

ADDRESS TO PARLIAMENT

June 8

"A Future of Freedom for All People"

My Lord Chancellor, Mr. Speaker:

As we enter the final decades of the twentieth century, we live in a world seemingly shaped by vast, impersonal forces. The gifts of science, the achievements of technology, what we may all hesitate to call the science of economics, apparently dominate our lives. Yet when the historians review our record, I believe they will reach a different conclusion. For in our time, man has asserted himself as never before - his personality and above all, his freedom. This is the true revolution of the modern era.

The evidence of man's free will is all around us. In Spain, a king demonstrates true majesty by insisting upon his people's right to determine their own destiny, against dictatorial extremes of left and right. In El Salvador, villagers line up for hours to reject violence and intimidation, and to select their own representatives at the ballot box. In Poland, workers organize to protect their rights and to bring about a freer, more efficient and just society. In a developed, a developing and a communist nation, the spirit of liberty has burst forth.

The standard of liberty, which past and present members of this Parliament have carried with such distinction, is now carried along by a sea of new hands. In virtually every country throughout the world the forces for freedom have demonstrated their courage and vision. The democratic revolution is gathering new

**State Dept. review completed**

strength. The age-old striving for a world without oppression and injustice is alive and vigorous. But such a world is still far from achievement. And there is nothing inevitable about its future, or even that present accomplishments will be preserved. For the forces of oppression are also strong.

Today we stand at a new threshold. Three decades ago an extraordinary group of statesmen launched the Western world on a bold enterprise -- to bring democracy and prosperity to nations

suffering from dictatorship, economic ruin or both. With Spain and Portugal now joining the earlier success of Germany and Japan in developing a democratic infrastructure, and with all of our nations having achieved a standard of living unprecedented in human experience, we have completed much of the vision of those statesmen -- though naturally much remains to be done within each of our societies.

Let us now embark upon a new enterprise -- one which is likely to take even more than three decades to complete but one of enormous promise and critical importance to global freedom, prosperity and peace. Let us resolve to help bring the structures and benefits of freedom to all peoples -- a free press, free trade unions, free political parties; free enterprise; freedom of speech, of religion, of travel, of economic opportunity; above all, freedom to choose one's own government, one's own leaders. This will take an act of will, and continued creativity and perseverance no less substantial than in the 1940's. It is the same blend of idealism and realism which served us so well then, and can guide us through the rest of this century and beyond.

Such a strategy must address three critical questions.

- o First, is it possible to bring freedom to all nations?
- o Second, how does freedom relate to other important imperatives like economic growth, social justice and peace?
- o Third, what can be done to help freedom grow?

1. Potential for Freedom

History is both sobering and encouraging. That Athenian and Roman democracy disappeared reminds us there is nothing inevitable about progress. But that their ideals survived reminds us of an eternal truth -- man's innate desire to control his own destiny.

It then took a thousand years for the Magna Carta to appear. In it we find the right of due process of law, and particularly that the sovereign should be subject to law.

Another long period of struggle ensued. But particularly over the past two hundred years there have been a series of historic successes.

- o Slavery, the most odious form of oppression throughout history, has been almost entirely eradicated.
- o At the outset of this period there were only a handful of democratically elected governments in the world. Today there are more than fifty. The geographic area covered by democracy has steadily grown.
- o While the majority of mankind still lives in dictatorships, in 1982 there are more people living in democracies than the entire population of the world in 1800.

Even dictatorships now need to justify their existence by claiming to fulfill the will of the people.

Yet, today the democratic revolution has been challenged by those who deny its applicability. Some assert that it is impossible for developing countries to be democratic. It is also argued that once a country has gone communist there is no hope for democracy.

We cannot accept either of these assertions. For accepting them would mean that the majority of mankind would be permanently unequal -- permanently denied the opportunity to dismiss corrupt and cruel leaders, to read the unvarnished truth in their press, to be free from the fear of arbitrary imprisonment, to travel to other lands, to assure their children equal opportunity under law. To say that Russians or Africans cannot enjoy these freedoms would be the same as saying that blacks or women should be second-class citizens because they were somehow different. It would be condescending and wrong.

It would be not only morally wrong, but factually incorrect.

The developing world already has a number of democracies.

- o India is, of course, the largest democracy in the world. It has passed a critical test for our systems -- changes in governing political parties through free elections.
- o Nigeria is a remarkable current example of a major developing nation striving to build democratic institutions.

- o Eighteen of the twenty-three countries in the Caribbean and Central America have freely elected governments.
- o Eight of the ten developing nations which have joined the United Nations in the past five years are democracies.
- o Many developing countries which are not yet full-fledged democracies permit some democratic institutions.

It is often claimed that free institutions cannot survive in a bitterly divided country or one with no democratic traditions.

