen leader does not have all the power himself, the leader has to “share” it with other democratically chosen groups of the society, it is not possible to make all the decisions on our own as the leader.

This is to say, that it does not make a government undemocratic if they do not live up to the society’s expectations, if only the government was chosen through democratic elections, then the government is in general democratic (Huntington, 1993, pp. 9-10).

Honduras is according to Huntington a part of the third wave of democratization, although the country belongs in a box that he calls democratic or semi democratic phases (Huntington, 1993, pp. 14-15). This third wave of democratization supposedly started in 1974, where democracy is said to have changed approximately 30 countries in Asia, Europe and Latin America. Even though the third wave of democratization started in the 70’s not all of the countries succeeded right away, there were still setbacks in some countries such as in China (Huntington, 1993, pp. 21-22).

The process of The third wave of democratization is not the same for all democratizing regimes. The end might always be more or less the same; democracy, but the beginning of democracy is almost never the same in any countries. But democracy is not the same all over, there are different kinds of democracy, such as parliamentary democracy or presidential democracy – or some are even a mix between the two. According to Huntington, the regimes that worked towards democratization in the third wave generally fell into three categories; systems made up by one party, military regime or a

personal dictatorship. The first category, the one party system, is where the one party monopolizes the power, and where the party legitimates its rule by using ideology. The second nondemocratic category, the military regimes, are usually made up by a coup d'état where the military replaces a government. This second category has especially been seen around Latin America. The third very nondemocratic category is when one authoritarian leader controls the power on his own (Huntington, 1993, pp. 110-112). Huntington believes that Honduras ended up in the category of a military regime back when they started to move towards democracy (Huntington, 1993, p. 113).

Nation-state and Democratization

Alfred Stepan is one writer of the theory on nation-state and democratization, born in 1936 and died in 2017. He is an American former journalist that has been a special correspondent for the Economist, and therefore, he has experienced more cultures and more countries than many others have. He was sent to West Africa and Latin America for his correspondent career, he has therefore seen and experienced democracy, or the lack of it, on close range. (Alfred C. Stepan, n.d.).

The other writer of this theory is Juan J. Linz was born in 1926 and died in 2013. He was a Spanish American political scientist, who was known for his knowledge and books on democracy and authoritarian governments. Linz and Stepan is known for writing books on democracy and democratization, where they both possess firsthand knowledge of democratizing countries (Britannica, n.d.)

In many countries where the democracy is not yet consolidated, the policy of the nation-state many times has a different logic than the logic of a democratic policy. The focus of a nation-state policy is often to increase the cultural homogeneity, therefore, they usually take on one language as the official language which will then be used when writing constitutions, and often it is also the only acceptable language when it comes to business or public schooling. The nation-state normally has a religion that is more privileged than others, even though it is not necessarily an official religion of the country, therefore, the country can easily have many different religions, but nonetheless one religion is more privileged than the others – official or not.

The cultural homogeneity is just aiming to promote the country to the people, perhaps to make the people feel more included in the cultural nation. The nation-state is using special symbols to have people feel more privileged having these symbols that represent them. These symbols such the flag of the country or even the national anthem – or even some types of the military services of the country – are being used as representatives of the country.

The symbols are for example used by most means of socialization controlled by the state; television, radio and textbooks. As a contrast to this not yet consolidated democracy's policies, the democratic policies emphasize a wide and inclusive citizenship where the focus is to accord equal individual rights to all citizens of the nation. The conflicts between the not yet consolidated democratic policy and the democratic policy are reduced when the one nation is virtually contiguous with the state where all or most of its residents identify themselves with a subjective idea thereof. For the residents to identify themselves with only one subjective idea by the nation, there has to be only one nation within the state and if the diversity is low in the state. Only if this happens, one or more leaders of the state can pursue the democratization policies and the policies of a nation-state.

The congruence between the demos and the polity would ease up the creation of a democratic state. This type of congruence should be considered a supportive condition for the consolidation of democracy. Although, when it is modern circumstances, not many nondemocratic states actually begins possible democratic transition if there is a high degree of homogeneity of the nation-state, that is, if the there is more nations within the state as an example (Stepan & Linz, 1996, pp. 24-25).

The ambitions of the political leaders are very often incongruent with the realities that the population of the state has. But a regime has to be very careful when trying to address incongruence like this, because they can easily create problems for the consolidation of the democracy. In many states the legitimacy of it is actually questioned because of these kinds of incongruences. This primarily happens in multinational states, where a majority of one state wants to join the other state, and that creates problems as to the first state and it makes people question the legitimacy of this state.

There are other possible complications for democracy and even for interstate peace. One complication of this could be if a large minority group in one country that belongs to the politics of one nation, could be considered to be related to another nation for any reason – an irredenta to the neighboring state. If the leaders of the titular nation then try to alienate the minority group, it can only make it worse, since the minority group then for sure will turn to the neighboring nation for help and support. This attempt of conflict resolution by the titular state's leaders may produce extremist nationalism in neighboring nations and countries, and this could go further and delegitimize the first government because they did not defend the interests of the group or because they did not pursue the policy of the assumed irredentas.

The fact that there is a neglect of the question of legitimacy of a state in literature on democratic transition and consolidation, is not very fortunate, because although it is not of any importance to nondemocratic polities, it is still important for the democratic theory and politics. ” *We cannot solve the problems of the proper scope and domain of democratic units from within democratic theory. Like the majority principle, the democratic process presupposes a unit. The criteria of the democratic process presuppose the rightfulness of the unit itself. If the unit itself is not [considered] proper or rightful – if its scope or domain is not justifiable – then it cannot be made rightful simply by democratic procedures*” (Stepan & Linz, 1996, pp. 26, bottom). This could seem like a stateness problem can never be solved, but Stepan and Linz both agree that it is not the truth. It is often necessary to have complex negotiations, consolidation agreements, pacts and territorial realignments before the formula of the majority can even be accepted as binding, legitimately. But as the quote argues the appropriateness of the unit has to be established before the majority formula can do anything.

This is an exact contrast from the democratic regimes to nondemocratic regimes such as authoritarian, sultanistic or totalitarian regimes. Territorial domain agreements are not necessarily prior for the nondemocratic regime, the nondemocratic regime is sometimes able to impose the consent over big groups of people and without the need to threaten the coherence of the state.

The fact that the central authority of a nondemocratic regime does not derive from a free electoral competition, it means that the aspirations of the separatists and irredentists are not appealed to very often in normal politics and therefore these aspirations can simply be suppressed in some cases.

So the complete contrast to this nondemocratic policies and issues, the exact definition of democracy includes the agreement of the citizens of any territory, although it is also possible in a democracy that there also are procedures to generate a government that can legitimate the claims of their obedience – that is to say, that this generated government can speak for the interests of the citizens who elected this government. So if one significant group of people will not accept the claims of the obedience as something legitimate, because the people is not interested in being a part of that political unit that the obedience see as legitimate since it is also democratically constituted, this can be a big problem for the democratic transition and the democratic consolidation.

A hypothesis is made based on the degree of acceptance of the domain and scope of a unit from that specific area, a territorial unit, where this unit is to make legitimate decisions about the possible future of that territory. This hypothesis is that the higher the percentage of people in a specific area

who feel like they do not want to become members of that unit no matter if it was to be reconstituted, the harder will it be to consolidate a democracy within that unit. So if people are not satisfied and do not want this territorial unit to make the legitimate decisions about the future for this unit and the people within it, democracy cannot be consolidated – as long as the people do not agree and accept the unit (Stepan & Linz, 1996, pp. 26-27).

It is not possible for the government claiming to represent the people to be challenged via binding institutional channels nor via potentially authoritative channels – these channels could be such as courts, because in these nondemocratic regimes, there is nothing like these appeal channels.

There are sometimes problems with excluding the minorities from the rights of full citizenship or electoral franchise but these problems are less politically dominant in the nondemocratic context, because in a nondemocratic regime, no one has these rights anyway. Everyone is excluded from these rights (Stepan & Linz, 1996, p. 27).

But since a democracy is based on the people, it is important to ask who is a citizen in the state and how are the rules of citizenship actually defined? Democracy is based on the people; it even says in the name which is from demos – people. But it is important to also see who the people is, it is not just the citizens as an individualistic connotation, it is also the collectivist people also known as nations. It is then important to see how the citizens actually became citizens, who are the citizens? There are two traditional principles used to see who is granted a citizenship, and this is citizenship by descent, so if one is descended from this specific country, this person is granted a citizenship. The second principle is if one was born in the specific country, then they are also granted a citizenship. But it is also possible to ask for a citizenship and then be granted one even if you are neither born there or descends from that country, so there is also a third principle. All these principles show that one has to be related to the state and country in question to be granted a citizenship and then be part of the democracy.

The first principle, descent, refers to if one is a descent of someone who has been a citizen of the state, if the previous generation for example was citizens of the state, these descents are not asked about their religion, language, subjective identity or race, they are just granted the citizenship.

The second principle of being granted a citizenship is if one is born in the state of question, this is self-explanatory how you then get the citizenship. But the principle that is the most connected with the state is the citizenship that is granted if asked to be given the citizenship. Because the citizenship

can only be granted by asking for it and then it being granted through law or concession, and only the state can grant this.

So the modern democratic governance is very much linked to the stateness. If there was no state, there could be no citizenship, and if there was no citizenship, there could not be any democracy. For a democracy to work, there has to be voting, and there cannot be any voting if there are no citizens to do the voting. Therefore, citizenship is essential for a democracy, and a state is essential for a citizenship. But under the transition to democracy, there was, in some countries, not even a question raised to this whole citizenship subject. In Latin America for example there were already laws on this (Stepan & Linz, 1996, pp. 27-28).

Democracy is characterized by the citizens and not by the subjects, so it is often that a democratic transition puts the demos (people) questions in the center of the politics. Because of what has been said above, there can be made three assertions about democracy:

1. Politics become more complex when large parts of a territory of state is composed by plurinational, lingual, cultural or religious societies. It will be more complex because a contract with the fundamentals of a democracy will be more difficult to make with all the differences.
2. What is stated above does not mean that it is not possible to consolidate democracy in multinational or multicultural states. But it means that there are other essentials for this to happen, essentials such as a considerable political crafting of democratic norms, institutions and practices has to take place for a democracy to be consolidated.
3. Some of the ways that are necessary to deal with stateness problems are incompatible with democracy (Stepan & Linz, 1996, pp. 28-29).

