26. Political Parties and the Election in Gazelle

Elly B. Kinkin

Introduction

This chapter will look at the Gazelle Open electorate in the 2007 election, with a focus on political parties. The significance of political parties flows from the *Organic Law on the Integrity of Political Parties and Candidates* (OLIPPAC) which was enacted in 2001, with the primary objective of strengthening the political party system on the eve of the 2002 election. The OLIPPAC was later replaced with a revised version, which came into force on 15 October 2003.

The changes brought about by the OLIPPAC and the replacing of first-past-the-post voting by limited preferential voting (LPV) will be discussed together, as they tended to dominate the election in the Gazelle electorate. The OLIPPAC and LPV generated a lot of interest, anxiety and general concern among voters and candidates alike around the country and within the Gazelle. It is against this backdrop that the conduct of candidates and political parties in the Gazelle will be discussed.

The chapter begins with some background about the Gazelle seat, highlights some aspects of political parties in the electorate and how they have fared, and then looks at the 2007 election in the Gazelle in the light of data derived mainly from a survey and an exit poll undertaken to see how the preferences were distributed.

Background

The Gazelle seat is one of the largest in the country, in terms of area and population size (Figure 26.1). Geographically, it covers about a third of the Gazelle Peninsula, and at the 2000 census included 41 percent of the population (89,664); at an average annual growth of around 3 percent, the population would have increased to just over 100,000 in 2007. The other three electorates within the province account for the other 59 percent (National Statistical Office 2000). East New Britain was one of the provinces that the Boundaries Commission had recommended for redrawing of electoral boundaries and the addition of another

electorate, specifically to cater for the Bainings (John Kalamorah, personal communication, Port Moresby 2007). The national parliament, however, rejected the recommendations of the Boundaries Commission just before the 2007 election.

Figure 26.1: Gazelle District

The dominant ethnic groups within the Gazelle electorate continue to be the Tolais, followed by the Bainings and then other non-Tolais from other provinces who are commonly referred to in the local dialect as *vairas* (foreigners); the latter are mostly second-generation settlers and occupy pockets of land towards the inland Baining. These non-Tolais have become more politically conscious of their rights and have organized themselves to participate in the political process, voting as a bloc.

Overview of political parties

In order to better appreciate political parties in the electorate, it is necessary to trace their origins. In most democratic forms of government, parties are an important vehicle through which like-minded individuals come together to pursue common goals and objectives.

In Papua New Guinea, the Pangu Pati was formed in 1967 primarily to press for independence, while most other parties opposed it and during the period 1968–1975 political parties were polarized by the clearly different positions they took. However, after independence in 1975 political parties did not have substantive policies which differentiated them from each other. Although parties continued to exist within parliament, they tended to exist in name only; most often they were the means by which individuals gained access to the government. Parliamentary votes of no confidence characterized the later part of the 1980s and the whole of the 1990s. Members of parliament were continuously looking for opportunities to get into government. There were factions within parties and ‘party hopping’ was frequent. Party machinery was virtually non-existent; leaders were the driving force—as Hegarty (1983) observed, parties revolved around the personalities of their leaders. This continued up to the 2007 election.

While political parties were formed in the late 1960s and 1970s to pursue specific issues and purposes, ‘what was missing ... was an underlying culture to galvanize support and purpose for the parties among the voting public’ (Okole 2004:38). This is true for the Gazelle electorate, where issues have surfaced, been supported by some individuals, groups and political parties, and then allowed to die as newer issues arose and people moved on. The pattern of political party behaviour at the national level played out at the provincial level, preventing political parties from establishing firm roots in the village, and rendering their activities meaningless. Saffu (1982:261) commented:

What is clearly indisputable from observations so far is the fragility and virtual irrelevance of political parties to the operation of Papua New Guinea’s political system.

While there may not have been any political culture in the strictest sense of the term, there were characteristic features of the political system of Papua New Guinea, including a culture of reciprocity. As pointed out by Okole, ‘people vote for candidates not so much that they would be lawmakers for the country. Rather, they are to be deliverers of tangible goods and services’ (Okole 2004:34). This relationship can only be terminated if the candidates refuse the demands of the voters; however, most candidates are prepared to secure voter support at any cost. Looking at this another way, candidates once elected are bound to repay the loyalty shown by voters. The culture of reciprocity is deeply ingrained in Papua New Guinea; if there is any cultural trait that characterizes the political system, then it is reciprocity. People vote for candidates in the expectation that they will in turn be assisted by them.

