

NEW GROUND

**Engaging people with the Conservative Party through
a bold, principled and imaginative foreign policy**

By James Mawdsley and Benedict Rogers

“If they answer not your call, walk alone, walk alone”
Mahatma Gandhi

CONTENTS

Summary 4
Introduction..... 5
Chapter 1 - The Purpose of a Political Party..... 6
Chapter 2 - Foreign Policy 7
Chapter 3 - International Development..... 12
Chapter 4 - The United Nations 15
Chapter 5 - Business on our Terms..... 20
Chapter 6 - The Arms Trade 24
Chapter 7 - The Environment from a Foreign Policy Perspective..... 27
Chapter 8 - Education 29
Chapter 9 - The ‘Right Way’ not the ‘Third Way’ 30
Chapter 10 - The Neutrality of Language 32
What can a Conservative do?..... 34
About the authors:..... 35

Summary

The purpose of a political party is the pursuit of a clear set of ideas and principles in the service of humanity. Winning elections is part of this, but not an end in itself.

Britain's foreign policy should promote freedom, the rule of law and the dignity of the person. Not only is this the right thing to do, but it is also in our long-term national interest.

International development is far more effective when organised on a person-to-person level rather than government-to-government. The basis of development is knowledge and skills. British people would gain great understanding by serving others in the developing world.

The United Nations requires radical reform. It will not be able to achieve its objectives while tolerating member states persistently violating its basic principles. Member states must be held to account or face expulsion.

British investment overseas will be a positive force only if it operates according to practices acceptable at home. Whereas it is not appropriate for Britain to impose its culture abroad, we are complicit in slave labour and environmental degradation when we pay subcontractors who do this.

The arms trade should restrict its market to countries which share our values. Failure to do this contributes to global instability and to specific security threats against Britain.

The environment requires grassroots solutions on a global scale which are impossible to realise while the vast majority of the world's population are powerless and hungry. We cannot hope for a protected environment until people themselves have their civil and political rights protected.

Education is about more than skills. It should encompass the values from which our culture has grown and the recognition of where those same values are shared around the world.

The "Right Way", an alliance of political parties around the world which share Conservative philosophy and through developing links can both learn new ideas and become more effective politically.

The neutrality of language needs to be re-established. Certain words, like globalisation and human rights have become loaded with political bias and thus are losing their meaning. Conservatives should not be afraid to address this.

Introduction

This paper sets out a Conservative approach to issues such as international development, human rights, the arms trade and the environment. We believe there is a natural alignment between Conservative philosophy and standing up for the oppressed and alienated. The Conservative Party is the party of William Wilberforce, the man who led the drive towards the abolition of slavery, and yet in recent years that radical commitment to human rights, and to humanitarian foreign policy, has seldom been remembered.

Many people in Britain, particularly the young, have switched off party politics, but they retain an interest in issues and a desire for a new sense of idealism from politicians. If the Conservative Party begins to seriously address questions of human rights, poverty and suffering around the world, by promoting a bold, principled and imaginative foreign policy, reflecting Conservative beliefs in freedom, the rule of law and individual dignity, this could help to enthuse the British people to consider the Conservative approach to government once more.

In the 1970s as the Conservative Party was re-thinking its political platform, groups such as the Institute of Economic Affairs and the Adam Smith Institute put forward bold ideas for economic reforms. At the time many of the free market ideas proposed were believed to be too radical, but the think-tanks and some Conservative politicians believed it was time to “think the unthinkable” in economic policy. Those ideas soon became mainstream economic policy for most of the developed world and some developing countries too. The time has come now to start “thinking the unthinkable” in foreign policy.

This set of ideas is “New Ground” for the Conservative Party, and yet it is rooted in the values that are the bedrock of Conservatism. Taken alongside the Party’s focus on reform of the public services and compassionate policies for disadvantaged communities, a bold, principled and imaginative foreign policy is right for the Conservative Party, and an essential precursor to our political recovery.

James Mawdsley and Benedict Rogers
January, 2003

Chapter 1 - The Purpose of a Political Party

The Conservative Party, one of the oldest and most successful political parties in the world, is rooted in a clear set of ideas. If it is to win back the support it lost in the General Elections of 1997 and 2001, the Conservative Party has to place those ideas at the centre of its political agenda.