This does not mean that every state should want to become a nation-state, nor should a nation strive to become a state. According to Stepan and Linz, its most likely impossible if half of the nondemocratic territories in the world could become nation-states simultaneously and become consolidated democracies, not with these terms, that they have come up with. It would be extremely difficult to make these not yet democratic states nation-states in a democratic understanding, because these states are multilingual, multicultural and multinational. If a state is multicultural, one of the only ways the state can become a homogeneous nation-state is if the state voluntarily engaging in a cultural assimilation, a peaceful creation of new territorial boundaries or voluntary exit, and this has to be financed

and monitored by the community from outside, the international community, and it also has to be accepted by the political leaders.

Another way of creating a homogeneous nation-state could be sufficient incongruence involving sanctions to people that are not speaking the language, practicing the religion of the titular nation, or wearing the national clothing (Stepan & Linz, 1996, p. 30).

But under modern circumstances, where all groups and states have intellectuals and writers who spread out national cultures, and where there are new possibilities for migrants to remain connected to the cultures of their home. Nowadays the democratic norms have to be modernized and therefore, these norms have to accept a certain degree of multiculturalism. If the titular nation does not want its people to have a connection to more cultures and remain a homogeneous nation-state, the nation has to go through sort of "ethnic cleansing" (Stepan & Linz, 1996, p. 31).

Corruption

Corruption as a concept is when someone abuses the entrusted power for their own personal gain. There are different classifications of corruption, and it can be seen in several contexts. There are three large categories of corruption; political, petty and grand corruption. It depends on the amounts of money that is lost and where it occurs, which kind of corruption that is being used (Transparency International, n.d.).

- Grand corruption: firstly, grand corruption usually goes without anyone being punished. It is an abuse of power on a high level that only benefits a few but where it hurts a lot of people. It causes serious harm to both individuals and to the society (Transparency International, n.d.)
- Petty corruption: this kind of corruption is something that is happening every day when public officials are abusing the entrusted power in their interactions with normal citizens. This can especially happen when the ordinary citizens are trying to access basic services or basic goods in places like hospitals, police departments, schools or other agencies where the public officials are supposed to help (Transparency International, n.d.).
- Political corruption: this type of corruption contains the political decision makers as the protagonists, where they can manipulate policies, institutions and rules of procedure in distribution of resources and financing. These political decision makers then abuse their position of

power to continue living their lives with status, power and wealth (Transparency International, n.d.).

Corruption in Democratization

One of the most successful and enduring metaphors in political life is probably corruption. Even in the ancient Greece there was a kind of corruption, the Greek ruler Lycurgus tried to stop this corruption in Sparta. The corruption back then in Sparta was different from what corruption is now. The natural vice of democracy is, according to the Greek ruler, the brutal role of violence. And this is what he tried to save Sparta from.

Also Machiavelli has brought up political corruption, but he added more elements to make a psychological and social explanation of it. He interpreted the competing effects of excessive power and wealth, which was some of the reasons to why leading figures of the society transformed into destructive partisans instead of being normal citizens. According to Machiavelli corruption is then the reason to why leaders of a government turn into competing rulers who want more money and more power (Whitehead, 2002, pp. 115-116).

Money has always been a cause of social power amongst people. But money has never been the only cause of it, there are many other sources to social power, but money is one of the main ones, and it has been like this since its early manifestations. In the post-cold war period all the constraints on the unfettered power of wealth for the people, private wealth, have been destroyed or weakened. Berlusconi is mentioned in the theory as one person who has been using corruption for his own benefit. Berlusconi can buy a giant empire in Italy with his wealth, then he can use more of his wealth and his power to rewrite rules to make his business empire undisputable.

In 1992 an American, Ross Perot, used his personal wealth to start a political movement that was then capable of redirecting the ancient two party structure that was ruling in the United States. This act was so powerful that it catapulted him to having 19 percent part of the presidential vote (Whitehead, 2002, p. 118).

It is not for sure that the person with the cleanest hands will win the electoral contest, or even be given the social power. Many times it turns out that the winning politician somehow was given funds for his campaign or for his party, that no one can see where it comes from. But there is rarely just one corrupt politician, often there are more, and then they compete against each other (Whitehead, 2002, p. 119).

Electoral Competition in New Democracies

There are various ways to fund a political party, and there are both legitimate and illegitimate ways. But what do the political parties actually need money for? Some need money to propagate whatever message they want to put out into the society to make people notice it and agree with it for them to win the electoral process. But there are also other reasons as to why a political party needs funding, a party can be asking for money to survive a period of repression, which has been the case in more countries in Latin America. Some parties also spend money to support organizations with the same mind as the party itself, and these organizations can easily be located in another country, so this funding needs money as well.

In some countries do the political parties have special, and important, interests, that they would want to support or raise money for; it can for example be interests such as churches, farmers, unions, etc. and then these parties would need money for this and not really for themselves. But since this is now a modern democracy with lots of competition, the main reason of party financing is probably because the parties need money to put up a show in the electoral arena for the voters. And this show can easily be very costly.

The parties also need money for their campaigns of course, but this can also be done by having a fund-raiser. But under authoritarian rule, some political parties were often under supervision or even banned, and when there was an electoral contest it was most likely manipulated by the people who were in power already. Even then there were periodic elections in most countries of the world, and it is still back then a costly affair, so even then they needed to be funded somehow. Normally the current leader would find one party or one particular candidate that he liked the most and then he would provide the party or the candidate with loads of resources to pay for whatever kind of campaign the party or candidate preferred. These resources typically came from the public sector, where the money could be taken from the employees to finance the campaign or the advertising thereof. So these kinds of parties could run campaigns that were very well financed, and the parties in the opposition were usually denied any money from the public because they then already were financing another party.

Private donors to the campaigns were encouraged, but only if they chose to donate to the parties were already approved of, and then the donors would be rewarded, and if they wanted to donate and support the opposition that was not preapproved by the current leader, the donors could even be given penalties as a punishment. The authoritarian style of ruling has been used in different countries such as

Brazil, the PRI in Mexico, Golkar in Indonesia and in Paraguay it was the Colorado Party that were good examples of this style of electioneering.

New sources of discomfort about the finances for elections might arise throughout a democratization. Because of the fact that elections become more competitive than earlier on, the stakes rise for the rival candidates. The current political leaders will probably fear that because of the competitiveness in politics now, can mean that if they first lose their office, then they might not get it again because of all the new candidates that emerge. The defeat in a competitive election can be very damaging for politicians, a defeat can destroy the reputation and the prospects of the politicians, therefore, some politicians will do everything for this not to happen. So this can help explain some of the reasons as to why there is a high level of corruption is linked to political campaign financing in many democracies (Whitehead, 2002, pp. 119-122).

Of course this paragraph has focused on high level of abuse in public offices, and this is a direct contradiction to democracy since the citizens lose their trust to the representative government when this happens. But not all kinds of political corruption are just for the enrichment of the corrupt person. The electoral democracies create their own unique inducements for abuse of office and this can sometimes have more to do with political survival than with personal enrichment (Whitehead, 2002, p. 131).

International Monitoring in New Democracies

In order to have an idea of where and how much corruption there is in the world's democracies, there are certain international institutions that will keep track of it. There are two main international financial institutions; the World Bank and the IMF, other than these two there are also regional development banks whose intent is to monitor bribery, abuse of public office in the countries, sectors where they can distribute loans and agency capture. The information that these institutions are given and find out from case to case, can give a broad sense of the commonness and the structure of political corruption in a large number of member states, where half of them actually are new democracies – newly formed democracies.

The World Bank Institute has continued to go ahead to organize and enhance this kind of information, they can, as an example, review foreign investors for them to track the frequency of 'kickbacks' in the public acquisition in different member countries.

The international financial institutions usually have more precise information, and they have the best opportunities to check information compared to regional financial institutions.

The World Bank focuses a lot on corruption, and in 1996 the president of the World Bank had to state that “*countries that are fundamentally corrupt should be told that unless they can deal with that they are not going to get any more money*” (Whitehead, 2002, pp. 132, line 1, paragraph 2) saying that if they continue to be that corrupt, they would not receive money from the World Bank, which is also there to help countries, and encourage a fair democracy. The IMF too made a statement to their members that they “*must demonstrate that they have no tolerance for corruption in any form*” (Whitehead, 2002, pp. 132, line 3, paragraph 2) to make sure that the members are well aware of the fact that the IMF does not tolerate corruption either, just like the World Bank. The IMF has cut off a loan from a member country before due to corruption in that country, or the lack of dealing with the corruption. This way they also warned other member countries that they are serious about corruption, and serious about the consequences thereof, saying that other countries could suffer the same punishment as Kenya (the first country to be cut off). They said that if there is poor governance in a country, or if the country puts the IMF in doubt regarding what the finances from the IMF is used for, then the financial assistance from the IMF could be delayed or even worse for them; be suspended.

There are guidelines for the institutions to take care of the corruption, and according to the guidelines it is both the corrupters and the corrupted as well that will be condemned. And if the IMF is reducing or suspending the financial assistance, the World Bank will follow in the steps of the IMF, and therefore reduce the aid from them as well. So the World Bank has been focusing on preventing corruption and fraud in projects that are bank-financed, and they have made programs in order to help countries to the same and provided them with advice on measures of anti-corruption (Whitehead, 2002, p. 132).

To find out how corrupt a country is, there has even been made a list where it is possible to see the rankings of all countries.

There is one form of political corruption that exists in all kinds of regions no matter if it is in authoritarian, old democracies, totalitarian or new democracies, it exists in some extent in all regions. This kind of corruption is if fundamental policy outcomes are being sold to people or parties that are willing to pay and able to, and this can be some more specific outcomes that they might not be able to obtain if they do not pay for it.

It is not really personal, individual, transactions that are important when talking about democracy. It is the corruption in public offices and the fact that public polies are being sold to the highest bid and bought more or less illegally

Analysis

This paragraph will be the analysis of the project. The analysis will help to find out how the democracy in Honduras has changed - just as the introduction states; that is the purpose of the project. The analysis will be written with help from the empirical data collected as qualitative surveys from a few people in Honduras, that are both politically active and not politically active. The surveys are composed in Spanish but is translated into English¹. The analysis will also compare the coup d'état in 2009 with the recent presidential election in 2017, that way it will help to find out how the democracy is like in this country. The analysis and the research made during this project, will make it possible to find out if there actually is a democracy in Honduras, according to these findings and the answers of the questions posed in this analysis.

