

# **WORLD FORUM on the FUTURE of DEMOCRACY**

## **September 16-18, 2007**

Federal Commission Jamestown, Virginia 1607-2007

Colonial Williamsburg ~~ The College of William & Mary

### **An Ordinary American's Perspective #1**

**Robert W. Owen**

**December 21, 2007**

#### Background Information

I am a 1967 graduate of the College of William & Mary. To my good fortune my wife and I received an invitation to attend the World Forum as delegates. We are most fortunate to have three lovely children, good health, good friends and family and enjoy life in America. We enjoy meeting new people, and we have been members of Trinity Presbyterian Church in Berwyn, Pennsylvania since 1982. On most political issues, you would consider us to be of the conservative persuasion.

The World Forum on the Future of Democracy was the final event in a culmination of a year's celebration by the Jamestown 400<sup>th</sup> Commemoration Commission. During the year, there were a number of conferences held at other Virginia universities where a variety of knowledgeable speakers discussed America's Foundation and the Future of Democracy.

The Forum attracted about 600 attendees including about 100 delegates from 18 countries. The international delegates included government leaders, journalists, non-governmental organization leaders and educators. Each international delegate was an alumnus of a U.S. Department of State exchange program and was nominated for the Forum by the U.S. Embassy in their home country.

The Forum consisted of two days of eight discussion sessions examining democracy. The first day focused on the principles of the Founders of America and the governmental framework created by the Founders. The second day concentrated on how democracy could flourish in other countries during the 21<sup>st</sup> century. There was a broad range of topics, from the faith of the founding fathers to world markets and minority rights.

The spirit of the World Forum encouraged the free flow of ideas and expression, and attendees checked their "political badges" at the door. We were all trying to learn from each other how the founding principles of the American experience with "democracy" (Republic) could impact the future of the world.

## **The Framers' Debate and America Today**

Jim Lehrer, Executive Editor/Anchor—The News Hour with Jim Lehrer, did a very good job of leading the first two and fourth panel discussions. The panelists and discussion topics with my commentary are as follows:

### *1. Developing a Structure for Deliberative Democracy—The Framers' Debate*

The Panelist: Dr. Joseph Ellis, Ford Foundation Professor of History, Mount Holyoke College; Dr. Hunter R. Rawlings III, President Emeritus, Cornell University; Dr. Gordon Wood, Professor of History, Brown University.

The Framers of the US Constitution created America's "framework" for a system of government by trying to emulate the best historical practices and avoid history's greatest mistakes. Create a republic not a democracy ("mob rule" according to Joe Ellis) and avoid a strong central government. According to Madison, antiquity (Greek & Roman) made the mistake of not allowing individual "state's" rights. The American Revolution was about protecting individual rights—Give me Liberty or give me Death!

Federalism is designed to curb democracy. The biggest danger to individual rights is the majority. The American Constitution innovatively guarantees individual liberty by spreading power among the three branches (executive, legislative and judicial) of the federal government, and between federal government and the states. In creating the Constitution, the delegates to the convention in 1787 had to compromise in order to get agreement. For example, Congress would have a lower house (represented by population) and an upper house (equal representation of the states, i.e. two Senators). In addition, the Constitution did not define all the duties of each branch of government, for instance, the powers of the President. The founders did not want to form a democratic "monarchy" so the duty to declare war was left to Congress.

In a general sense, Hamilton and Washington wanted a European state with more centralized powers, but Jefferson and Madison wanted a very limited federal government. Hamilton wanted a standing army while most of the other Founders wanted state militias. Hamilton did prevail in setting up a central banking system, and the federal government had very little taxing authority. Although the Founders believed in a God, they did not think that there should be a state sanctioned official religion. The Founders recognized that tying religion and the "state" together led to individual religious persecutions plus it had a bad record historically. The Founders decided that religious issues would be best determined by the individual states.

How do you protect the "people" from themselves (majority rules) and preserve minority rights became the "big" debate during the Declaration of our Nation (Constitutional Convention) in 1787-88. The 100 years of Colonial representation and government experience helped the founders create America's governmental framework. It is also

quite evident that the Founders wanted to create a new nation of representative government, but could not solve the slavery issue which was very inconsistent with the principles of the Declaration of Independence. It is the reason for an emphasis on special “property” rights guaranteed by the Constitution. The Framers thought that slavery would eventually disappear or could be resolved twenty years after the new nation had been founded. As we know, America had to suffer through the Civil War in order to end slavery.