Political party support base

Because political parties restrict their activities to elections and votes of no confidence and have not seriously attempted to cultivate a constituency for their policies, then it becomes difficult to gauge how they will perform in any election.

The electorate is not homogeneous but is made up of different groupings. The groups identified within the Gazelle electorate include the Tolais, the Bainings and people from other provinces (mostly in the Momase and Highlands regions);¹ church denominations; women; smallholder settlers and plantation workers; professional groups and business houses; and the working class. None of these groups appears to have been linked to any of the political parties, either in the past or in the 2007 election. Any links that might have existed probably had more to do with individual candidates or party officials than with parties. In effect, the parties lacked a support base and looked for candidates who had a support base with which to support the party.

All the political parties in the Gazelle were linked to either an individual or a family, rather than to any of the major groupings identified above. Interestingly, individuals and families previously associated with political parties have tended to move to the newer parties.

A number of observations were made concerning the support base of candidates:

- All candidates, except for three from outside the province, pegged their local areas as their support base. Of the three candidates from different provinces, at least two appealed to people from their home provinces and other 'outsiders' (*vairas*) to support them.
- Although all the candidates attempted to attend church services and mid-week fellowships around the electorate, it was the Melanesian Liberal Party candidate, Malakai Tabar, a passionate Christian, who tried to secure the Christian vote throughout the electorate.
- A number of candidates presented themselves as part of the 'new generation' and appealed to youth, calling for a change of leadership. Their slogan was, 'New times demand new leadership'.
- Three of the candidates appealed directly to the ethnic Bainings vote, which constituted a large bloc.
- The sole female candidate (Odelia Virua) did not aggressively pursue women voters, as was expected of her; she decided to focus on the Bainings group, smallholder settlers, and those sympathetic to the environment (especially non-government organizations).

Party-endorsed candidates since 1987

The Gazelle seat is one of a small number in the country where fewer than 10 candidates have contested at each election since independence. In 2007, 16 candidates contested. Table 26.1 shows the number of party-endorsed and independent candidates at each election since 1987. The rise in the number of party-endorsed candidates may be attributable to the introduction of the OLIPPAC in 2001.

Table 26.1: Party-endorsed candidates at elections in Gazelle Open electorate, 1987–2007

Year of election	Party-endorsed candidates	Independents	Total number of candidates
1987	3	4	7
1992	2	2	4
1997	1	5	6
2002	6	3	9
2007	10	6	16

Source: Papua New Guinea Electoral Commission

The only party that has consistently endorsed a candidate for the Gazelle seat since independence has been Pangu. Independent candidates have been a feature of every election for the seat since 1987, which is perhaps a reflection of the fact that independents could always join a party after the election and perhaps become a member of the government. There was nothing to lose by being an independent and everything to gain. As Okole et al. (2003:33) have observed:

Independent status is also more desirable since individual MPs can join parties at a later date and propel changes to party alignments that might elevate them to ministries and other coveted positions.

It is often quoted in Papua New Guinea politics that ‘Candidates do not win because they are endorsed by parties; rather parties endorse candidates who are going to win’ (Okole et al. 2003:44). In the Gazelle seat, prior to the enactment of OLIPPAC, political parties have had problems identifying potential winning candidates or convincing them to run under their party platforms.

It seems to be the case that the leadership qualities of party leaders (which include charisma) held parties together in the period from 1975 to 2002. In most instances there was a feeling of loyalty to the party leader on the part of the members. A number of the candidates who have run for the Gazelle since independence have had close ties with the party leaders.

Gazelle Open in 2007

Sixteen candidates ran for the Gazelle seat 2007. Ten were endorsed and supported by a political party. The remaining six ran as independents but four of the six had some form of association with a political party (see Table 26.7 in the appendix to this chapter).