What Was Honduras Like Before President Manuel Zelaya and What Happened With Him in 2009?

Honduras officially changed the regime to be a democracy instead of being a military regime in 1982. Although there was corruption, impunity, violence and inequality when the regime was ruled by the military, but it did not change after the transition to democracy either (NDI, n.d.).

Roberto Suazo Cordova was the elected president to start the newly transitioned democracy, he was a part of the Liberal Party of Honduras (PLH). Honduras started receiving financial aid from the United States already with the first president in the country, and this happened because the chief of the armed forces of Honduras possessed quite a bit of power as well. The chief of the armed forces then decided with the president that the United States could use their territory to train foreign military troops, if Honduras then would receive a fair amount of financial aid. Even after the military training by the United States ended, the financial aid kept coming to help the poor country.

The cooperation with the United States also benefitted the country, when Manuel Zelaya, also from the Liberal Party of Honduras, was elected as president. He made the first agreement with the United States, that should secure free trade between the two countries (BBC, n.d.).

The United States even supported the president, when he was ousted in the military coup in 2009. The American President Barack Obama supported Zelaya saying that the Honduras state should talk it out in a calm way behind doors and without any distractions from outside.

¹ Both the original survey in Spanish and the translated version are attached in the appendix.

According to the Honduran government, president Zelaya was trying to change the limits for the presidential terms, saying that president Zelaya supposedly should have tried to change the constitution so that he could sit as president for longer than the four years allowed, he wanted to have a referendum to hear the people's thought on the subject. It was not very popular amongst the others in the government. The president was dragged out of his house Sunday morning wearing his pajamas, he was sent on a plane to Costa Rica with the order not to return. The military forced the presidential guards to drop their weapons and surrender. The president was all confused going to the airport, going from being the president to suddenly being thrown out of his house and voted out of office (Malkin, The New York Times, 2009).

The electricity was turned off the Tegucigalpa, almost for the whole day, the local media said it was by orders from the military. The Honduran people in the entire country was imposed a curfew, where they had to be home by 9 pm. There were no services in the churches that day. Only the protesters who supported president Manuel Zelaya were out burning tires and facing the soldiers.

Zelaya was voted out of office in June 2009, but his presidential term was supposed to run until January 2010. All this because they found that Zelaya had many similarities with the Venezuelan Hugo Chávez and was afraid that he would then introduce socialist populism in Honduras just like Chávez had done (Malkin, The New York Times, 2009).

The Current State of Honduras

After the coup d'état, Honduras had to elect a new president. There was not much to do, so one was picked. Porfirio Lobo Sosa was the one elected.

In 2014 the next election was held, and that is when the current president, Juan Orlando Hernández, was elected for presidency for the first time. The first act as a president was to hand over a suspected drug lord to the United States, one that they had been wanting for a long time. This boosted the cooperation with the United States a bit, and after the coup, it was probably necessary to make the relationship between the two countries a little better.

The Honduran government with Juan Orlando Hernández in the front got a special law to make it more secure for the journalists, the human rights activists and justice workers, where they created a panel that should investigate whenever one of the above mentioned categories received a threat of some kind (BBC, n.d.). This was a good thing for the journalist and environmental activists because

Honduras is known to be the most dangerous country to be an environmental activist. Over 120 people, who tried to stand up to companies that are ruining the country and stealing land, were killed from 2010 to 2017. They were murdered by security guards, hired assassins or state forces, just for standing up against pollution. The ones who have not been murdered, have most likely received a threat, an attack or been sent to prison (Kyte, 2017).

The murder rates have been lowered since president Hernández came to power, and he has raised the growth for the country. The plans Hernández has for the new term of his presidency is to also create more jobs for people, to be able to lower the poverty rate more and raise the growth even more (Reuters, Reuters, 2017).

The Presidential Election in 2017

Juan Orlando Hernández set up an election on November 26 2017 even though the constitution states that it is not legal to take two terms of presidency, which means that he had to change a law in the constitution for it to be possible for him to rerun for the presidency. This was fairly weird to some people since Hernández supported the coup d'état in 2009, when they suspected Zelaya to do the exact same thing.

The law was changed, and the election was chosen to be in November 2017. Hernández had a few candidates running against him, but the people's favorite was without a doubt the television host Salvador Nasralla, who came from the party called the Opposition Alliance Against the Dictatorship. This party merged with the party run by the former ousted president Zelaya, and it is now called LIBRE (translated: FREE). It was new for the people to see a man like Nasralla run for presidency since he was just a television host, but the fact that the people knew him from TV-shows, and he was such a colorful man, he was a good opponent to the president. He was a popular man saying that if he became the president of Honduras he would fight corruption in the country, more than what Hernández said he does, and he would go through all the police officers to find the ones who were being bought by gangs or other people, so he could fire them and hire 25.000 new ones that were already checked out not to be corrupt (Reuters, Reuters, 2017).

But as the people voted for the candidate they liked the best and they sat at home in front of their TV something went wrong during the counting. People suspected Hernández to win, but they voted anyways. It started out with Hernández being in the front, but Nasralla came quickly after him. The

Honduran people thought the winner would be announced around 7 pm as usual, but this time it took longer. At some point around 8 or 9 pm Nasralla was actually winning the election as seen from the votes, but they kept saying something was wrong with the electronics. No one got any information about the winner that day. Nor the next day. A recount was made a few times, and it took a long time to count these votes again.

The winner was announced in December (The Guardian, 2017). But in the while people were waiting for all of this to come to an end, there were protests, and people were killed on the streets. It was chaos in Honduras at this time. People were in the streets shouting “Fuera JOH” (Out with Juan Orlando Hernández). They were sure that the election was fraud, that Hernández had done something corrupt with the votes since it took so long to recount the votes. This whole counting scandal gave Honduras its biggest political crisis since the coup d’état in 2009.

Not only were there large protests in the streets but this also lead to a curfew given by the Honduran government. People were not allowed to leave their houses between 6 pm and 6 am for 10 days, and if they did, they could be given a fine for it or even taken to prison (Lakhani & Kinosian, 2017).

The Honduran state declared themselves a state of emergency after all the violence that happened in the streets after the election. Lootings were going on, people were burning tires, wearing masks throwing rocks, etc. people were getting injured in the protests, the police and the armed military was everywhere with their riot shields (Ritzau, 2017) (Kinosian, The Guardian, 2017). The lootings resulted in many stolen TVs and washing machines from the early closed stores, and the police used teargas to break up the masses of protesters. People literally had to buy food for a whole week at the time because the roads were blocked, and they could not just go to a supermarket whenever they wanted.

The opponent, Nasralla, was sure that Hernández stole the election, and his party and he demanded a recount in several regions, because the voting suddenly turned out to be in favor of Hernández and not showing that Nasralla had a lead of nearly five percent, but apparently this was not the case in the new recounts (Reuters, The Guardian, 2017).

[Has The Democracy In Honduras Changed Since The Coup D’état In 2009, If So, How?](#)

Fifty percent of the people who answered the survey said, that they were happy and satisfied with the old president Manuel Zelaya and they did not like that fact that the military ordered a coup to remove him from office and make him flee the country. In survey number four, a woman writes as a comment

to that question, that the best years of her life were when Zelaya was president, because he actually fought for the people and their interests. This woman is very politically active and has because of this been forced to seek exile in Spain. So she really knows what it is like to leave your beloved country because of politics just like Zelaya had been forced to leave Honduras. She states that the reason of the coup d'état back in 2009 happened because the government was afraid of the power that Zelaya had gotten, and that he wanted to change a law from the constitution. But he wanted to bring the change of the constitution to a referendum to make sure that people were agreeing with what he was thinking. It was just a proposition to get the opinions of the inhabitants of the country. But before he even got to make the referendum, they then ordered the coup and had him leave the country, the same day as the referendum was supposed to happen, he was chased out of his home.

A coup d'état is not a part of a democratic process, according to Huntington this coup was very undemocratic. It is undemocratic because the president was elected by the people, and if the military, the elite, and some people from the government just make a decision that this president is not doing well enough, and then chooses to run him out of the country in order for them to select a new president a few months later. This is a direct break in the trust of the people, the people who believed that when they chose the president, he would be the president until his term was over, and then they could choose different one.

The coup d'état then led to international attention, more than usual, because no one wanted to accept the new government with the temporary president Micheletti, because as Huntington states, a president has to be elected by the people, not by the rest of the government, and when they first took a very undemocratic decision about the coup, then the whole case was absurd.

There are several international organizations that denied the recognition of Micheletti, calling the country a de facto state since it was only in this chaos-like state because of the choices taken by the military and the vice president. This means, the international organizations and many countries did not see Honduras as a country, since they committed a huge break of the democracy.

The OAS, Organization of American States, were trying to negotiate with the de facto state of Honduras, but in vain. Micheletti did not want to listen to their demands to bring back Zelaya in order for the democracy to return. According to the OAS, the coup d'état ruined the democracy in Honduras, and it could only become a democracy again if they held a referendum which would make a decision about Zelaya. The referendum should ask the people whether or not they wanted Zelaya to come back

and finish his presidential term, but Micheletti refused the demands and did not care if the country was going to be banned in all of the international organizations or not. He believed that although Honduras was a poor country, it would be better off dealing with the problem on their own than receive money or support from the outside and then be forced to do something Micheletti and the rest of the government did not want to do (Korsgaard, 2009).

Although the fact that Zelaya wanted to hold a referendum for the people, would actually be a sign of a democratic consolidated regime. As Stepan and Linz states in their theory on democratization, this is a sign of a nondemocratic regime, actually it is rather a sign of a military regime, just as Honduras was before it transitioned to democracy in 1981. As the man in survey one says, the Honduran state make the coup in order to make the people think that they needed more democracy, that the government they had before was not democratic enough for the people. They wanted the people to think that Zelaya was trying to make Honduras into a new Venezuela since Zelaya had changed his politics to be so much alike the politics that Chávez had.