The Founders felt that the “press” would help frame the issue of free speech. Free speech in the “press” followed the English approach where the concept of “libel” had been introduced. You could print anything, but you must bear the consequences if it could be proven in a court of law that the information was not true and the publication of it was malicious. This was contrary to the French approach where the “government” had to approve press articles. The Framers all agreed to create the “bill of rights” (the first 10 amendments to the Constitution) after the government had been formed.

## *2. Has America Kept the Founders’ Faith? Is it Working?*

The Panelists: William P. Barr, Executive Vice President and General Counsel, Verizon Communications; 77<sup>th</sup> Attorney General of the United States. David Brooks, Columnist, the New York Times; Rev. Dr. Joan Brown Campbell, Director, Department of Religion, Chautauqua Institution; Robert D. Hormats, Vice Chairman, Goldman Sachs

David Brooks indicated that the Framers would be quite pleased to learn how their governmental “experiment” had blossomed into such a world power. Individual freedom and liberty are still pillars in our society, and we have developed an impressive history of protecting minority rights. The Founders would cheer our free speech and political process. The Framers considered the legislative branch of government to be the most potentially dangerous to our individual freedoms. It is where the majority can rule and pass laws that can take away from individual freedom and liberty.

The Constitution defined some very specific goals for the federal government. The two primary functions were to protect our nation and regulate interstate commerce. The Framers would be shocked to learn how large our federal government has grown, and how extensive the lobbying effort is toward our “central” government. The experience of the Civil War changed our thinking to be more “country” orientated versus the individual states. The federal government introduced the income tax to raise money for itself rather than leave all the taxing authority to the individual states. Prior to the Civil War, the federal government largely generated revenue by selling land and levying taxes on imports and exports.

The concept of “judicial activism” would be considered very anti-democratic to the Framers because they created the legislature to make or change laws. In addition, the Framers would be disappointed to learn that “the press” was preoccupied with politics versus policies. They would also be surprised to learn how world trade has grown and the important role America plays in the international community. The tension between

individual rights versus the “betterment of the community” would be somewhat foreign to them. They had rejected the French revolution approach that emphasized equality while we concentrated on equal opportunity for all. Public education was very important to the Founders not just because it gave the opportunity of upward mobility, but it was also one of the three requirements to maintain a democracy. According to Jefferson, you needed a moral, educated and engaged public. (We will talk about these three pillars later)

### **Lunch with the Secretary of Defense: Robert M. Gates**

The Honorable Robert M Gates, W&M class of 1965, delivered the luncheon address. Senator John Warner from Virginia introduced Bob Gates with some humor and much respect for his accomplishments in government. Senator Warner noted that Bob Gates who initially started as a CIA analyst is the only CIA Director who rose through the ranks of the CIA. Bob’s topic was very appropriate: a “realist’s” view of promoting democracy abroad.

“Americans continue to wrestle with the appropriate role this country should play in advancing freedom and democracy in the world. It was a source of friction during the entire Cold War. In truth, it has been a persistent question for this country throughout our history: How should we incorporate America’s democratic ideals and aspirations into our relations with the rest of the world? And in particular, when to, and whether to try to change the way other nations govern themselves? Should America’s mission be to make the world “safe for democracy,” as Woodrow Wilson said, or, in the words of John Quincy Adams, should America be “the well-wisher to the freedom and independence of all” but the “champion and vindicator only of her own”?”

There is always tension when you are trying to provide security for the United States while remaining true to our democratic principles. There has to be a right mix of realism versus idealism. We had to ally with a tyrant like Joseph Stalin so that we could be victorious in beating back Hitler’s Nazi Fascist regime in World War II. It is not always so cut and dried. America does make a concerted effort to deal in the international community with our principles for individual liberty and freedom intact. We do not use our military power to build an empire, but rather to defend ourselves from countries or individuals who would do us harm. The Founding Fathers learned early that our Democracy needed to be defended because our principles can be hostile to dictators and autocratic rulers.