It is important to consider the role and influence of the political parties prior to the OLIPPAC and after the OLIPPAC. In 1997 there were only six candidates with more than 10 political parties fielding candidates nationally. In 2002, with 43 registered political parties the three independents could have easily picked up endorsement from a political party. In 2007, too, with 34 political parties the six independents could have been accommodated by any of the political parties.

The relatively small number of candidates running since 1987 is indicative of the conservative nature of the electorate, which does not allow just anybody to run in the election for the sake of running, as is the case in other parts of the country. Low winning margins in other parts of the country have encouraged some individuals to try their luck. A candidate intending to run for the Gazelle seat must have standing in the community, must be supported by a good cross-section of leaders in the electorate, and must have the resources to fund his/her election.

Support from political parties

The influence of political parties in the Gazelle seat was not as strong as one might have expected given the changes to the OLIPPAC. The assistance given by political parties varied. Basic assistance ranged from the payment of the nomination fee, to posters, T-shirts, hosting of rallies, and hiring of vehicles (two of the party-endorsed candidates, Sinai Brown and Patrick Varagat, were able to provide a convoy of vehicles during the campaign period). Of all the party-endorsed candidates spoken to, only one revealed the total amount the party gave him. The rest were disappointed with their parties but refused to reveal the amount they had received.

Coordination of activities by political parties was lacking. There were no party activities. The party machinery observed in other countries to promote candidates to the voters was missing. The candidates were left on their own after nomination.

From the time nominations were opened up to the declaration of results, only five leaders from the 10 political parties visited the electorate to campaign for their candidates. While most of the political parties had regional and provincial

branches in the province, it was difficult to establish whether party executives at the national level visited their candidates in the province. Table 26.2 summarizes this data.

Table 26.2: Visits by party leaders, Gazelle Open electorate, 2007

Name	Party	Party leader	Visit by party leader?
Malakai Tabar	Melanesian Liberal	Dr Allan Marat	Yes
Sinai Brown ^a	National Alliance	Sir Michael Somare	Yes
Joseph K. Willie	Independent	–	–
John Sambie	Independent	–	–
Henry Ningo	PNG Party	Sir Mekere Morauta	No
Henry Saminga	People's National Congress	Peter O'Neill	No
Herman Remas	Independent	–	–
Henry Kubak	People's Progress Party	Sir Julius Chan	Yes
Dominic Rangan	United Party	Bire Kimisopa	No
Philip Kameng	Pangu Pati	Sir Rabbie Namaliu	Yes
Benroy Miliok	Rural Development Party	Moses Maladina	No
Peniel Niligur	Melanesian Alliance Party	Sir Moi Avei	No
Patrick Varagat	New Generation Party	Bart Philemon	Yes
Odelia Virua	Independent	–	–
Simon Kambiu	Independent	–	–
Abraham Yako	Independent	–	–

^a Sitting member

While it is difficult to quantify the influence of the party, the presence of the party leader in the electorate should boost the standing of candidates. Sinai Brown, the sitting member for the Gazelle seat, hosted the prime minister and senior executives of the National Alliance for several days, and they appeared on the nightly news, giving him an advantage in terms of media coverage. Dr Allan Marat, the founder and leader of the Melanesian Liberal Party, was in the province and his visits to the three electorates helped his party collect two seats (Rabaul and Gazelle). Melanesian Liberal Party candidates for the Provincial and Kokopo seats finished second and fourth respectively.

Other party leaders who visited the electorate and campaigned for their candidates included Sir Rabbie Namaliu (Pangu Pati), Sir Julius Chan (People's Progress Party), and Bart Philemon (New Generation Party). But although their visits were marked by a lot of feasting and celebration, the support shown at rallies was not there in the tally rooms. For example, the visit by Sir Julius Chan in support of his candidate Henry Kubak was well covered by the media and well attended, but Kubak picked up only 5.6 percent of the total formal first preference votes cast. The visit of Bart Philemon, the leader of the New

Generation Party, who had declared war on the National Alliance and whose visit to the province was well attended and talked about, did little for his candidate who collected only 3.5 percent of first preference votes.

In the final analysis, the brand name of the political party, the party leader (who was potentially prime minister), party policies, campaign strategies, and the alliances that the parties entered into regarding distribution of preferences, had little impact in attracting undecided voters or securing second and third preferences.