But in the Western Hemisphere alone:

- o Costa Rica returned to democracy out of a civil war in 1948.
- o Venezuela, after decades of brutal and corrupt military dictatorship, went to the polls in 1963 and has had twenty years of democratic progress.
- o Jamaica in 1980 held elections amidst violent civic conflict; Honduras in January inaugurated a democratically elected president after  
a decade of military rule; and in El Salvador well over 80% of the electorate braved bullets and terrorism to vote.

In the United States we held two elections during a terrible civil war. As Lincoln said "...if the rebellion would force us to forego or postpone a national election, it might fairly claim to have already conquered or ruined us." Democratic institutions continued to function on both sides.

And in Europe, Turkey began moving to democracy in 1922 after centuries of autocratic rule, defeat in a world war and a bloody civil war, and achieved democracy after World War II. Despite several years of recent terrorism, Turkey's current leadership again has committed the country to democracy and has announced that elections will be held next year.

But is democracy possible when a country has become communist? Here again we reject the notion of historical inevitability. Just as the survival and spread of democracy is not inevitable, so Marxist-Leninist dictatorships are not cast in concrete. To talk about such inevitability is to deny the existence of free will. It is to deny our humanity.

The major difference between communist and non-communist dictators is that communists tend to be more thorough in their attempt to control every aspect of society and less hesitant in applying the full police power of the modern state. But the natural drive of their people for self-determination nonetheless exists, and in fact is intensifying. Outside observers are consistently taken by surprise when there is an eruption of the forces for freedom in communist countries. But the indicators of pressures for change are there for us to see: 1953 in East Germany,

1956 in Hungary, 1968 in Czechoslovakia, 1981 and 1982 in Poland. The streams of refugees and the dissident movements in communist nations all indicate the popular desire for change.

We must not underestimate the survivability of one of the most highly-developed systems for political control in the history of the world. But we also must not underestimate the force of this era's other major dynamics: anti-imperialism, the striving for modernization and individual freedom -- all increasingly work against systems based on external control and rigid dictatorship.

Obviously freedom will not come all at once in developing and communist nations. But if the democracies band together with the peoples of the world, it can come gradually and over time. If the forces of freedom join in solidarity, we will eventually overwhelm that minority of men who use force and deceit to prevail over others.

Edmund Burke explained our mission as a partnership to further our civilization: "As the ends of such a partnership cannot be obtained in many generations, it becomes a partnership not only between those who are living, but between those who are living, those who are dead and those who are to be born."

## II. The Relationship of Freedom to Prosperity, Justice and Peace

If it is reasonable to dream of a future of freedom for all people, is it possible to pursue that dream without harming other objectives? Or must the dream be delayed, sacrificed to some supposedly greater good? In particular:



- o Is democracy incompatible with economic growth and equal justice for all?
- o Is the pursuit of democracy so provocative that it will hinder the search for peace?

At one time the brutality of dictatorships was justified in the name of efficiency, economic growth and social equality. We were told that they would make the trains run on time, that they would establish a work ethic, that they would bring about a classless society.

Today, when the evidence is too overwhelming to talk about efficiency, the idea of social justice is still put forward. But what justice subordinates workers and farmers to central planners, and society's productive capability as a whole to militarism?

The very nature of dictatorship requires subordination of economics to political control. Insistence upon denying farmers their own land for political reasons and the consequent failure to meet the food needs of their people provides only the most obvious example.

By contrast, all democratic parties -- social-democratic, centrist and conservative alike -- favor a mixed economy with some government role and one balance or another between the public and private sectors. Only communism, fascism and other dictatorial forms of socialism advocate artificial control over natural private economic instincts, regardless of the loss thereby of private contributions to production and growth.

- 8a -

The results are clear. In every comparable situation -- West and East Germany, Austria and Czechoslovakia, Malaysia and Vietnam -- the democratic country outproduces the communist state by a wide margin, particularly in meeting the needs of its workers and farmers as opposed to meeting the needs of the state.

Freedom is also consistent with justice. Democracies which need land reform, greater equality of economic opportunity or other

- 9 -

social objectives can achieve them by electing leaders who will implement these programs. Only dictatorships can deny farmers their own land and workers their own unions. Only dictatorships can create a "new class" in a supposedly classless society.

This brings us to another critical dimension -- the relationship of dictatorships to peace. Governments which are unconstrained by their peoples' needs and wishes, and which rule by the use or threat of force, are more likely to use or threaten force in their relations with other states as well. They are more likely to impose their systems through violence as this is the means through which they came to power and remain in power.

But would peaceful support for the natural desire of peoples to determine their own destiny threaten peace itself. And should we encourage democratic change in right-wing dictatorships, but not in communist regimes? Let us consult communist leaders themselves on this subject. Reflecting the views of his predecessors and presumably his successors as well, President Brezhnev repeatedly has stressed that the competition of ideas and systems must continue and that this is entirely consistent with relaxation of tensions and peace.