Secretary Gates reflected on the Helsinki Conference with President Ford and the Soviet Union in 1975. Many critics were opposed to America’s participation, since they believed that the accords did little but ratify the Soviet Union’s takings in Central and Eastern Europe. The treaty’s provisions on human rights were disparaged as little more than window dressing. However, the conference and treaty represent another of history’s ironies. The Soviets demanded the conference for decades, finally got it, and it helped destroy them from the inside. The “realists” opposed holding the conference for decades, and attended grudgingly. Events have shown that the meeting played a key role in our

winning the Cold War. Why? Because the human-rights provisions of the treaty made a moral statement whose significance was not lost on the dissidents behind the Iron Curtain. Helsinki became a spur to action, a rallying cry to fight tyranny from within and plant democracy in its place.

### 3. *Are America's Founding Principles Relevant in a Global Age?*

Moderator and Panelists: Moderator--Walter Isaacson, CEO of the Aspen Institute and former CEO of CNN and managing editor of Time. Panelist: Stephen Heintz, President of Rockefeller Brothers Fund; Kumi Naidoo, Secretary General of CIVICUS; Y.J. Choi, Minister of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations.

Is there a new paradigm to world order? Have countries become so “interdependent” that trade has replaced war? South Korea had many adversaries in Asia, but now trades with most countries because the South Korea economy has become so strong. In essence, does foreign trade create peaceful relationships out of adversaries? There is a lot of evidence that “free” trade does help develop the infrastructure that can lead to countries becoming more democratic. For example, trade requires agreements that need an independent legal system to handle disputes and enforce agreements. Consequently, more transparency can evolve as the quantity of business transactions increase and confidence in the infrastructure and the legal system can grow.

### 4. *The Future of Democracy: Why Does it Matter? An International Dialogue*

Moderator and Panelists: Moderator—Jim Lehrer; Panelists: Dr. Ali Ansari, Director, Institute for Iranian Studies, University of St. Andrews, Scotland; The Honorable Lawrence Eagleburger, former United States Secretary of State; The Honorable Sandra Day O'Connor, United States Supreme Court Justice (retired)

This segment had been structured to allow pre-recorded questions from College of William and Mary students and foreign delegates attending the Forum. Rather than deal with each question, I will give a few examples and then summarize the panelist's discussion within a few categories.

Can democracy be taught? What happens when democratic elections are held and tyrants are elected that do not subscribe to our democratic principles? Can a democracy and theocracy co-exist? Is a more democratic world a safer world? Does economic development lead to democracy? Can economic development lead to political oppression? Is there a relationship between, education, health, the environment and “well being” and democracy? In an age of global security issues, are there conflicts between individual rights and security in a democracy?

## **Democracy is hard work and a process**

There is sometimes a perception that democracy is an end in itself versus a means to an end. A democracy is not a panacea for all problems, but rather a process that involves its citizens in building a representative government. Thomas Jefferson had noted that the American Republic (US Democracy) could not survive if the public did not remain educated and engaged with good ethics. Each generation must work hard to improve the process and keep the basic principles of democracy alive for each succeeding generation. The structure of democracy with its separation of the three branches of government (Legislative, Executive, and Judicial) can be taught, but the politics of democracy must be experienced over a period of time. In addition, it is important to have an infrastructure or institutions in place that can help support a democracy. It is critical for institutions to support the “rule of law” and to the greatest extent possible provide transparency in governmental transactions.

Economic development has been a precursor to positive change. In order to maintain economic growth through global trade, a court system needs to be in place that can deal with contract disputes and other matters. Not only can an independent legal system be developed, but also trust and transparency between the trading parties can become a reality. As more and more people join the middle class, there is a natural evolution (and time) for individuals to want to have a say in how their governments are structured. When “Capitalism” or “Free Enterprise” can be combined with proper regulation, it is a very effective way to help improve the lives of those at the bottom of the economic ladder.