The policies of the 10 political parties were broad and general; most were reduced to slogans. 'Free education', 'good governance', 'honest leadership', 'new leadership', 'anti-corruption', 'a time for change', 'focus on rural development', 'restoring confidence in the public service', and 'infrastructure development' were some of the catchphrases used. These phrases were good but they lacked strong supporting policies to realize the bold, broad statements.

The role played by political parties during the election was more symbolic than policy oriented. Attempts by candidates to differentiate their policies from those of other candidates and political parties did not filter down to the voters. The level of scrutiny of party policies was very low, and candidates escaped from having to explain and elaborate their policies, instead appealing to the voters' emotions on issues such as greater autonomy for the province, securing good prices for cash crops (although it was not clear how this was to be done, given that prices are dictated by world markets), reclaiming plantations from big businesses and the churches and passing them on to the people, the building of a fish cannery (put on hold by the national government), fast-tracking the upgrading of the airport to international status, and improving the deteriorating roads, to name a few.

It would have been interesting to have attempted a costing of what was promised to the people, as an indicator of how realistic the promises were. The National Research Institute, and in particular Dr Alphonse Gelu, has been pushing this idea.

Political party alliances

There was only one instance of political party alliance, namely between the PNG Party of Sir Mekere Morauta and the New Generation Party of Bart Philemon. This alliance was observed at the provincial and electorate levels, where resources, intelligence and information were shared. During polling,

supporters were encouraged to exchange preferences. It was difficult, however, to trace the preferences, in the absence of data from the Papua New Guinea Electoral Commission.

However, alliances were built among the candidates, who shared a strong desire to remove the sitting member. Throughout the province candidates ganged up against the incumbents; this was clearly evident in the Kokopo, Rabaul and the Gazelle contests.

The sitting member, Sinai Brown, although collecting most first preferences (5045; 18 percent) compared to Malakai Tabar's 4612 (16 percent), eventually lost because after the fourteenth exclusion Tabar was able to collect 4161 preferences to amass a total of 8773, while Sinai Brown collected only 2634 preferences, bringing his count to 7679.

Another important feature of the 2007 election was the alliances that were built between candidates contesting Open seats and those contesting the Provincial seat. One observation was that the candidates for the Provincial seat chose not to differentiate themselves from each other on the basis of their parties but to work with Open seat candidates. For the Provincial seat candidates, it was suicidal to campaign along party lines with their counterparts from the Open seats, as Open seat candidates could retaliate by campaigning against them. The candidates running for the Provincial seat thus tended to abstain from interference in the Open seats.

Leo Dion, the National Alliance governor of the province, chose to run on his track record as governor and asked the province to judge him by his performance in the previous term. He did not regularly campaign with Sinai Brown, the sitting National Alliance member for the Gazelle, fearing a backlash if he pushed the party line. The National Alliance had not supported a fish cannery in the electorate, which was potentially a big money earner for the province as well as the company. The national government had also been slow to upgrade the provincial airport to international status. As evident from the media (especially talk-back radio shows) the people of the province were not happy that the national government, with three members from the province in the National Alliance and the support of Dr Allan Marat and Sir Rabbie Namaliu, had not fast-tracked some projects in the province.

The limited preferential voting system

LPV was part of the electoral reforms which sought to widen the representative base of winning candidates as well as secure cooperation from rival candidates and their supporters in the distribution of the second and third preferences.

As outlined by John Nonggorr, lawyer for the Electoral Commission, the LPV was meant to deal with law and order problems and to change the behaviour of candidates and supporters to ensure the success of elections (*Post-Courier* 20 March 2007:2).

The success of the various by-elections, using LPV, after the 2002 election accomplished at least two main things: there was reportedly greater cooperation among candidates and their supporters, and the introduction of preferences gave voters the opportunity to vote for more than one candidate, which reduced the level of dispute among family and community members (see Standish 2006).

The winning margin for the Gazelle seat over the past two decades has been very convincing (Table 26.3). Since 1987, the support base of the winning candidates has always come from their respective areas (for Esorom Burege and Nakikus Konga, from the north coast part of the electorate; for Sinai Brown, from the Toma area. Martin Tovadek, who held the seat from 1977 to 1987, is from the Toma area).