Conservative ideas

The ideas that bring Conservatives together include the following:

- Freedom: people should be free to take decisions about their own lives
- Light government: the state is there to serve not to dictate
- Rule of law: it is the rule of law which secures our liberty
- Strong defence: in Britain we have a valuable heritage and a way of life worth defending

Conservatism is based on the belief that people are more important than the state. It combines a respect for individual liberty, and a belief that people should help each other. Compassion comes through people, not through the state. All of us are responsible for the condition of our country.

It is true that much of the purpose of a political party is to win elections. But there must be an even greater end. Because although a party without the purpose of seeking votes is little more than a pressure group, a party that seeks only votes with no clear ideas and values is of no service to anyone but itself, and as a political organisation is pointless.

In every political issue the Conservative Party addresses – Britain's public services, poverty, human rights, foreign policy, the environment – we have to ask ourselves how our core values can be applied. If we do not live these values, we do not hold them.

Chapter 2 - Foreign Policy

A nation's foreign policy is primarily shaped by national interest. That is a reality from which no one can escape, and it is right. Foreign policy can never be purely altruistic, because the obligation of the government which shapes and conducts that foreign policy is to serve its own people. The question, however, is what is our national interest, and would our national interest be served by a sense of duty and charity to other countries and people?

Leading multinational corporations recognise that enduring returns are secured through a culture of responsible and respectable practice. This holds for governments too. The "British brand" must be decent. Indeed it must be excellent. Then can foreign policy look beyond short-term economic and strategic interests to a longer-term vision of the world shaped by the values of democracy, freedom and respect for human dignity? A starting point would be to look at what is tolerable and acceptable in our own society. We should ask ourselves whether we would tolerate a government or an organisation which locks up political opponents, tortures and executes them, systematically rapes ethnic minorities or carries out genocide against another race within its borders. If these acts took place in Britain, would we find them acceptable?

The answer is obviously no. It makes no sense, then, to accept that treatment of other people in other countries when we would not tolerate British people being treated in such a way. If Britain is governed according to certain values, its government should apply those values to all areas of policy, including foreign affairs. If Britain does not stand up against such acts in other countries, it may find it loses its own freedoms as a result. For if dictators are appeased and a blind eye is turned to their barbarity, yet more dictators are encouraged – sowing more instability in the world.

Duty and charity

But before examining national interest in detail, let us look at where duty and charity fit in.

First, duty. Britain has a long history of engagement in the world, through its days as a colonial ruler in much of Asia and Africa. Since the Second World War, Britain has embarked on the path of decolonisation. But tragically in many places decolonisation has not resulted in liberation and democracy, but in dictatorship and oppression. While it is not for Britain to impose its ideas on another country, it is Britain's responsibility to speak up for those who cannot speak for themselves, particularly those people who were loyal to Britain during the colonial days and who expect some loyalty from us in return. According to Freedom House¹, of the 39 countries today which in 1900 were under British imperial rule, by 2000, 18 of these countries could be considered free, 14 partly free, and 7 under oppressive and authoritarian rule. To wash our hands of this situation

¹ *Democracy's Century: a Survey of Global Political Change in the Twentieth Century*, Freedom House, December 1999

and not get involved is to throw away any sense of respect for those who have been among our best friends in our own times of trouble.

We would therefore argue that Britain has a duty to help the Karen and other ethnic minorities in Burma, if only because they were loyal allies of ours in the Second World War. The ethnic minorities in Burma are suffering extraordinary brutality and the threat of genocide at the hands of the military junta, and they question why Britain is not at their side in their struggle the way they were with us.

Similarly, Britain has a duty to the people of Zimbabwe, who in the days when it was Rhodesia were loyal to Britain and are now suffering at the hands of Robert Mugabe.

Another example is that, despite handing over sovereignty of Hong Kong to China in 1997 as it was obligated to do under the terms of its lease, Britain has a duty to ensure that “one country, two systems” and the liberties guaranteed under the terms of the Basic Law and the Joint Declaration are protected for the people of Hong Kong.

There is a charitable element too. Although we cannot fix all the world’s problems, we can play our part. And there are examples of this in the case of Rwanda, Kosovo and Sierra Leone, where Britain has acted militarily and with humanitarian assistance for largely altruistic reasons.

Self-interest

Duty and charity, however, ultimately feed into national interest. It is not in our long-term interests to break the bonds of friendship and loyalty with past allies. Those who have been loyal to us in the past will remember our failure to support them in their fight for freedom. Those who struggle for freedom today will take note of those countries and businesses that back their oppressors. And when these people win their struggles against oppression, Britain will suddenly find that the corrupt regime it had befriended is no longer there, and those who have replaced it have good reason to feel enmity towards us.