Can a Democracy and a Theocracy co-exist? No, but a Democracy and religion can co-exist. Iran considers the American model (Separation of Church and State) ideal for religion to thrive within a Republic state. The religion with the most influence in Iran is Islam and it sets the foundation for virtue, which is one of the ingredients for democracy. Although the Iranians have structured their Republic to operate with a separation of Church and State, it does not currently operate that way because the religious Mullahs control the political process. America’s founding fathers were greatly influenced by their religion (Christian/Judeo) when developing the structure of an American Democracy. For example, the economic concept of Capitalism and/or Free Enterprise was directly related to the various protestant religions popular in Colonial times plus gave a sound basis for a “moral” electorate. The Founding Fathers did believe in a God, but did not want to create a government that decided which religion was the “right” religion for its citizens. The Founders experience with Britain and their review of history indicated to them that an official “state” religion was not in the best interests of anybody.

## *5. Terrorism and Security*

Moderator and Panelists: Moderator--Admiral James M. Loy, Senior Counselor, The Cohen Group, former Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security; Panelists—Dr. Ali Ansari, Director, Institute for Iranian Studies, University of St. Andrews, Scotland; Dr. Martha Crenshaw, Senior Fellow, Center for International Security and Cooperation, Stanford University; The Honorable Mitchell Reiss, Vice Provost for International Affairs, The College of William and Mary; The Honorable Charles S. Robb,

Distinguished Professor of Law and Public Policy, George Mason University; and former US Senator and Governor from Virginia.

Historically speaking, 90% of all terrorist movements end within the first year, and all terrorist organizations tend to disappear within 10 years. The thesis that democracy can prevent or eliminate terrorism is not necessarily true. In fact, the transition to democracy can be very violent. In the long term, terrorism is not successful, but it can create havoc in the short term. The current “vintage” of terrorist tactics is quite alarming with the “suicide” bombings of innocent civilians and the potential use of “weapons of mass destruction” (WMD). Governments must be careful not to overact, but they need to be effective in three areas:

1. Offense--Aggressively pursue the terrorists and their organizations and try to eliminate any “safe havens”.
2. Defense--Tighten security and access to sensitive areas, identify and keep track of terrorist activities, and encourage government agencies and individuals to share suspicious behavior and information.
3. Win the “heart and minds” of the affected groups of individuals. Economic development and assistance can help with item 3 provided it is from the “ground up”. See section on World Markets and Democracy for more details.

Terrorism is an enormous challenge to all governments around the world. Internally, The United States faces four challenges in dealing with terrorism after 9/11.

1. Intellectual—We did not have a lot of resources that could help us understand the enemy including linguists. Although we have made significant efforts since 9/11, the effort does not measure up, for example, to our response to the Soviet’s launch of Sputnik when we mobilized our space program.
2. Bureaucratic—Government agencies have not been good about sharing information. So, since 9/11, we have had the largest governmental reorganization in fifty years.
3. Ethical/Moral—terrorist tactics repulse us so much that we want to “draw a line in the sand” and say: you’re either with us or against us. Unfortunately, the world is not so black and white.
4. Negotiating—there are tremendous risks to democracies in negotiating with terrorists. The principle that we don’t negotiate with terrorist groups can get in our way when trying to convince some to change their minds. On the other side of the fence, we can miscalculate the intentions of a terrorist group. An example of a successful negotiation is Northern Ireland with the IRA, but there have been many unsuccessful attempts to negotiate with terrorist groups.

Dr. Ansari indicated that “soft” power could be more effective than “hard” power. The American principled documents, such as The US Constitution, Bill of Rights and The Declaration of Independence, along with the American struggle to establish a working Republic is considered an inspiration to many people in the world. In fact, it could be argued that America is the current “moral” center of western civilization. According to Ansari, the world needs more “statesmanship” rather than the standard “political” approach when dealing with complex world problems. Politicians tend to view issues/problems over a shorter period of time for expediency rather than taking a longer term view. For example, Britain, since 9/11, has enacted some new laws that have restricted some individual rights that had evolved over many years. Governments need to be cautious when restricting individual rights even though the security measures may be quite necessary. Finally, moderate Moslems need a “rallying cry” to improve their ideology while western democracies need to be supportive of the “modernization” of Islam.