Table 26.3: Candidates and winning margins, Gazelle Open electorate, 1987–2007

Year ^a	Candidate	Party	Winning vote (%)
1987	Esorom Burege	People's Progress Party	26.3
1992	Nakikus Konga	Pangu Pati	39.9
1997	Nakikus Konga	Pangu Pati	48.6
2002	Sinai Brown	National Alliance	37.6
2007	Malakai Tabar	Melanesian Liberal Party	17.0 (primary vote) 53.3 (after preferences)

^a This does not include two by-elections.

Source: Papua New Guinea Electoral Commission

The winning vote was always above the 25 percent mark, while in other electorates around the country winning margins were often reduced to single-digit numbers. However, this does not deny the importance of local loyalties: the people of the north coast area have always voted for candidates from their area, while people from the Toma area have always voted for a Toma candidate; the Bainings have always voted for Bainings, and the people from other areas of the Gazelle Peninsula have done the same. When there is no candidate from their area, people have tended to support their relatives from the other areas.

Survey and exit poll

A questionnaire was administered during polling to determine the basis upon which voters gave their preferences. Two questions were asked. First, 'What was the basis for giving your first, second and third preferences?' Secondly, 'Which of your preferences did you give to the only woman candidate?'

The first question offered six possible responses:

- relatives—pressure to vote along family lines is immense; failure to do so can result in isolation (some families have been known to have stopped talking to each other for several years)
- leadership qualities—if no relatives are standing, then, according to informants, voters look for leadership qualities such as experience, charisma, educational qualifications and integrity
- churches—churches are very important institutions within the electorate and have been known to influence voters
- party affiliation—selected because it is the focus of this chapter
- business acquaintance—this does not necessarily refer to business dealings but includes social and cultural activities that bring people together, such as marriages, deaths, initiation rituals and feasts that involve villages
- others—to cover factors that have not been otherwise accounted for.

The questionnaire was drawn up after discussions the author had with a number of public servants, one local-level government (LLG) president, two councillors and a number of ordinary villagers who had been involved in past elections. The survey was conducted during the polling period, which was one week, for only one LLG within the electorate—the Toma-Vunadidir LLG; its president, David Piamia, assisted with the survey.

Preferences were not necessarily distributed among the five variables: for example, a voter with two relatives standing might allocate his or her first and second preferences under the relatives category.

The factor that accounted for most first preferences was relatives, which received 35 percent (Table 26.4). This was followed by church (27 percent) leadership qualities (18 percent), business acquaintance (7 percent), and others (10 percent). Party affiliation received the lowest, with just over 2 percent.

On second preferences, surprisingly relatives again received the largest share, with 39 percent (clearly some voters had several relatives standing as candidates). Leadership qualities followed with 20.5 percent, church 17 percent, others 11 percent, business acquaintances 9 percent, and political party affiliation again last on 3 percent.

The bulk of the third preferences, interestingly, went to others, which collected 37 percent. A possible explanation for the high percentage is that many voters met their social and cultural obligations with their first two preferences and decided to 'give away' the third preference. Church accounted for 21 percent of third preferences, relatives 16 percent, leadership qualities and party affiliation each 11.5 percent, and business acquaintance 2 percent.

Overall, relatives was the determinant of how respondents distributed their preferences, followed by church. Notwithstanding the fact that the province had gone through a number of awareness exercises which listed 'leadership qualities' as the principal criterion that voters should look for, leadership qualities was a relatively minor influence on the distribution of preferences.

To the question, 'Which of your preferences did you give to the only woman candidate?', out of the 122 respondents (39 females and 83 males) the female candidate received only eight second preferences. Six of those preferences came from female voters. One can only speculate about the basis on which voters distributed their preferences for the female candidate; it was certainly not along policy lines, as her stated policy goals were to assist the Bainings people, who are a disadvantaged group in the electorate, and to help settlers in the Keravat area obtain basic government services (such as technical and financial assistance in the agricultural sector).² The fact that she was married to a person from the Momase Region does not appear to have made a difference, though people from Momase constitute a very big segment of the population within the electorate.