According to the woman answering the survey 4, the fact that the government actually succeeded with the coup, was a sign of the government wanting to stop the democratic development that Zelaya had started. According to her, the Honduran government was lying to the citizens saying that Zelaya was going to reelect himself and remain in power without consulting the people on the matter. Also survey number 5 says, that not only was the Honduran government and military afraid of Zelaya staying in power, they were afraid of him introducing the country to communism. If Zelaya had gotten the referendum through and the people voted for his proposition to be able to be reelected by the people, they were sure, he would change the whole country's politics and make the country a communist one.

The military made the coup in order to change the ruling of the country, to become more democratic and not to change the very constitution of the country. But in the survey there is a question asking the Hondurans if the democracy in their country has changed, and if so then how it had changed. There are different opinions in the answers of this question, although the majority of these answers agree with each other on the fact that the democracy has definitely changed in the country. The democracy has changed to worse, as they say.

In survey number one, the man answers that the democracy has definitely changed, that the it is now at the lowest it has ever been, saying the democracy has never been this bad in Honduras. And that is

even including all the elections that have been that were full of fraud. This makes sense when thinking about what the Hondurans have experienced in the time from the coup and until the inauguration of the latest president. As some of the surveys mention, almost everything about the democracy have worsened since 2009, since the democracy was directly broken by the coup. People stopped trusting the government, stopped believing that the government actually was trying to do what was best for the people, instead of thinking of themselves. The government was very contradictive; blaming a break of the democracy and the constitution for the coup, that they exerted, and then end up destroying the democracy themselves.

Survey three says the same thing, that it has only gotten worse, that if there is democracy in Honduras it is only to benefit the authority and politicians, to benefit the people in power, not the normal citizens, and that is not what the point of selecting a representative government was about. When choosing a representative government, it is supposed to focus on the interests of its people, not focus on the interests of themselves, as said by Huntington.

Survey four is of the understanding that the Honduran government is nowhere near democratic, she says that the Honduran government is suppressed by a dictatorship, and that this dictatorship is breaking all rules. She says that Honduras can no longer obtain the basic human rights, and that the whole government is hated by the majority of the population. This is not democracy she says, this is a dictatorship. She says that the state that Honduras is in at this moment, is the worst state it has ever been. There are organizations that are trying to make Honduras a democratic country again as she says, to make the dictatorship fall. The organizations are trying to make the government understand that it is necessary to have the constitution back as it was before Hernández changed the law on reelection. And one of the largest parties of the opposition is trying to fight back, trying to make the Hernández government understand that they cannot just change the constitution, they cannot just hold illegal elections. It is not fair for the people of the country, it is not fair, because they have another perception as to what democracy is, as to what the government is supposed to do contra what they are doing for its inhabitants.

The democracy has gotten worse, and it is affecting the minorities of the country. As Stepan and Linz are talking about, the country is a modern nation-state democracy, at least it was, and it has minorities, it is not pure homogeneity, and as survey four says, when the country is no longer democratic, the minorities are being displaced. These minorities are victims of violence; they are not able to be part of the society. Even though there are organizations for the different cultures, organizations and groups

that are there to help the minorities, such as the indigenous in Honduras. There are groups for these people, and it is necessary if a country is going to be a democracy. Linz and Stepan says, it is necessary to have organizations or other groups to manage the interests of the minorities, the other cultures. Honduras have many different types of indigenous people; Garífunas who are a mixed Afro-Caribbean group of people, who actually do not really speak Spanish, they have their own language, and they live in one part of the country only. There are also indigenous with an origin of the Mayan indigenous (Minority Rights, 2018). These organizations are supposed to help the indigenous people have as many rights as others, since it is one of the main things in a democracy, according to Stepan and Liz. But according to this survey, this is just not helping, the democracy is not being a real democracy, when the government is the reason why the black community, the indigenous, and others are being replaced and forced out of their territories. The country need the democracy, needs the dictatorship to fall, as long as it is as now, the poverty will not be taken care of, the education and the health will not be better, not for the minorities nor for the rest of the population.

Back when the coup happened and the whole world was in a crisis as to what to think about it, Hillary Clinton, who was the Secretary of State in the United States that time, has admitted that although the Organization of American States were holding themselves back and did not acknowledge the “new” state of Honduras, Hillary Clinton took advantage of the situation. She possessed a fair share of power back then, and she knew how to use it (Gies, 2016).

She has admitted in a book of hers, that she exploited the hard situation Honduras was having, so that it could benefit the United States. She did not really care about the democracy of either the United States nor Honduras. She made sure that there would be held an election to elect the new president to take over for Micheletti. She wanted it to be fair, free and legitimate. But the way she helped the Honduran government put it together, might not be what others would call a democratic election.

Clinton and the Honduran government made sure that in the period up to the election, there would be a media block outq, so people were not able to write all sorts of propaganda, and they could not make as many problems about Zelaya as if they were able to use the media as usual. Although it should be legal to run your own kind of political campaign, if not then at least legal to write about what a candidate does good or bad, but this was not the issue at this election.

For an election to be democratic, many theorists claim that international monitoring of the election is a must. Samuel Huntington is one of the theorists who claim that it is especially important for a

transitioning democracy, or as Stepan and Linz says, a not yet fully consolidated democracy. But even though Clinton knew about this, at least because she knew what the OAS was doing in Honduras, she made sure that there was no international monitoring of the election. There were no one from the outside who could make sure that there were no irregularities, no corruption and no fails in the election. Some would even say, that this election was not real, because it did not live up to the rules of a popular vote.

But not only was the election fairly questionable, but the period of time leading to the election was full of questionable happenings as well. Clinton has admitted to actually be a part of the decisions the Honduran government made about killing politicians being against the coup and being against the new election. Although everyone has the right to speak their mind, they have the right to run against other candidates, and they have the right to have their own opinion. But this was not the case, according to Hillary Clinton (Gies, 2016).

As mentioned, the inhabitants of Honduras lost their trust in the government when they decided to exert the coup, but the people were willing to give the government and the democracy a second chance in the latest election. Too bad, the election was not living up to the hope that the people had for it. They so wanted to trust the democracy again, since they have been trusting it for many years. But with everything that happened at the election, the trust was still not there (Kinosian, The Guardian, 2017).

So as the surveys say, the democracy in Honduras has without a doubt changed, but not to the better. The democracy in Honduras has become a lack, something that the people want and are being promised, but it is just not present for them to actually gain from it.

Sub-conclusion

The surveys all agree that the democracy in Honduras is not the same as it has been before the coup in 2009. They all agree that the way the democracy has changed, is definitely not to the better, it has rather changed to the worse.

The paragraph above has found out, that the surveys are right, the democracy has changed, and it has not changed into what is better for the people. It has been found out, that Honduras has not done everything on their own, of course they have gotten financial aid from international financial organizations, but the United States have played a big role in the democracy of Honduras. The help from the United States has been in the country for several years.

When Barack Obama was president the coup happened, the Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton, took advantage of Honduras and its bad shape. Even though Honduras was supposed to be a democracy, and even though Clinton was supposed to be all about democracy, they managed to make an election, that was so far from democratic, as one can imagine. An election without any international monitoring, no international observers, although that is necessary for a democratic election, that is what Clinton made possible in cooperation with the Honduran government. They wanted the election to be over, in the hope that the Honduran people would stop thinking about the coup, and move on to the new democracy and the new government.

Since the coup in 2009, the Honduran government has failed to regain the trust of its people. The way that the government has controlled the country since then, has been a direct break of their trust. The fact that the government then chose to make all these undemocratic decisions, as to change the constitution after firing the people president and his people knew, would be against his proposition, for their own benefit, did not make it any better for them. They are furious with the government; they cannot imagine a worse government than the one that they have now. They were happy with the government and the president that they had back in 2009 before the coup was states, but now they have to live with this one.

To sum up, the democracy has in some way changed, but only to the worse. It has become less democratic than it was in 2009. The people despise it, they do not like this kind of democracy, it is not what they expected when they were promised a government run by elected representatives that should manage the interests of the people.

[Is Honduras A Politically Corrupt Country?](#)

As Laurence Whitehead says in his theory on political corruption, many countries are getting help from international finance organizations. Honduras gets help from organizations like The World Banks, USAID, International Monetary Fund. But as Whitehead says, these organizations focuses on the democracy in a country. If there is democracy in a country, it has to be sure that there is no corruption. Because these organizations find the question on corruption just as important as democracy. For a country to be able to get financial help such as loans, it has to be democratic but it also has to show that it does not tolerate corruption. So if the country shows any sign of corruption, the loans that have been granted can easily been taken away from them again. This is also what happened when the coup d'état happened in 2009.

The international financial organizations would not accept the fact that Honduras called itself a democratic country, when they managed to pull off a coup and remove the sitting president. Even worse was it when the country's new temporary leader refused to hold a referendum on the matter. This was not living up to the standards of the IMF and the World Bank, so they both decided to freeze the loans that they were getting. This would of course just make the poverty even worse in this already poor country. But as mentioned in the paragraph above, the temporary president did not mind the fact that they were not getting any money or any support from these organizations. When Honduras at last held the new presidential election it was seen as a democratic act and the organizations then open up for the loans again. This is a sign of a corrupt regime, when even other countries and international organizations can see the undemocratic act in it, when the acting country itself cannot (Reuters, Reuters World Service, 2010).

According to these organizations it is safe to say, that the actions of the military and the government during the coup in 2009, were corrupt and undemocratic. But according to the surveys answered by a few Hondurans, it was not only the coup that was corrupt and undemocratic. They are angry with the country, and how the authority decides things.

The way Hernández got to change the law in the constitution was a surprise to many Hondurans. Not only was Hernández a big supporter of the coup due to a break of the constitution, but he was also very sneaky trying to keep the modification of the constitution a secret, or at least not let it get too much attention. (Hobson & Bautista, 2018) That is why he managed to make the change in the congress in the middle of the night – dismissing whoever would disagree with him, and hiring the ones he knew would agree in the voting round the next day .

Survey five says that when Zelaya wanted to change the constitution and remain in power, it was bad for the country, but now when Hernández does it, or has done it, it is great for the country. The government is contradicting, saying it is bad when others do something, but it is okay if they do it themselves. It is just like survey one says, that the democracy the Hernández government is pursuing, is the democracy that can benefit themselves. And that is exactly what Whitehead also states in his theory is political corruption. When the authority does something just to benefit themselves.