Also we are only asking these systems to begin by living up to their own constitutions, to abide by their own laws, and the international obligations they have undertaken. We are asking for a process, a direction, not an instant transformation.

In the nuclear age, we must find a sounder basis for peace than now exists. We cannot ignore the fact that even without our encouragement there have been and will continue to be repeated explosions against repression -- the Soviet Union itself is not immune from this reality.

The danger that this will some day spill over into international relations is self-evident. The only sensible approach is for dictatorships to move toward more modern and democratic forms of self-government, to develop the means of domestic consensus-building and thus avoid violent revolution.

This is the Western objective in Poland. We seek not revolution but a process of peaceful reconciliation and reform. This is clearly the desire of the Polish people.

The Soviet Union itself would not be weakened by permitting modernization -- within its own borders as well as in other countries.

Fostering the democratic spirit also can help build the consensus necessary if some future generation is to replace the present international system with a set of international legal institutions empowered to resolve conflicts among states. The "democratic habit of mind" -- the willingness to abide by law and the desire to find peaceful accommodation -- which characterizes domestic governance in democracies is required for observance of international law as well.

- 11 -

Let us for a moment imagine the benefits for peace and arms control of a process of democratization within the Soviet Union.

- o Public involvement in the search for peace would grow, eventually to the point it has reached in the West. The enormous Soviet military budget, which now consumes one ruble in every six spent in that country, would be subjected to the scrutiny of elected representatives. Instead of suppression of genuine popular movements for arms control -- as we are witnessing in East Germany -- there would be legitimate public pressure for the kind of substantial reductions Western peoples want and their governments are proposing.
- o The problem of verification, a central difficulty in all arms control efforts to date, could be dramatically eased. We could introduce an "open land" policy to complement the tacit "open skies" policy -- permitting much more thorough verification and thus abolition of whole categories of arms -- such as chemical weapons.
- o Above all the suspicion and distrust which is inherent in closed political systems, and which so poisons the pursuit of peace, would be eased.

When we consider the future relationship of democracy to prosperity, justice and peace, let us recall that it was dictators who caused most of the horrors of the mid-20th century. Hitler committed genocide against Jews, Slavs and others, and he started the Second World War. Stalin committed the starvation campaign of collectivization, the terror of the Great Purge, and the colonization of half of Europe. Whatever economic development these two brought their people was far outweighed by the terrible human cost.

### III. What Can Be Done.

The danger of a crusade is that it will get carried away with its own righteousness, and betray the very ideals it seeks to serve. We must enter upon the effort to help democracy grow with vision and determination, but also with modesty and caution. After two hundred years of development to achieve our present degree of democracy, the United States is still not finished. For example, we are still experimenting with the proper balance between federal, state and local governments. The ability to make federalism work is of course key to the growth of democracy in many societies.

- 13 -

The developed nations are far from having all the wisdom on democracy -- in fact nations like India and Sri Lanka, Venezuela and Costa Rica may have more relevant <sup>offer</sup> experience to/countries in the initial stages of democratization.

Nor must we demand perfect democracy or nothing. There are important differences among dictatorships, important partial steps.

While we must be cautious about the pace of change, we must not be reticent to declare our ultimate objectives. We must be convinced that these are in the deepest sense not our objectives, but the inalienable and universal right of all human beings. For example the <sup>Universal</sup> UN/Declaration of Human Rights guarantees free elections. Our task is to help people gain what is their natural due -- recognizing that if they were free this is precisely what they would demand for themselves.

The objective is quite simple to state -- <sup>establishing</sup> the infrastructure of democracy: the system of a free press, unions, political parties, universities which allows a people to choose their own way, to enjoy their own culture, to reconcile their own differences through peaceful means. In sum, alternative sources of power to government. This is not cultural imperialism -- it is providing the means for genuine self-determination and protection for diversity.

In calling upon the West to offer concrete and open assistance to the forces of democracy -- to help schools, publications, social and political organizations in other

countries -- the "New York Times" recently cited these eloquent words of John Stuart Mill:

"The doctrine of non-intervention, to be a legitimate principle of morality, must be accepted by all governments. The despot must consent to be bound by it as well as the free states. Unless they do, the profession comes to this miserable issue -- that the wrong side may help the wrong, but the right must not help the right."

Since 1917 the Soviet Union has offered covert political training and assistance to Marxist-Leninists in many countries. Of course it also has promoted the use of violence and subversion by these same forces.

Over the past several decades, West European and other Social Democrats, Christian Democrats and Liberals have offered open assistance to fraternal parties, to help bring about peaceful and democratic progress. Appropriately for a vigorous new democracy, West Germany's political foundations are a major force in this field.