### *5. Protecting Religious Freedom and Minority Rights*

Moderator and Panelists: Moderator—The Honorable Donald W. Lemons, Justice, Supreme Court of Virginia; Panelists—Mr. Mokhtar Lamani, IDRC Senior Visiting Fellow, Center for International Governance Innovation; Dr. Ingrid Mattson, President, Islamic Society of North America; Mr. Theodore M. Shaw, President and Director-Counsel, NAACP Legal Defense Fund; Dr. Rodney A Smolla, Dean, Washington and Lee University School of Law.

Of all the individual freedoms, the protection of religious freedom and minority rights might be the most difficult. Mr. Mokhtar Lamani related two relevant stories about his experience living in the “Red” zone in Iraq. Mr. Lamani lived and worked outside the relatively safe “Green” zone in Baghdad. In order to help develop strategic solutions for Iraq, Mr. Lamani met with all constitutes (Politicians, Religious and Tribal Leaders, Civil Servants and Intellectuals) in Iraq, its neighbors and the allied forces in Iraq.

The first story: The first Iraq democratic elections became an election based on the formation of “religious” parties. An individual running for mayor of a sizable town would not align himself with a “religious” party. Even though everyone in the town considered this individual to be the most competent and qualified individual running for mayor, he only garnered votes from his family members. This is one reason why the national government has had trouble reaching compromise on important legislative issues. Iraq is a young “democracy” that is just learning the process.

The second story: Prior to the coalition toppling the Saddam regime, there were about 50,000 Christians practicing in Iraq. Now there are about 2,000 left. The Christians were systematically asked to convert to Islam, if not, then pay a monthly fee of \$250, if they couldn’t pay, then leave the country, and if they didn’t leave, they would be killed. This is not a democracy that currently protects individual religious freedom or minority rights. However, until very recently, it had many insurgencies being fought with little or no time for protecting individual freedoms.

Dr. Ingrid Mattson offered an historical perspective to a question posed by the moderator, The Honorable Don Lemons: Is Islam compatible with Democracy? She began with a rhetorical question: Is Christianity compatible with Democracy? No one would question that today, but in Colonial times Virginia had a state sponsored religion. In fact, many of its citizens then would not recognize Virginia now. In the 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> centuries of the common era, Baghdad had a stressful religious conflict between its two branches of Islam—the Sunni(Sunnites) and Shia(Shi'ite). Each “community” banded together for identity and protection, but if they caused any trouble for the greater community, there would be significant punishment. This is a tyrannical model that had been followed viciously by Saddam Hussein. Islam is trying to move from a “pre-modern” state to a “modern” state, but a state must be able to provide security for its citizens in order to protect individual rights. It is not an easy transition for a society to move from one “collective” group where safety is provided to protection of individual rights by the state. In fact, protection of “minority” rights can sometimes exacerbate the problem, because the state might perceive that their imbedded moral code might be threatened. The Iraq Constitution is a very inclusive democratic document, but Islam is the official religion of Iraq. This is an example of how important the Islamic culture is to many Iraqis. The transition from a collective religious community society to a society where your religion is one’s own individual conscious and where an independent Judiciary protects minority rights will be a long and arduous journey.

The panel next moved to the importance of an independent Judiciary to protect minority rights otherwise a democracy would fail. The American experiment has struggled with protecting minority rights since the insertion of special language found in the US Constitution dealing with “special” property rights. Of course, these special property rights dealt with slave owners. The Founders pushed off the slavery issue until it ultimately had to be dealt with through a very painful and costly civil war. Discrimination did not end with the civil war because of individual state “Jim Crow” laws which perpetuated government sanctioned discrimination. The government sanctioned discrimination ended with the famous Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka, Supreme Court case (1954) and the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Affirmative Action legislation has also tried to legislate equality in the work place and admissions in higher education which has spawned a number of lawsuit challenges that have culminated in a couple of “landmark” Supreme Court cases—The Bakke case (1978) and The University of Michigan (2003) case. In essence, these two decisions allowed “diversity” to be used in admissions as long as it is not used in a “mechanical way”, i.e. the use of quotas or a point system.

America is currently in the middle of a debate about two different concepts of equality: Process Equality and Outcome Based Equality. Process equality means everyone has the same equal opportunity, while outcome based equality means that the result should reflect the diversity of our society. There is a healthy tension between these two approaches to equal opportunity. It is “un-American” to require quotas, but we should pursue the ideal of a shared culture in a diverse society. The pursuit of “outcome based” equality probably deals more with our psyche as an attempt to remedy past wrongs. We

are fortunate in America that we generally support the rule of law. We may grumble about decisions, but we will obey the final judicial decision.