Survey one says that the constitution does not even acknowledge the change, so for him the latest election was not even legal, at least the fact that Hernández won again is illegal. For him this is a proof of how low the country has sunk, the level of democracy has sunk this low. Using corruption

like this, changing the constitution, without actually officially changing it, is just an abuse of power, says survey one. The fact that this election passed through at the end, just means that it was one of the most corrupt elections in the history of Honduras, if not the most corrupt one. It just shows that the ones who exerted the coup, was just as corrupt when they got impunity and did not get any consequences for that act.

Not only was the election corrupt because Hernández was not allowed to win, but the way it was all happening the day of the voting, when the computer system suddenly failed, and the system was out for hours before it came back and when it finally came back, the votes were coincidentally in favor of Hernández. Survey one is definitely not happy with how it all worked out, and he does not agree with the fact that the people responsible for the fraudulent counting at the latest election do not get any punishment for the corruption either. Just like survey two, the answers are very simple, just that the election was manipulated, it was rigged. As Huntington says, a rigged election is political corruption, and it should not be possible in a democratic country as Honduras claims to be. Survey two answers to what suspicious things were noticed at the latest election, and the answers given are a clear sign of political corruption from the politician's side. There were several people who saw some of the ballot boxes being moved without any supervision, and they saw that the sealing of the ballot boxes was even broken. This was a clear sign of fraud, saying that the election was rigged, because if the ballot boxes were open and moved around without any observation, then nobody could know, if votes were taken out of it or votes were being put inside of it. By saying that it is a sign of voting fraud, otherwise it would not make any sense for the voting centers to move the ballots around without it being overseen by the observers.

Survey two believes without a doubt, that this suspicious thing that was going on in the local voting center, was in favor of Hernández. So according to survey five Hernández was stealing the election, to make sure he did not win. Well, it probably was not Hernández himself who actually committed the fraud, but the fact that the fraud was committed, it most likely came from above, which means, he had made the orders. When a politician like that can make orders for other people to commit fraud for them, it is sure to see that this politician is powerful. A powerful politician can do many things, and this kind of fraud of ballot boxes, are a clear sign of political corruption, because he is doing it to benefit himself, for him to stay in power.

Survey two even says, that she is sure, that the only reason Hernández won the presidential election, is because he committed this fraud of the ballots, saying the only reason for the victory was corruption. She is also sure, that the win was also happening because the United States helped it along. Hernández is also known to have a really good relationship with the United States, he is known to be very fond of the United States, and he sends drug lords to the States for them to be prosecuted and sentenced in this country. The United States would benefit from Hernández to win the reelection, because of plans Hernández has set in motion, plans such as the anti-corruption plan within the police force, where he has gotten rid of approximately 20 percent of the police force. The plan is to purge the corrupt people in Honduras one by one, starting with the police. Because of this plan, the United States is willing to give a lot of money to Honduras, because they believe in Honduras trying to change.

Honduras has for many years had many migrants fleeing to the United States, and Hernández has come up with a plan for this not to happen. The plan is for him to create 600.000 jobs within certain sectors, and that should be enough for the Hondurans to stay in Honduras. So if the election went bad for Hernández and the winner was Nasralla, this plan maybe would not have gotten through, which would be bad for the United States, because they would then continue to receive all the immigrants, that they do not want. Also the money that they had already put in the country for these plans to work, would have been wasted when the plans would not be fulfilled (Runde, 2017).

The idea of another country intervening in a presidential election like this, is highly unlikable. This would be corruption on a whole new level, not only political corruption, but an even worse kind, because it would also seem like the United States do not believe in the democracy of this country. That they would rather have their own will instead of the democratic people's will. This kind of corruption would break the people's faith in the democratic system. But having this in mind about a possible help from the United States in the elections, it would make more sense, when seeing who was the first country to acknowledge the winner of the election in December.

The United States has been very fond of Hernández, saying he is an ally to them, and that it helps him a lot, that he has friends in high places. Hernández and the United States have had a good relationship ever since Hernández was elected the first time, since he had a good relationship with the chief of staff of The White House, John F. Kelly. The United States has invested a lot of money in Honduras not only financial aid to help fighting drugs and corruption, but they have invested in Honduras when they helped them educate their police and their military. The United States have been in Honduras

for many years, the training of the armed forces in Honduras has not been easy, they have spent a lot of time, and a lot of money. All this because they like the fact that Hernández is trying to change the country, and they see the change as positive since it also helps the United States. If Hernández lost the election in 2017, the United States would not have had an ally in Central America, at least not as effective an ally as Hernández has been for them. Also, if he did not win, the White House was afraid, more Hondurans would be tempted to take the road to the United States, and they would not want them. All the billions of dollars that they had given to Honduras, and the Central America in general, would probably lose the effectiveness, since their partner would not be there to take care of it (Tharoor, 2017)

The United States was the first country to acknowledge the winner, even though there were still huge protests by the people being sure that the result was fraud (Malkin, New York Times, 2017). And even though the military broke the human rights, that allow the inhabitants to do peaceful protests, but they were stopped by the military and the armed forces despite this (ITUC CSI IGB, 2017). The OAS had tried to plan a new election to be sure of the result, since there were so many irregularities in the counting of the votes, and all the suspicious things that had been noticed around the votes, but despite this inquiry, the United States still chose to acknowledge the result.

People in the United States had written letters to their government with the request that they should back the OAS up with their inquiry, because it would be the best thing for Honduras' people. Many had been beaten up in the custody of the Honduran military, several had been murdered, but the United States would not listen, and decided to back the newly elected Honduran president instead. The United States stated that Honduras had been loyal to them, and they had been trying to fight the illegal drugs, these facts in cooperation with the fact that Honduras wanted to help the United States with the immigrants from Honduras, was enough for the United States to support their decision (Malkin, New York Times, 2017).

Also survey four is sure that the current government of Honduras had help from the United States. Although she also believes that Hernández took advantage of the support given from other countries and organizations, such as the European Union, even though they waited for a long time to even acknowledge the result of the election. But survey four says, that Hernández and his people are thirsty of power, and they could take advantage of any support given to them ever.

Survey four is highly affected by the latest election, she compares it to earlier elections, where the people also voted for one person, a person from another party than what Honduras was used to. According to survey four, the people of Honduras primarily voted for a woman, Xiomara Castro, who was from the party where Manuel Zelaya still has a role. But even though the people voted, it was not their votes that were being counted. It was instead Juan Orlando Hernández who won the election. She says, that the same thing happened in the latest election, that the president and his people had used fraud for the second time to be able to win. Survey four states that it was not only the voting fraud, but the fraud and the corruption started out when he chose to convince the congress to vote in favor of his proposition as to run for presidency a second time even though the constitution has a law saying it is illegal. Of course, she says, he got it as he wanted, he ran for presidency again, and he won – again. When the people started protesting at the latest election, he made sure, that the military and the armed forces would take care of it.

The clashes between the protesters and the armed forces were violent, some were deadly. Even though the people only wanted to have their decisions respected, they wanted the government to respect the real result. According to survey four, the armed forces were the reason why some politicians from the opposition disappeared, and still is, she says the military were ordered to take care of these problems, so they kidnapped and killed whoever were against them. She says that there are still political prisoners up to this day, and none of the armed forces are being prosecuted for this, impunity is more important for the government. Survey four talks about how hated the current president is by a large part of the inhabitants of Honduras. The people were imposed a control by the representatives of the president, they were intimidating the people in order for them to do what Hernández and his people wanted when developing and planning the election. Survey four says that it was obvious how the fraud was committed directly at the voting centers, she says it was clear to see, how the ballots were being stuffed with illegal votes.

Survey four also talks about how the government is corrupt in another way than just at the election, although the election shows pretty well, how politically corrupt the country is. Hernández and his government issues rules that will help them get richer, rules that will only benefit them and others of their belief. Hernández has created the MACCIH (Misión de Apoyo Contra La Corrupción y La Impunidad En Honduras – the Mission of Support Against Corruption And Impunity in Honduras), this organization has been fighting corruption with the president, but no matter how much the people push forward for them to actually follow through with the punishments of the corrupt people, nothing

happens. The organization is fighting against corruption and impunity, but the president is still the president. His people are not touched, the corruption can just keep going, and he can feel like he is changing the country fighting others that are corrupt.

Survey five experienced that the people who were governing the voting tables, were secretly hiding the papers where the names of the people were written, they were hiding the names of the people because they did not want the voters to see, if they actually keep a record of dead people on these papers. Survey five was denied to check if her deceased family members were written as dead or as still voting. If the names of the deceased people are not written as deceased, the representatives at the voting stations can, if they are corrupt and not democratic, vote for the deceased people, and vote in favor of the candidate that they want. With the many surveys saying that they have seen ballot boxes having a broken seal, or seeing them being stuffed with votes, that for sure were not legal votes, there is a chance that these votes could be the votes of the deceased people. Rumors are going around in Honduras saying this, although there is no proof of this.

Sub-conclusion

To sum up, it is fair to say that Honduras has definitely shown signs of it being politically corrupt. It is primarily shown in the different elections that have been held in Honduras, but with the help from the surveys answered by some Hondurans, it has also shown that the political corruption does not only occur at the election, at the voting tables, but it occurs under, during and even also after the elections.

The corruption is not only election fraud such as voting fraud, there are really serious problems of corruption going on in Honduras, when people are getting killed as a result of the corruption, and these people getting killed, are only getting killed because they have another perception of what is best for the country. Politicians disappeared, the surveys say it is without a doubt orders from the president or his people, and that it for sure was exerted by the military and the armed forces, but there is no way to find out, since the politicians are still missing, possibly dead.

Most of the surveys have experienced some kind of corruption in their country, such as a stuffed ballot box, or voting fraud. But the one corrupt thing that recurs in the answers to the survey, is that the president of Honduras, Juan Orlando Hernández, managed to become reelected as a president, when it is completely illegal. That Hernández was one of the elites that were agreeing with the former Honduran government when planning the coup d'état, because they were afraid of the former president changing the constitution so that he could be reelected. So the fact that Hernández were able to

do the exact same thing, that they kept Zelaya from doing, is a political corrupt act committed not only by the president, but also the congress that agreed to change the law saying it was illegal.