Today I wish to announce that the United States has decided to join in this open and entirely legitimate enterprise. As I am speaking here, a bipartisan group of leaders representing the major institutions of freedom in the United States is gathered in the Capitol. They are committing the Republican and Democratic Parties, the AFL-CIO, the Chamber of Commerce, the American Bar Association and the American Society of



- 15 -

Newspaper Editors to join in defining how America can best make its contribution. This joint study will be completed in time for consideration by the public, the Administration and the Congress within the next six months. It will examine what kind of foundations, programs, public and private efforts are required.

This is above all an area for efforts by private groups. Our parties, unions, foundations and press associations should be the primary vehicle to help democratic forces in other societies. They have some very important efforts already underway. There is much room for new programs and institutions. The government can and should offer support.

The United States offers economic and security assistance. It is time we helped democratic development as well for it can make a unique contribution to economic growth and peace.

Clearly this is a task for all those who love freedom throughout the world. There is much we can do together as well as on a national basis.

Therefore I am particularly pleased to announce that a group of leaders -- distinguished for their contributions to democracy -- have agreed to design an international strategy to help build the infrastructure of freedom. King Juan Carlos of Spain and former President Jose Figueres of Costa Rica are taking the lead in organizing this effort, working with (a distinguished American).

- 15a -

It is their intention to have recommendations ready for consideration by individual governments, parties and other groups by this time next year.

There is a proposal before the Council of Europe to invite parliamentarians from democratic countries to a meeting next fall in Strasbourg. This gathering might want to consider the recommendations of the international group as well.

We need to begin to think of ways in which the community of the democracies can work more closely together to foster the values which our people already enjoy, and all the world's peoples would like to enjoy.

There are two aspects of democracy which could benefit from detailed and early attention. Thus as an initial American contribution, we are organizing two conferences:

- o Multi-candidate, multi-party elections are the major instrument for insuring the people's will. Therefore this November, we are hosting in Washington an international conference on free elections. The conferees also will be invited to observe our elections, for democracy does not divide along lines of developed and developing nations. The voter turnout in El Salvador was higher than we are likely to achieve here. We can all benefit from the experience and enthusiasm of others.
- o If elections are the main instrument of democracy, then constitutions -- written and unwritten -- are its foundation. Therefore next spring we are hosting a conference of the world's outstanding thinkers on Constitutionalism and Self-Government. Much of history's constitution-making has occurred since World War II -- one of the most profound political experiences available to man. Authorities from India, Nigeria, Venezuela and other countries....judges, philosphers and politicians with practical experience

....have agreed to participate in this conference.

We will explore how best to further and foster the rule of law, the system which recognizes that man's instincts require limits as well as freedoms, that leaders need checks and balances. The Chief Justice of the United States, Warren Burger, will serve as Honorary Chairman and host.

There are many avenues to explore, many promising possibilities.

- o We intend to launch a dialogue with the world's great religious leaders about the relationship of religion and democracy. Clearly spiritual pursuits will flourish in systems guaranteeing religious liberty; just as totalitarian regimes have attempted to suppress them.
- o We would like to consider the possibility of establishing an International Democracy Day. This could help us each year to focus on the progress we have made and lessons learned, and to make a renewed commitment to this necessarily long-term task.
- o We invite the Soviet Union to consider with us how the competition of ideas and values -- which it is committed to support -- can be conducted on a peaceful and reciprocal basis. For example, I am prepared today to offer President Brezhnev an

opportunity to speak to the American people on our television, if he will allow me the same opportunity with the Soviet people. We also suggest that panels of our newsmen periodically appear on each other's television to discuss major events.

Above all this is not a task for states but for people. This is a task for initiative by the many private groups and individuals concerned with freedom.

### Conclusion

The human species has come a very long way in a very short time. The fact that we, who 500 years ago did not even know of entire continents on our/<sup>own</sup> planet, can now circle /<sup>this planet</sup> in 90 minutes and even land on others, is but one illustration of the many revolutionary changes that have taken place.

But no change has been more profound than the new conviction that human bondage in any form is wrong, that people should chose their own leaders, that we should be free to speak, worship, travel, and develop individual farms and enterprises.

Even the most dictatorial regimes now feel forced to pay obeisance to democracy -- even they have so-called elections and constitutions and call themselves democratic. The task then is not to start from the beginning, but to give impetus to an historic movement underway.

"It has been said that democracy is the worst form of government except all those other forms that have been tried

from time to time." Those well known words of Winston Churchill to Parliament in 1947 remind us of the essence of our enterprise.

A man who had led his people to great victory in war lost an election just as the fruits of victory were about to be enjoyed. But he left office honorably, knowing that the liberty of his people was more important than the fate of any leader. History recalls his greatness in ways no dictator will ever know.

Churchill is no longer with us. And the task I have set forth today will long outlive my generation. But let us agree to make a major effort and to engage the next generation. For the sake of peace and justice, let us move toward a world in which all people determine their own destiny.