It also appears that women, who constitute over 40 percent of the voting population in the electorate, did not support the sole woman candidate. She was one of the first three candidates to be eliminated. And the evidence from the survey suggests that she would have done no better if she had been endorsed by a party, since voters gave little weight to party affiliation. For a very affluent electorate, with easy access to the media and good awareness, the poor distribution of preferences to the only female candidate speaks a lot about the plight of female candidates.

² Although I did not speak to the candidate herself, I spoke to her husband who highlighted some of her policies and what she stood for.

Table 26.4: Basis for giving first, second and third preferences, by men and women

Responses	Sex	Preferences			Total
		First	Second	Third	
Relatives	M	28	34	17	79
	F	15	14	3	32
Leadership qualities	M	18	20	9	47
	F	4	5	5	14
Church	M	23	12	15	50
	F	10	9	11	30
Party affiliation	M	2	4	8	14
	F	1	0	6	7
Business acquaintance	M	5	10	3	18
	F	4	1	0	5
Others	M	5	3	31	39
	F	7	10	14	31
Total		122	122	122	

Relatives includes in-laws; kinsman; same ethnicity; cultural relations. Leadership qualities includes honesty; integrity; proven track record; education; experience. Church includes same church; Christian principles; active church member. Party Affiliation includes leader of party; party policies. Business Acquaintance includes workmates; sport and social networks; professional associates; friends of friends. Others includes pressure from spouse, relatives; sympathy vote; etc.

Comparing the 2002 and 2007 election results

Although the introduction of LPV means that the elections of 2002 and 2007 are not strictly comparable, it is worth looking at the similarities and differences.

No changes were made to the boundaries of the Gazelle seat. The number of registered voters was 27,482 in 2002, and 27,938 in 2007, an increase of 456.

Nine candidates stood for election in 2002 (Table 26.5), of whom six were endorsed by political parties. In 2007 16 candidates stood, of whom 10 were party endorsed. Party-endorsed candidates received little support from their respective parties; in general, they were no better off than the independents.

The sitting member, Sinai Brown, won the seat in 2002 with 10,107 votes (37 percent of the total). In 2007 he led on first preferences, with 5045 votes (18 of the total)—a drop of just over 50 percent on the 2002 vote—but eventually lost to Malakai Tabar, an agriculturalist and lecturer by profession.

Table 26.5: The Gazelle Open electorate, 2002

Candidate	Party	Votes polled (number)	Votes polled (%)
Sinai Brown	National Alliance	10,107	37.6
Norbert Kubak	People's Progress Party	6,606	24.6
Henry Ningo	People's Democratic Movement	3,554	13.2
Thomas Kalas	Independent	1,917	7.1
Isaac Wartovo	Independent	1,643	6.1
Elly Kinkin	Independent	1,378	5.1
James Anjo	People's Labour Party	989	3.7
Jack Sion	People's Action Party	360	1.3
John Rarau	Independent	326	1.2
Informal votes		602	
Total votes		27,482	
Formal votes		26,880	100

Source: <http://www.pnhec.gov.pg/results/Report18.html>

From the figures, it is clear that all candidates collected votes from their support bases but could not widen their appeal to other constituents. Tabar was able to collect votes from his home area, his wife's area, church groups (he is a devout Christian), the working class, and ordinary villages with whom he had daily contacts over two decades.

As noted above, all the candidates ganged up against and campaigned against the sitting member and successfully prevented the flow of preferences to him.

Conclusion

There is no party in Papua New Guinea that has anything that remotely resembles a nation-wide organization with an ideology or an image, cadres of activists and a persistent, mobilized mass support (Saffu 1982:261).

Unless and until there is a party with an ideology that guides its conduct, and deep roots within a focused political support base across the country, then it will be very difficult to talk about political parties. Political parties can only be understood within the context of a political system that interacts with them. When the personalities of candidates and members of parliament dominate the system, political parties are largely irrelevant.

In the case of the Gazelle seat, Pangu Pati, the only party which has been fielding candidates since independence, was not able to build a political base.

It might be argued that without OLIPPAC it was not possible for parties to develop, but with OLIPPAC designed to strengthen parties, and office bearers of political parties now being paid from public funds, some effort might have been made to build a party support base within the electorate. The survey and exit poll showed that while people are concerned about leadership qualities, they are not prepared to ignore their relatives or candidates from their areas, or the churches. LPV has allowed the option of accommodating their relatives and other primordial associations but at the same time voting for a good leader who will have wider support from the electorate.