There are situations where simple self-interest should propel Britain to act to end injustice around the world. The case of Iraq is an example. If rulers like Saddam Hussein are allowed to construct biological, chemical and nuclear weapons of mass destruction, they may one day turn them on us, either directly or by giving them to terrorists. If North Korea continues to starve its people and develop nuclear weapons, it will become a serious threat not only to Asian, but world stability.

If countries like Afghanistan, Iran, or Sudan had democracy, the rule of law, political stability and religious tolerance, Britain would not experience the current crisis in immigration and asylum. If Columbia and Burma had a transparent and accountable democratic system of government, drugs production and trafficking could be brought under control. If China can be encouraged to develop the rule of law, end the imprisonment of political dissidents and move towards a system of democracy and transparency, the long-term economic gains for British business in such a large market, freed from corruption, would be very significant. If religious oppression and intolerance

are allowed to continue, the threat from fundamentalist Islam – exhibited on September 11th 2001 but manifesting itself even now in Nigeria, Indonesia, Pakistan, Sudan and Saudi Arabia – will only grow.

In other words, it is in our national interest to promote democracy, the rule of law, respect for human dignity and religious freedom and tolerance. That means having a bold and principled foreign policy. It means abandoning short-sighted *realpolitik* and being prepared to act alone.

Where possible we should work with other countries to bring about positive change in the world. Where possible we should engage with undemocratic regimes that show signs of change. Countries may well have economic or historical impediments to achieving good governance. Understanding this, we need not attempt to define absolute standards of governance which must be met before engagement is possible, but rather we should look for co-operation and progress on specific issues and cases which we raise. Ultimately our engagement abroad must respect universal values of human rights; worthy ends cannot be achieved by unworthy means.

The United States' National Security Adviser Condoleeza Rice said last year that the United States “will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary, to exercise our right to self-defence by acting pre-emptively”². That was greeted with shock by many foreign policy analysts. But it surely makes sense – and is in the national interest – to pre-empt catastrophe.

Condoleeza Rice went on to explain the need to act against rogue nations, which are countries, in her definition, that:

- Support terrorism;
- Disregard international agreements they have signed;
- Are not democratic;
- “Reject basic human values and hate the United States and everything for which it stands”.

She continued:

“I don't think there is any place that you don't try to do something – there is a range of options – about it. I don't think you ever want simply to abandon the unhappy and unfortunate residents of a dictatorship to their fate.”

She is absolutely correct. There are a range of options – it does not necessarily entail military action to bring about change or to alleviate suffering – but that a country with the freedoms, wealth and privileges of Britain or the United States should ignore oppression in any corner of the world cannot be either right or in our national interest.

And she concluded:

² *The Daily Telegraph*, December 7 2002

“The wave of the future, the road to modernity, is through democracy – not defined as any particular system of government but defined as adherence to certain key foundational principles about the relationship between human beings and their government.”

European Union

This belief in democracy, the belief that governments ought to be answerable to their people, is deeply held right across Europe. For this reason, countries in Europe have a compelling interest in co-operating with each other in the promotion of democracy abroad. This ought to be one of the fundamental goals of the European Union.

It is right for the EU to set itself internal objectives, such as establishing a free market, freedom of movement for its citizens, and co-operation and intelligence sharing between security forces. However, any organisation which is purely inward looking is bound to die. If the EU is to grow in strength and meaning, then it must be outward looking too. And indeed, as Europeans look abroad and examine countries like Zaire, Bhutan or North Korea, then it becomes far more apparent that we Europeans do indeed have a great deal in common. We share profoundly important interests in seeing civilisation’s deepest values secured around the world: freedom, the rule of law, respect for the dignity of the person.

Without this outward looking *raison d’etre*, it is very tempting for EU officials to regiment and regulate life in Europe, trying to make everything uniform, taking sovereignty in areas where it should never be given. Instead, let Europeans maximise their advantages by collaborating freely on objectives we hold in common, and respectfully preserving the diversity and independence which gives us so much of our strength.

While applauding the excellent work done by Scandinavian countries, promoting human rights is an area in which Britain can certainly lead in Europe, given our long history and experience of engagement with the world.