The fact that Honduras had help becoming acknowledged even though so many countries and organizations were against it, is lining up to the border of corruption. There is no evidence that the surveys are right about the United States have helped Honduras in the latest election, but there are certain things that speak for this happening. When there are so many written articles, that can actually back up the claims that the surveys have talked about, when the articles talk about how much the United States would lose if the president was not reelected, and they then go out and acknowledge the election in front of the whole world, who would not acknowledge it.

So it is fair to say, that yes, Honduras is a country that is affected by political corruption in all matters. Both when it comes to elections, but also when it comes to the laws that are being made in favor of the ones in power. The fact that the politicians and the government in Honduras need to kidnap and kill people in order for them to get what they want, is just proof that the country is highly corrupt.

[Is Honduras A Democratic Regime?](#)

There are different types of democracy in the world, but the democracy that Honduras is known to use, is the representative democracy.

In a representative democratic regime, the political authority or rulers are chosen to make the political decisions for the people. The people chose the authority through an election where every adult is allowed to vote for whomever they prefer to take care of their interests (Svensson, n.d.).

Reading the history of Honduras, one of the first things the web page tells you, is that Honduras became a democracy in 1982, transitioning from a military rule. The history says that even though the country was full of violence, inequality, impunity and corruption, the people believed that the country could be a consolidated democracy, and that the Honduran institutions would be governing to benefit all people, not just one group (NDI, n.d.). Honduras is therefore known to be a democracy, a fairly new one and still with problems, but a democracy with democratic elections and everything.

As Huntington writes in his theory on democratization, there are different understandings as to what democracy is. But the definition he has written, is a definition that is also written by other theorists, so that is the definition this project is working from. His definition is starting out saying the same as the definition above, that a democracy is people's right to vote for a representative to take care of the interests of the people. He also says that there are certain rules, so to speak, for when the elections

for finding this representative are actually democratic. It is important for democracy, that there is no corruption in the election, it is also important that the election is happening in a fair and honest matter, for both the people but also for the candidates. This is why it is important for any popular election, that there are international monitors, so that they can help keep an eye on how it is all working out, make sure that there is no fraud, nor any corruption in the election. For an election to be democratic, the opposition needs to have the same rights, the same possibilities as the government in that moment. This is to say, that the opposition cannot feel like they are being harassed, or feel like they are not getting the same opportunities.

In a democracy, Huntington says, every person has the same rights when coming to voting and having a say in the politics. It is allowed for everyone to run for the candidacy, it does not matter what color of the skin the person has, nor the level of wealth the person has.

One of the questions in the survey is how the people that are being asked think democracy is. Above is written one definition to make sure what this project is taking outset from.

The first survey answered thinks that democracy is a way to express and participate as a society in the governmental system. For the society to express itself and participate in the governmental system, it has to participate actively, the people in the society has to participate actively, because otherwise they will not be a part of the governmental system. This is the perception this first guy has of democracy. But he does not think that Honduras is a democratic country. He believes that Honduras is undemocratic since they do not have a constitution that allows participation of the people. The constitution is not acknowledging the true democracy, in his opinion. This is also him who said that the democracy is at its lowest ever, which makes sense since he says, that there is no democracy in Honduras at all.

Also survey number two agrees that there is no democracy in Honduras, because her perception of democracy is also that it is the rights of the people to select their own authority, that they are allowed to select who they want to rule their country. But Honduras is not like this, she says, Honduras is dictatorship where the inhabitants are ignored by their representatives, their will is not respected and not taken care of, the rulers are just imposing their own will onto the people. But it has not been like this forever, it is a fairly recent change. She feels so upset that no matter if they vote or not there is no change in the country, because the government does whatever it wants anyways. She says, that the Honduran people are helpless, they cannot change a thing, and she honestly feels like the whole

country is just being dominated by the United States, that the country does not care about its people, as long as the relationship with the United States is still good.

Survey number three believes that democracy is a functional system where the people can feel free and actually are free to choose their authorities, their rulers, and it is a system where the elected government accept and respect their will. But also she believes that there is no democracy in her country, because as she wrote in her answer, there was a huge break of the constitution when the president chose to change article 239 “*El ciudadano que haya desempeñado la titularidad del Poder Ejecutivo no podrá ser presidente o Designado. El que quebrante esta disposición o proponga su reforma, así como aquellos que lo apoyen directa o indirectamente, cesarán de inmediato en el desempeño de sus respectivos cargos y quedarán inhabilitados por diez (10) años para el ejercicio de toda función pública*)²”. This article of the constitution is saying that if a person has been the president before, he or she cannot become president again, not if he or she runs for it, nor if he or she is being appointed. If the former president chose to run for presidency again or is being appointed again, the person will be suspended from the politics for ten years, and even the ones who directly support the former president to run, or the ones who support it indirectly would also be suspended. But as survey number three says, president Hernández both suggested changing this and he ran again, many people supported him, but none of them got suspended for ten years. So no one from the government was actually following the constitution that is supposed to be seen as the democratic book of rules for the country. So according to her, the country of Honduras is far from democratic when Hernández turned out to win the presidency again, even though it was illegal.

Survey three chose to vote at the latest election in 2017 even though she knew that the democracy was gone, and that nothing would change despite the people voting for change. She chose to vote because she wanted to show that she wanted a change in the country, she wanted to fight the system, she has a dream that the country will be great again, she wants to change the lives of the future generations for them to be able to feel the democracy once again, she dreams that the nation can once again be a beautiful place to live. So even though she does not believe in Honduras being a democratic

² Translated into English: The citizen who has held the title of the Executive Power cannot be president or be appointed. The one who breaks this disposition or propose its reform, as well as the ones who support this directly or indirectly, will cease immediately in the performance of their respective positions and will be disqualified for ten (10) years for the exercise of any public function.

country, she believes that by keep voting it might change the country, or change the minds of the future generations, making them aware of what the country could be, and not just what it is now.

Democracy is the power of the people, where every person freely can choose the authorities that they want to be the representatives, it is the people's right to choose any ruler that is controlling the country. This is what survey number four thinks when being asked about what democracy is for her. But she says, that this is real democracy, and it is the kind of democracy that Honduras lost back in 2009, when the people's elected president was ousted from office. Honduras can still feel the coup d'état, Honduras is still affected by the consequences of the coup, even though it happened almost ten years ago. In her opinion, Honduras is far from a democracy, she thinks of a dictatorship when thinking about Honduras now. The rulers in Honduras are chosen by the government itself through electoral fraud, so the people does not decide anything about this, even though that is the purpose of a democratic popular election. Not only are the rulers chosen by the government through electoral fraud, but they are also chosen with the help from the United States. No ruler is being elected unless the United States are agreeing with it.

Survey four is politically active, and therefore cares a lot about the politics of the country even though she has been forced to flee the country for her own safety. She has lots of opinions about the politics and the Honduran government, and most of her opinions are very much against the current president Juan Orlando Hernández.

Honduras is a failed state, it is not functioning as a real state anymore, at least not a state that actually cares about its inhabitants. The state cares about its elite and whoever rulers it has, as well as the relationship and the acceptance and acknowledgement of the United States. Therefore, the republic of Honduras cannot be called a democratic regime, she says. The Honduran institutions are more focused on the interests of Hernández than the interests of the people, which should be their job, to take care of the people's interests. A democracy does not focus only on the rich people; it focuses on every person of the country. This is also why she says that Honduras is having its worst crisis ever, because it is nowhere near what the country is supposed to be, and the problems have their roots in the politics of the country.

Although there were enough international observers at the elections, the country is still not democratic, because in spite of the fact that there were enough observers, they did not do anything to make sure, that there was no fraud. It was easy to see, that the election was manipulated by fraud, but the

result still ended up being in favor of Hernández, and the observers should have done something to make sure, that the fraud would not win. So despite the observers, which according to Huntington is one of the necessities for an election to be democratic, the election was still not democratically exerted, at least not with all the problems the election had.

Survey number five also says that democracy to her, is the power of the people. But she also says that it does not exist in her country, because her country does not respect the people's opinions. The people's opinions are not respected because the president buy the power of the country, and in that way the state and the government has to do whatever he wants done.

Honduras does not respect the opinion of the majority, and to survey five, that is enough reason to say, that Honduras, her country, is not democratic. The state continues to prepare more and more military for them to be ready for when the people hold protests to make the government understand when they do not agree with the government. The people of Honduras are repressed by the police, the people are afraid of saying their opinion, they are afraid of what will happen if they stand up to themselves and keep fighting. But they do keep fighting, they will keep fighting until the government starts to hear the necessities of the people, instead of only being concerned of their own necessities. So survey five says that there definitely is no democracy in her country. But there is a lot of instability in her country instead. Instability in the sense that the people are never sure of having a job, having an income. The people cannot be sure of anything in Honduras, only the fact that there is no democracy. Survey five says that even though she does not believe that her country is a democracy, despite the fact that they call themselves a democracy, she still voted in the latest election. She knew that she would not be able to change anything, but she voted anyways to show that she wanted to at least try, she wanted to show that she is willing to change her country. She is angry that her beloved is in the state that it is, she is angry that the people of Honduras cannot act freely, they cannot do what they want, they cannot change anything within the country, only the president can. And she is sure, that Hernández will leave the country in even worse state than it is now. She believes that when the president now has four more years, he will leave the country even poorer and more indebted, which for her is an even worse state than now. It makes her angry, that she can only dream of her country being better, she cannot do anything to actually change it.

Survey number six agrees with all the others' perceptions of democracy, and she, as well as the others, does not believe that there is democracy in Honduras. She also brings the issue of the law that was changed by the president, in order for him to be reelected. She finds this issue a deal breaker, that was

the absolute most undemocratic thing, it is the thing that is making her sure that the country is undemocratic. The law was modified just to please the president; they did not even care enough about the people to ask them what they wanted. So they just changed it because that is what the president wanted, they did not care about the rest of the country. She thinks that the most important thing a democratic country can do, is to respect the constitution and the constitutional rights for the people. The government should respect the people's rights to demand transparency, because now they do not exist for the Honduran government, and when the people are invisible to the government, to the president, the regime turns into a dictatorship, where the government should only listen to the president and do what he wants. That is Honduras.