References

- Hegarty, D., 1983. 'The 1977 national elections in Papua New Guinea: an overview', in D. Hegarty (ed.), *Electoral Politics in PNG: Studies on the 1977 National Elections*. Port Moresby: UPNG Press.
- National Statistical Office, 2000. *Papua New Guinea 2000 Census: Preliminary Figures*. Port Moresby: National Statistical Office.
- Okole, H., 2004. 'Coalition politics: a culture of reciprocity', in *Papua New Guinea Yearbook 2004*. Port Moresby: *The National*, pp. 33–40.
- Okole, H., 2005. 'Papua New Guinea's brand of Westminster: democratic traditions overlaying Melanesian cultures', in H. Patapan, J. Wanna and P. Weller (eds), *Westminster Legacies: Democracy and Responsible Government in Asia and the Pacific*. Sydney: UNSW Press.
- Okole, H., Narakobi, B. and Clements, Q., 2003. 'Strengthening a Parliamentary Democracy for the 21st Century: Legislative Needs Assessment Report'. Port Moresby: National Parliament of Papua New Guinea.
- Saffu, Y., 1982. 'Aspects of the emerging political culture', in *Proceedings of the 1982 Politics Conference: Evolving Political Cultures in the Pacific Islands*. Hawaii: Institute for Polynesian Studies, Brigham Young University, pp. 256–279.
- Standish, B., 2006. 'Limited preferential voting in Papua New Guinea: some early lessons', *Pacific Economic Bulletin* 21(1):195–211.

Appendix

Table 26.6: Voting statistics for Gazelle Open electorate, 2007 election

Number of registered voters	52,418	
Total votes cast	28,310	
Informal votes	1,157	(4.1% of total ballots cast)
Total allowable ballot papers	27,153	
Total ballot papers remaining in count	16,452	
Total votes distributed	17,496	
Exhausted ballot papers	10,701	(39.4% of allowable ballots)
Absolute majority (50% + 1)	8,227	

Table 26.7: Gazelle Open electorate results, 2007 election

Ballot order	Candidate	Sex	Political party	Primary votes		Position after primary vote	Preferential votes		Order of exclusion	Total votes	Total allowable ballots (%)	Ballots remaining in count (%)
				Number	%		Number	%				
15	Malakai Tabar	M	Melanesian Liberal Party	4612	17.0	2	4161	47.4		8773	32.3	53.3
24	Sinai Brown	M	National Alliance	5045	18.6	1	2634	34.3		7679	28.3	46.7
18	Joseph Karani Willie	M	Independent	2687	9.9	3	2118	44.1	14	4805	17.7	
14	John Sambie	M	Independent	2240	8.2	4	1855	45.3	13	4095	15.1	
10	Henry Ninggo	M	PNG Party	2055	7.6	5	1377	40.1	12	3432	12.6	
13	Henry Saminga	M	People's National Congress Party	1521	5.6	7	1371	47.4	11	2892	10.7	
17	Herman Remas	M	Independent	1495	5.5	8	550	26.9	10	2045	7.5	
11	Henry Kubak	M	People's Progress Party	1585	5.8	6	297	15.8	9	1882	6.9	
19	Dominic Rangan	M	United Party	1082	4.0	11	547	33.6	8	1629	6.0	
22	Philip Vuiira Kameng	M	Pangu Pati	1176	4.3	10	207	15.0	7	1383	5.1	
21	Benroy Miliok	M	Rural Development Party	1242	4.6	9	77	5.8	6	1319	4.9	
25	Peniel Niliigur	M	Melanesian Alliance Party	1075	4.0	12	75	6.5	5	1150	4.2	
16	Patrick M. Varagat	M	New Generation Party	962	3.5	13	19	1.9	4	981	3.6	
23	Odella Virua	F	Independent	159	0.6	14	31	16.3	3	190	0.7	
12	Simon Kambiu	M	Independent	153	0.6	15	1	0.6	2	154	0.6	
20	Abraham Yako	M	Independent	64	0.2	16	0	0.0	1	64	0.2	