There are three competing philosophies about religion in America today:

1. High separation: to the greatest extent possible, government and religion should be separated.
2. Middle separation: the government must be neutral toward religion—neither favoring nor disfavoring.
3. Low separation: government is allowed to recognize the role of religion in society and accommodate its presence.

Middle separation might allow public displays of religion for historical purposes while low separation is comfortable with religious affiliated organizations performing some services on a joint project basis. A couple of examples might be drug rehabilitation and disaster relief. In the context of the above, Americans tend to agree on four principles for religion:

1. Anti-discrimination—all religions are treated equally
2. There is no official religion and the government can not tax to support religion
3. America does not allow religious federalism, i.e. can not organize political subdivisions around religion
4. There are two different court systems: Religious courts and Secular Courts (federal and state). The religious courts deal with theology, which can be a bishop, church elder, etc. while the secular courts deal with the legislated law.

The American people are a good and generous people and we have progressed through various stages of democracy. We embrace the ideal, even though we often fall short. We have many imperfections, but we have made enormous progress in our democracy.

## *7. World Markets and Democracy*

Moderator and Panelists: Moderator—Dr. Jessica P. Einhorn, Dean, Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, The Johns Hopkins University; Panelists—Ambassador Chan Heng Chee, Ambassador of the Republic of Singapore to the United States; Mr. John Hewko, Vice President, Operations, Millenium Challenge Corporation; Dr. Robert Hormats, Vice Chairman, Goldman, Sachs & Co.

Dr. Jessica Einhorn did a nice job of framing the panel discussion with an historical overview and making the linkage that “free” trade can help in the development of democracies. The Bretton Woods Agreements (July 1944) created a system to promote

trade and govern monetary relations among independent nation-states. Cordell Hull (former US Secretary of State) had argued: “..unhampered trade dovetailed with peace; high tariffs, trade barriers, and unfair economic competition, with war...if we could get a freer flow of trade...freer in the sense of fewer discriminations and obstructions...so that one country would not be deadly jealous of another and the living standards of all countries might rise, thereby eliminating the economic dissatisfaction that breeds war, we might have a reasonable chance of lasting peace.” At the international level, these ideas evolved from the experience of the great depression (1930’s) and the end of World War II.

United States foreign policy had seen the development of the World Bank as a way to prevent economic depressions so that communist and fascist governments could not take hold with poorer nations. During the “cold” war, the United States was trying to have more countries turn to democracy. With “open markets and free trade”, the United States was exporting Freedom and Liberty. The trading system has not been 100% perfect because there has been some protectionism even in the United States. For example, agriculture has traditionally had some protectionist tariffs. Over the years, America has ebbed and flowed between degrees of free trade and protectionism. Recently, Congress has been moving toward more and more protectionism, which could adversely affect developing democracies. International economic markets, properly regulated, can help economic development increase standards of living and help build democracies.

Although economic development is necessary, it does not guarantee democracy. What comes first—economic development or democracy? The four Asian “tigers” all developed a little differently and they all have different degrees of democracy. Hong Kong evolved from a British Colony, returned to China and now has independent elections. Taiwan and South Korea evolved from dictatorships and have a “broad” democracy today while Singapore has become an economic power but with a relatively “tight” democracy. The biggest threat to democracy and economic development today is protectionism. Asians think of America with open markets and political freedom, but if protectionism were to prevail in America, what would America be exporting? Not Freedom and Liberty!

Established in January 2004 by the Bush Administration, the Millennium Challenge Corporation’s (MCC) mission is to reduce poverty through the promotion of sustainable economic growth. MCC is based on the principle that aid is most effective when it reinforces good governance, economic freedom and investments in people. Because corruption undermines every aspect of sustainable development, MCC has made fighting it one of its highest priorities. Using objective indicators, countries are selected to receive assistance based on their performance in governing justly, investing in their citizens, and encouraging economic freedom. In essence, US government assistance is delivered from the “ground” up versus from the “top” down. This is a new program designed to develop a partnership with a host country and its citizens. Most of the projects have been for building or improving infrastructure, but there must be a consensus between its citizen groups and the government before projects can be approved. In the

past, very little government aid filtered down to the benefit of its citizens while this new approach will hopefully reverse our prior results.