Principles first

Last year, the Shadow Foreign Secretary Michael Ancram visited Zimbabwe to meet with opponents of Robert Mugabe’s regime. He entered Zimbabwe on a one day tourist visa, not on an official visit. He has set a good example. If more British politicians, especially frontbench politicians, were prepared to ignore the so-called “sovereignty” of illegitimate regimes and cross into areas to see first-hand the suffering of the people, it might help to begin to change foreign policy approaches around the world. If a senior Western politician is able to say when talking about a situation, “I have been there,” it carries influence and authenticity.

Of President George W Bush and his approach to foreign policy, Condoleeza Rice said:

“I know that the President is always going to ask first what is the principled thing to do or the right thing to do.”

The Conservative Party should follow that example and develop an approach to foreign policy which involves asking what is the principled thing to do. Usually, the principled thing to do also happens to be in the national interest.

Chapter 3 - International Development

In 2005, Britain will spend £4.6 billion on international aid, which is 0.4 per cent of national income. The United Nations set a target of 0.7 per cent.

Problems of poverty and disease in the developing world are as pressing as ever. Britain should meet the UN target, which is reasonable, but it is important to acknowledge that there is something fundamentally wrong with where aid is currently spent.

The Secretary of State for International Development Clare Short summed up the current Government's approach when she said:

*"We are also increasingly providing support directly into the budgets of developing country governments in return for a commitment to good governance that includes not only investment in basic services but also improvements to financial management and justice systems."*³

Although improving financial management and justice systems and developing good governance are important, sending funds directly into the budgets of developing country governments does not seem to be the best direction of aid money. Government-to-government funding is susceptible to misuse or corruption – funds are easily siphoned off into military budgets, official entertainment or Swiss bank accounts. Government-to-government funding involving millions of pounds is likely to exacerbate the problems of dependency, oppression, corruption and environmental degradation. How much of the money benefits the people is hard to say.

Conservatives believe in helping people to help themselves. A core Conservative value is to do as much as possible through people and civil society, and keep government small and focussed. Promoting initiative, enterprise, creativity and independence among people – helping move people away from dependency – is at the heart of Conservative thought.

Person-to-person aid

These values should shape our approach to international aid. A future Conservative government should turn the aid budget on its head and develop person-to-person aid.

Time and again it has been shown in the developing world that what is really required is not sackloads of rice and flour, but people with expertise to share. In the short-term, humanitarian aid will doubtless be required to keep people from starvation and disease, but aid policy should also focus on the long-term. Development is about small steps, not ambitious solutions.

Conservatives should therefore campaign for part of the Department for International Development (DFID) aid budget to be used to finance British people to go overseas to

³ *Parliamentary Monitor*

help develop skills. Perhaps 30% of our aid budget should be allocated this way, rather than the current allocation of less than 5%. This can be done by increasing the number of grants awarded to the numerous organisations which exist for this very purpose and to encourage the formation of new ones. The developing world desperately needs trained doctors, lawyers, teachers, computer technicians and mechanics. Perhaps even more, there is a need for basic training in primary healthcare. Proper hygiene can prevent many diseases, and prevention is better than treatment.

In addition, the aid budget should be used to fund more small, community-based development programmes that provide person-to-person care instead of government-to-government.

However, in many places, the problem is not a lack of skills but a lack of material resources. For example many places have skilled healthcare workers but do not have medical supplies. DFID funds are therefore well spent when procuring supplies in bulk which can be distributed by non-state organisations which have a presence in a given area.

Conservative Association sponsorship

But Conservatives do not need to wait until we are in Government to begin this. Conservative Associations can start now, by identifying people in their local communities – of whatever political persuasion – who would like to spend a few months or a year overseas helping develop skills. If every local Conservative Association, and perhaps Conservative-controlled councils, sponsored one person in their constituency to go abroad and teach IT, journalism, law, English, medicine or plumbing – or any other skill that they have – for up to a year, the effect would be extremely positive. It would:

- address the aid and development problem in a practical way;
- show Britain that Conservatives do care about the world's poor;
- impact British society for the better, helping to redirect our national culture.

The developing world would benefit, and the volunteer would benefit. They would learn more about the world and gain fresh experience which would develop character. The volunteers could be in their “gap year”, aged 18, before university, but they could just as easily be any age. They could be in their thirties and wanting time off from the rat-race of work, or anyone taking a sabbatical. They could be in their sixties and wanting to do something new in their retirement. Each Conservative Association could invite applications and interview the applicants. The decision should be made purely on the basis of the suitability of the person for the prospective project, and the desirability of the project, and not on any political agenda.