Survey number seven does not think either, that Honduras has a democracy, but according to him, there has not even been a change of this since the coup in 2009. According to him, it has been like this for many years, there has always just been one person controlling everything in the country, even though they were supposed to be selected by the people. The election processes in Honduras are not transparent, not when the election happened as it did, with all the doubtful recountings. The democracy is still on its lowest, actually nondemocratic, because the power has just changed hands. Nothing else.

Democracy is the act of ensuring the integrity, the security and more necessities that a population demands. And the people then trust the representatives to fulfill the expectations that the people have. This is how survey number eight sees democracy to be. Survey eight thinks that the public sector is controlled by the government, and therefore it is required to take care of the ambitious interests of the political leaders, and first after this has been taken care of, they can work on the social necessities of the Honduras people. The public sector and the institutions should not be controlled in order for a country to be democratic, at least not controlled in a way where they put the interests of the leaders first. She says that the complaints the government gets, are not being attended not are the demands of the people. The system is corrupt and far from democratic, it can be again if these problems will be solved and the system starts to respect the demands of the people and respect the constitution as well.

All in all, the surveys all agreed on what democracy is; their right to elect the representatives that should then manage their interests and their demands. That democracy is respecting the people, respecting the people's decisions and also respecting the constitution as the important law that it is.

Not only did the Hondurans from the surveys agree on what democracy is, they also agreed that Honduras definitely is not a democratic regime. All the expectations that they had to their government were never attended to, and they feel left out. The government does not care about its inhabitants, even though they are the future of the country; if they were not there, there would be no country to rule.

For a regime to be democratic, the elections have to be overseen by international organizations that will then be able to see if an election is rigged in any way. If this is the case, the election can either not be called democratic, or it cannot be seen as being a valid election. If they choose not to call the election democratic, then the state of course cannot call itself a democratic regime either, at least not if they acknowledge the result of the then nondemocratic election. If an election is seen as rigged, it cannot be called democratic, because then it is corrupt. Democracy and corruption does not cope well, and therefore if a state has one of the things, it would be very difficult to have the other. Of course a country can have some corruption, but it cannot be what fills up the country. The democracy has to be the most important thing in a country, and the country has to show that they will not accept corruption. Even though a country might have some, they still have to make an effort to minimize or completely stop the corruption.

The fact the Honduran government, including the congress and the supreme court, chose to let president Hernández rerun for the presidency even though the constitution does not allow this, can also be seen as a very undemocratic act. The people of the country assumed, as the surveys show, that the government would respect and obey the constitution, not just modify it a bit, so that it could only be this one president who could run again. They found as a giant break of the democracy. For the Honduran people, the constitution is the law both the people and the government should follow.

It was also fair to say that the coup d'état that happened in 2009, was far from democratic as well. Huntington has said in his theory on democracy, that one thing that is definitely not democratic is if a military makes a coup d'état. A coup would take all democracy away from the state, because the state then would choose to remove the president from office, and in a democracy the president should be elected by the inhabitants through an election. So when a state then chooses to remove this current president elected by the people, it would go against the voters' decision. If a decision made by the government goes directly against the people's decision, the democracy does not work. The democracy only works if the government respects the decision of the people. When the government then chooses to make a coup in corporation with the elite of a country, it is just even more undemocratic, because

it seems like, the government then is corrupt, since the elite has something to say. In a consolidated democracy everyone should have the same rights, everyone should have the same amount of votes in a country. So when the elite has more power than the people, the democracy does not seem to be consolidated.

In the chapter above it has been concluded that Honduras is a fairly corrupt country. It has plenty of political corruption, all the surveys say the same and many articles state the same fact. Especially their elections are very corrupt, and that is also another reason as to why Honduras cannot be called a democratic regime.

Honduras is not democratic because their elections are highly rigged. Most of the world even has problems finding out what to do about the questionable act that this country is doing. The world would not acknowledge the coup in 2009, they would not acknowledge the temporary president nor the elected president who then took over for Zelaya. Of course it was necessary to acknowledge the government at some point, but it took a long time, because many other consolidated democracies did not see this act as fair and democratic. Even when the international financial organizations stop their finances because of the nondemocratic decisions they took, it is clearly not just the Hondurans who answered the survey, who believe that Honduras was not acting fairly and democratically.

The doubt then came back at the latest election, because there were so many things going on with the voting and the counting. The international observers would not acknowledge the result; the European Union would not acknowledge Hernández' win until there was more certainty to the situation. Was not until the United States acknowledged the questionable result, that many other countries then had to accept it as well. The international monitoring, in shape of observers, are the ones who know the most about fraud in an election, and they know if an election is rigged. So when the observers ask for a new election even after a recount of the votes, then the United States should listen and not acknowledge the result, instead they should have demanded a new election to make sure the election could then be democratic. But this was not the case with this election, and therefore, it can be concluded that Honduras is not a full-democratic regime, and it has not been since before the coup in 2009. The people of Honduras is fighting for their government to change back into being a democracy as was the plan with the country, since they transitioned from the military rule.

Sub-conclusion

To sum up the paragraph above; the surveys all agreed that Honduras cannot be called a democratic regime. They have several examples as to why their country is not a democracy, but one example is

mentioned in most of the surveys. This example is the fact that the current president succeeded with the reelection although the constitution states that it is illegal. So the fact that the president and his allies managed to convince the congress and the supreme court to let him modify the constitution in order for him to be able to be reelected without the punishment, ten years of suspension, that the constitution says is the punishment for this.

The surveys all agree on what democracy is, which is also why they all agree that Honduras does not live up to this kind of ruling. They have a common understanding that democracy is the power of the people, that the people are free to choose the authority that they believe can attend the best to the needs of the people. The authority that is chosen by the people are to put the interests of the people before their own when coming to decision making in the government. They agree that the representatives they have chosen should also respect the law of the country, which is the constitution. For the Honduran people these responsibilities have not been fulfilled in Honduras. Some of the surveys thinks that these responsibilities have not been fulfilled since before the coup in 2009, but others think that even before the coup, their country was still not living up to the concept of democracy. But there are more things that play a role in the decision on whether or not the country is democratic. As many of the surveys have mentioned, their country has been ruined by corruption. The elections that have been held since Zelaya was pushed out of office, have been filled with fraud and corruption. As the theory by Huntington and the corruption theory state, there cannot be a democracy if there is a high amount of corruption, and the elections cannot be democratic if they have been full of fraud. Therefore, this paragraph has found out, that Honduras is not a democratic regime.

Conclusion

This chapter of the project will sum up on the findings of the previous chapters. The objective of this project was to find out if the level of democracy had changed since the coup d'état in 2009 where Manuel Zelaya fled out of the country, and if so, then how did change. Not only the level of democracy was on the agenda for the project, but it was also an aim to find out if the country actually was corrupt, and if so, then how it would affect the democracy in Honduras. Lastly the project was also going to find out if Honduras actually is a democratic regime or not. All of these objectives should have been answered in the analysis, but this conclusion will shortly tell what the project found out. The theory of the project is used to analyze the Honduran case, the theory is necessary for the analysis, since it can help back up the empirical data, which in this case are the surveys from Honduras.

The analysis starts out by analyzing the case of the coup d'état in 2009, this was done by using the surveys that were sent to eight Hondurans, who had experienced both the coup in 2009 and also the election in 2017. These people have a perception about their country as to what the democracy is like in their country compared to how democracy is taught to be like. These surveys also tell how the people felt during the coup and what reasons they were told to back the coup up.

The democracy in Honduras has changed to some degree, but it has just not changed to the better which was what the Hondurans expected after the coup. The reason for the coup was that the president back then wanted to change the constitution and rerun for the presidency. The government said this was not fair, because according to the constitution this would be illegal.

The democracy has changed to the worse, the people gets the right to vote, but their votes are not taken into consideration. Usually a democracy is based on the votes from the people. Democracy is based on people. But in the analysis it has been concluded that Honduras does not think of its people, at least the government does not. Instead of focusing on the people of the country, the government then focuses on the elite and the leaders of Honduras. The election that have been held in Honduras since the coup, have not been democratically correct. Hillary Clinton, the Secretary of State back in 2009, helped Honduras forget about the democratic necessities in an election. Clinton helped Honduras made a media block out, so the people could not keep in contact and write a lot of propaganda this way. Not only did she help with this, but she also made sure that there were no international monitors at the election, which is one of the most important things in an election, if it should be allowed to be called a democratic election. Honduras made sure that some of the leaders and voters of the country who did not like the way the coup was handled, would not be in the way of the new election, therefore,

there were kidnappings and killings, all executed to keep an order of peace in the country – this was furthermore excused as an act to make people forget about the coup and move on by Clinton. According to many articles and the surveys the new election should not have been held in the first place, the international financial organizations advised Honduras to let Zelaya back in the country and make the people take a decision as to whether or not they would want Zelaya back after what the government then had told them. But the temporary president, Micheletti, did not agree, and he refused to hold a referendum like this. This then led to a suspension of the financial aid from these organizations, but Micheletti believed that the country would manage without that money for a while. So they ended up having an election for a new president.

The latest election in Honduras was probably one of the elections that was referred to the most all around the world. The election was very questionable although it started out being very democratic and promising for the voters. Since the president Hernández modified the Honduran constitution to make sure he could rerun for the presidency, he was not very popular around the country. But the election was happening, the opposition was ready, and people voted. The opposition candidate Salvador Nasralla seemed to be winning the election with a lead on almost five percent. But suddenly something went wrong in the counting of the votes, they blamed the computer system, but even though the computer system started to work again, the result of the election did not come until many days later. The result was suddenly all in favor of the current president, so he ended up winning the election. People were furious, lootings were happening in the street, protests were going on, people were being killed. Many countries would not acknowledge the result – until suddenly the United States did, although their own organization of election monitoring said that the election was shady and fraudulent. The United States would lose too much money if the opposition won, because Hernández was their ally, and they gave a lot of money to Honduras, which would lose its efficiency if Hernández did not win again.

The Honduran people feel like they are suppressed by the United States, they say that the United States has more say in the Honduran politics than the Honduran people who should actually have a large role in the politics, since the democracy is the power of the people. The surveys say that the democracy in Honduras has changed, but only to the worse. Now they feel like there is no democracy in their country. The democracy has been exchanged with a dictatorship, so whatever president Juan Orlando Hernández and his people think is the best, their interests, that is what Honduras will then take care of.