## 8. *Sustainable Development*

Moderator and Panelists: Moderator—Carol J. Lancaster, Director, Mortara Center for International Studies, Georgetown University; Panelists—Rebecca Adamson, President, First Peoples Worldwide; Frank Tugwell, President and CEO, Winrock International.

As has been emphasized at this conference, there is a very close relationship between economic development and democracy. So the question of “sustainable development” for some of the subsets to economic development is very relevant. The United States has had a debate about whether to use public funds to provide economic assistance to other countries since Jefferson uttered, “a government that governs best governs less”. For the last century, America has determined that providing governmental assistance is good American foreign policy.

One of the goals when offering financial aid to another country is to benefit the poor or indigenous people. The cumulative total of the indigenous people in the world represent about 22% of the landmass of the world. It is often difficult to determine how best to develop the local asset based upon the priorities of the local people and their culture. Again, one of the largest obstacles to success is government corruption.

Another trend in economic development is recognizing that the world has become interconnected. For example, the globe has limited natural resources so we must be good stewards of the useable land. There is a conflict within the agriculture community where the soil has eroded because of a rush to produce biodegradable fuels. Within the next 2 decades, the world population is projected to increase by 50% so will we be able to feed the world if we continue degrading the soil. Energy demands have reduced the low cost fuel reserves, which have generated a great deal of activity to solve the energy supply problem with alternative energy programs, such as solar, wind and nuclear power. There is a debate about how to affect change. The argument on how to solve the problem is whether you can affect change through some international authority issuing regulatory mandates while others feel the private sector will solve the problem by allowing free market pricing to provide the incentives. It is probably a combination of the two.

*The writer needs to make an editorial comment here. Making the environment a political issue is extremely bad policy if you are trying to build a consensus and affect the world's environment. There is no scientific agreement that humans can affect climate change. To strongly suggest otherwise undermines credibility and hampers debate. Those who disagree are often labeled anti-environment. Most citizens of the world want to be good stewards of the land and natural resources so that following generations can enjoy the fruits of life. Exempting emerging markets from any international agreement will not help the world to develop any meaningful standards.*

## Closing Celebration and Summary

Tim Sullivan presided over an evening of celebration. We had inspirational video presentations from three of the Honorary Chairs: George H. W. Bush, Baroness Margaret Thatcher, and Tony Blair. Peggy and I will not forget the speeches from Paly and Pablo. Paly Voda from Ukraine talked about how their democracy took hold on a cold night in November 2004, and her poignant “frog” tale about overcoming fear, which is so vital to a developing democracy. Pablo Canedo, who is from Bolivia, lobbied for the next World Forum on Democracy to be held in his country. Pablo stressed the need for an on going educational program about democracy so that future leaders can emerge from countries around the world.

We learned a great deal from many of the international delegates, and we were very inspired by their enthusiasm for democracy. We enjoyed dinner with Ahmad and Ali Ansari, Anastasia Ekkert (Russia) and a Turkish delegate. During Tuesday’s luncheon, we got to know delegates from South Africa, Republic of Indonesia, India, and Pakistan. Meeting many of the international delegates has given me a sense of hope for the Future of Democracy in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

### *Where do we go from here?*

Tony Blair indicated that we all share universal values of human dignity. Basic liberties include human dignity, equality, justice, fairness, and the right to choose our own governments. I suggest that an annual speakers bureau be held in Williamsburg to discuss individual liberty and freedom. There should be a resource for “students” of democracy that can help educate future leaders about the “process” (to borrow a point made by Margret Thatcher) of democracy. It is hard work! Initially, I recommend a website that is affiliated with Colonial Williamsburg where you can see videos from the World Forum on the Future of Democracy and view some important “living documents” about the development of democracy. In addition, there is a Glossary of democratic terms, and a fascinating Time Line of the historical development of democracy. The website is: [www.icitizenforum.com](http://www.icitizenforum.com)