The people of Honduras does not believe in democracy in Honduras until they will have a pure democratic election, an election where their votes will be the counting votes. Honduras is a politically corrupt country; the elections are full of fraud, the systems suddenly shuts down in the middle of a vote counting, and when the systems finally work again, then the votes are suddenly falling out in favor of another person than before the system failed. People have seen observers at the voting centers stuffing the ballot boxes, making one candidate more likely to win. Voters are not allowed to see if their deceased family members are on the lists of voters, making the voters fear that the names or their beloved deceased would then be used for more voting fraud. A president is winning his second term of presidency even though the entire election was illegal and he, and others, were supposed to get ten years of suspension from politics in the country. People are disappearing in Honduras, people who are against the president and his party, people who maybe said too much. These are pure evidence that the country is highly corrupt. Hernández supported the Honduran government and military back in 2009 when they wanted to exert the coup against Zelaya, because Hernández was a part of the elite him being in one of the biggest parties in the country. He supported the coup because he was afraid, that Zelaya would turn Honduras into a Chávez country, a communist country, especially if Zelaya's referendum on the constitution matter actually turned out in favor of Zelaya. Hernández was afraid that Zelaya would get the citizens' accept to change the constitution and rerun for president, this being a break in the democracy of the country. But then it turns that he, Hernández, did it himself, fired the people he knew would be against his proposition, and convinced the congress to agree with him. Although none from the government then finds this new change of the constitution a break of the democracy, because now it was a popular man from the government who did it, and he would make changes in favor of the other rulers in the government and congress. It has therefore been concluded that the democracy in Honduras has changed, but not to the better. It has changed to be even worse than before, it has changed to be a dictatorship, according to the Hondurans, and is therefore not a democracy anymore, even though they call themselves a democratic country. the country has been through a lot, and the presidents from 2009 until now has been very corrupt in their way of ruling their country, they have not lived up to the concept of democracy, at least not as they promised. The politicians have been fraudulent and corruption, not thinking about the people of Honduras, only thinking about themselves, therefore, Honduras is not living up to the definitions of democracy, Honduras is not living up to be a consolidated democracy. Honduras can simply not be a democratic regime, when corruption is taking so much space in the country, that the people turn transparent to the government.

Bibliography

(u.d.). Hentet fra <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/dec/18/honduras-election-president-juan-orlando-hernandez-declared-winner-amid-unrest>

Alfred C. Stepan. (n.d.). Retrieved from Journal of Democracy:
<https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/article/alfred-c-stepan-1936%E2%80%932017>

Association For a More Just Society. (n.d.). Retrieved from Why Is Honduras So Violent? Drugs, Gangs, Corruption, and Impunity: <https://www.ajs-us.org/content/why-honduras-so-violent>

BBC. (n.d.). Retrieved from World Latin America Timeline: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-latin-america-18974519>

Betts, R. K. (n.d.). *Britannica*. Retrieved from Samuel P. Huntington American Political Scientist:
<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Samuel-P-Huntington>

Britannica. (n.d.). Retrieved from Juan J. Linz: <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Juan-Linz>

Den Store Danske. (n.d.). Retrieved from Honduras: [http://denstoredanske.dk/Geografi_og_historie/Syd-_og_Mellemamerika/Mellemamerikanske_stater/Honduras_\(Landeartikel\)](http://denstoredanske.dk/Geografi_og_historie/Syd-_og_Mellemamerika/Mellemamerikanske_stater/Honduras_(Landeartikel))

Gies, H. (2016, June 28). *Telesur*. Retrieved from Honduran Democracy Still In Crisis 7 Years After The Coup: <https://www.telesurtv.net/english/analysis/Honduran-Democracy-Still-in-Crisis-7-Years-After-Coup-20150520-0052.html>

Hobson, A., & Bautista, L. (2018, January 31). *Real Clear World*. Retrieved from The Damage To Democracy In Honduras :
https://www.realclearworld.com/articles/2018/01/31/the_damage_to_democracy_in_honduras_12697.html

Huntington, S. P. (1993). *The Third Wave of Democratization in The Late Twentieth Century*. Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.

InSight Crime. (2018, August 27). Retrieved from Honduras Profile:
<https://www.insightcrime.org/honduras-organized-crime-news/honduras/>

ITUC CSI IGB. (2017, December 14). Retrieved from Honduras: Amid Evidence Of Election Fraud, Police Cracks Down On Peacefil Protesters: <https://www.ituc-csi.org/honduras-amid-evidence-of-election>

Kinosian, S. (2017, December 18). *The Guardian*. Retrieved from Call For Fresh Honduras Election After President Juan Orlando Hernández Wins:
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/dec/18/honduras-election-president-juan-orlando-hernandez-declared-winner-amid-unrest>

Kinosian, S. (2017, December 7). *The Guardian*. Retrieved from Crisis OF Honduras Democracy Has Roots In US Tacit Support For 2009 Coup: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/dec/07/crisis-of-honduras-democracy-has-roots-in-us-tacit-support-for-2009-coup>

Korsgaard, C. (2009, August 27). De Facto Regeringen Udfordrer Verden. *Mellemfolkeligt Samvirke*.

Kyte, B. (2017, March 14). *Global Witness*. Retrieved from Honduras: Deadliest Country In The World For Environmental Activism :

https://www.nytimes.com/2009/06/29/world/americas/29honduras.html?rref=collection%2Ftimes%2FZelaya%2C%20Jos%C3%A9%20Manuel&action=click&contentCollection=timestopics®ion=stream&module=stream_unit&version=latest&contentPlacement=92&pgtype=collectio

Lakhani, N., & Kinoshian, S. (2017, December 3). *The Guardian*. Retrieved from Thousands Protest In Honduras In Chaos Over Contested Presidential Election:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/dec/03/thousands-protest-in-honduras-in-chaos-over-contested-presidential-election>

Leith, W. (2018, February 24). *Spectator*. Retrieved from Is Tegucigalpa The Crime Capital Of The World?:

<https://www.spectator.co.uk/2018/02/is-tegucigalpa-the-crime-capital-of-the-world/>

Malkin, E. (2009, June 28). *The New York Times*. Retrieved from Honduran President Is Ousted In Coup:

https://www.nytimes.com/2009/06/29/world/americas/29honduras.html?rref=collection%2Ftimes%2FZelaya%2C%20Jos%C3%A9%20Manuel&action=click&contentCollection=timestopics®ion=stream&module=stream_unit&version=latest&contentPlacement=92&pgtype=collectio

Malkin, E. (2017, December 22). *New York Times*. Retrieved from US Backs Honduran President's Victory In Disputed Election: <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/22/world/americas/us-honduras-president-hernandez.html>

Martin, W. (2016, December 1). *Independent*. Retrieved from Most Dangerous Countries in The World:

<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/politics/most-dangerous-countries-in-the-world-criminality-index-a7450266.html>

Minority Rights. (2018, May). Retrieved from Honduras: <https://minorityrights.org/country/honduras/>

NDI. (n.d.). Retrieved from Honduras Overview: <https://www.ndi.org/latin-america-and-caribbean/honduras>

Oxford Living Dictionary. (n.d.). Retrieved from Democracy:

<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/democracy>

Reuters. (2010, February 11). Reuters World Service. *World Bank Restores Development Aid To Honduras*.

Reuters. (2017, November 26). *Reuters*. Retrieved from Candidates and What's At Stake In Honduras Presidential Election: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-honduras-election-candidates-factbox/candidates-and-whats-at-stake-in-honduras-presidential-election-idUSKBN1DQ0QT>

Reuters. (2017, December 2). *The Guardian*. Retrieved from Honduras Suspends Rights As Violence Spreads Over Delayed Vote Count: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/dec/02/honduras-suspends-rights-as-violence-spreads-over-delayed-vote-count>

Riis, O. (2007). *Samfundsvidenskab i Praksis; Introduktion til Anvendt Metode*. København K: Hans Reitzels .

Ritzau. (2017, December 2). *DR*. Retrieved from Myndighederne Erklærer Undtagelsestilstand I Honduras: <https://www.dr.dk/nyheder/udland/myndighederne-erklærer-undtagelsestilstand-i-honduras#!/>

Runde, D. (2017, November 14). *Foreign Policy*. Retrieved from The United States Has A Lot Riding On The Honduras Election: <https://foreignpolicy.com/2017/11/14/the-united-states-has-a-lot-riding-on-the-honduras-election/>

Santana, A. (2017, November 24). *Telesur*. Retrieved from Elecciones En Honduras (2017'9:

<https://www.telesurtv.net/bloggers/Elecciones-en-Honduras-2017-20171124-0001.html>

Stepan, A., & Linz, J. J. (1996). *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe*. Johns Hopkins University Press Baltimore and London.

Svensson, P. (n.d.). *Den Store Danske*. Retrieved from Demokrati:

http://denstoredanske.dk/Samfund,_jura_og_politik/Samfund/Moderne_demokrati_og_konstituti_onelt_monarki/demokrati

Tharoor, I. (2017, December 4). *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from The Crisis In Honduras Should Matter To The U.S.: https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2017/12/04/the-crisis-in-honduras-should-matter-to-the-u-s/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.db662d055c81

The Guardian. (2017, December 18). Retrieved from Call For Fresh Honduras Election After President Juan Orlando Hernández Wins: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/dec/18/honduras-election-president-juan-orlando-hernandez-declared-winner-amid-unrest>

Transparency International. (n.d.). Retrieved from Glossary, Political Corruption:

https://www.transparency.org/glossary/term/political_corruption

Transparency International. (n.d.). Retrieved from Glossary, Corruption:

<https://www.transparency.org/glossary/term/corruption>

Transparency International. (n.d.). Retrieved from Glossary, Grand Corruption:

https://www.transparency.org/glossary/term/grand_corruption

Transparency International. (n.d.). Retrieved from Glossary, Petty Corruption:

https://www.transparency.org/glossary/term/petty_corruption

Transparency International. (n.d.). Retrieved from Country; Honduras :

<https://www.transparency.org/country/HND#>

Whitehead, L. (2002). *Democratization Theory and Experience*. New York: Oxford.

World Bank. (n.d.). Retrieved from The World Bank in Honduras :

<http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/honduras/overview>

World Population Review. (n.d.). Retrieved from Honduras :

<http://worldpopulationreview.com/countries/honduras-population/>