When the volunteer returns from abroad, they could give a presentation to the Association and local newspapers, and thus everyone would learn something more of the developing world.

Current approaches to aid and development, by government-to-government funding or through large relief organisations which have little personal contact or sensitivity to the

local culture and needs, are proving to be ineffective. It is time to try a new approach, a Conservative approach, based on people, skills, accountability and creativity.

Chapter 4 - The United Nations

The United Nations was established in order to enhance peace and stability in the world. The foundations of the UN, and particularly its Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), are worthy and should be supported. However, something has gone badly wrong with the way the UN operates.

In most organisations, members are expected to support, in word and deed, the principles for which that organisation exists. If you join a club, you adhere to the membership rules. If you belong to a political party, you support that party's philosophy. What is blatantly apparent is that many of the UN's members fail to live up to the organisation's values.

Universal rights

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the UN General Assembly on December 10, 1948 was established, as the document itself states, "as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations". Member states of the UN have "pledged themselves to achieve, in co-operation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms". These universal rights and freedoms include for all people:

- the right to life, liberty and security of person;
- equality before the law and equal protection of the law;
- freedom of movement;
- the right to own property;
- freedom of thought, conscience and religion;
- freedom of peaceful assembly and association;
- the right to take part in the government of the country, directly or through freely chosen representatives;

The Declaration also prohibits the following:

- slavery and the slave trade in all their forms;
- the use of torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment;
- arbitrary arrest, detention or exile;
- arbitrary interference with a person's privacy, family, home or correspondence.

These aspirations contained in the UDHR are reflected in the UN Charter, which is legally binding upon all UN members. Yet the Charter is consistently violated by members such as Burma, Cuba, Indonesia, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. In addition to this, covenants and treaties are legally binding upon states which have signed and ratified them, yet to take one example, the provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) are broken with virtual impunity by signatories such as Algeria, China, Iraq, Iran, Sudan and Zimbabwe.

Surely the status and influence of these members within the UN system should be downgraded according to their unwillingness to adhere to the UN's objectives. For example they could lose rights to sit on committees, to table or sign motions, to speak in debates or to vote.

There are precedents for punishing member states which violate the UN Charter. South Africa had its membership of the UN General Assembly (UNGA) denied in 1970s and 1980s, and Afghanistan, Cambodia, Haiti, Liberia and Sierra Leone all had their membership of the UNGA denied in 1990s. But few other countries have been disciplined. The UNGA would be a far more effective body if regimes which wilfully undermined its Charter were excluded.

On the other hand, there are cases where people have manifestly chosen their representatives, for example Taiwan and Tibet, yet they have been unable to gain membership of the UN. Another example of this is Burma, where the people overwhelmingly elected the National League for Democracy (NLD) under Daw Aung San Suu Kyi in 1990. But Burma is currently represented at the UN by the State Peace and Development Council (SPDC), the military regime, and this despite the fact that every year for over a decade this regime has earned the UN's strongest condemnation for its human rights abuses. Article 6 of the UN Charter states, "A Member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the Principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the Organisation by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council". There is a case, then, for the expulsion of Burma's current representatives to the UN and the acceptance of the NLD's nominees, since the NLD is the democratically elected government of Burma. Perhaps China would veto such a move. If so they should be asked to explain why. As Daw Aung San Suu Kyi herself has asked:

"Is the United Nations General Assembly meant for the lawful representatives of the people of various nations, or is it meant for just any old government that happens to have come to power?"

Structural problems

Allowing UN members to break with impunity the treaties they have signed results in absurd situations, amply demonstrated by the current composition of the Commission on Human Rights, a sub-group of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). This 53-member body now includes China, Cuba, Indonesia, Pakistan, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Sudan and Syria. For 2002/3 the Chairmanship was given to Libya, while the United States has been voted out of the Commission altogether.

As a result, in 2002 for the first time in many years the Commission on Human Rights failed to put forward a resolution critical of China's human rights record. This is despite China's egregious violations of UN treaties and the claim by Amnesty International, in 2001, that China had executed more people than all other countries put together, totalling 2,468 executions. No country put forward a resolution, and the United States was unable

to, and so China was left to conclude that its view of human rights was now in “the mainstream”.

In addition, the imbalance on the Commission on Human Rights in favour of oppressive regimes has enabled those regimes to use the system for accrediting Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) at the UN to their advantage. According to US Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, “oppressive regimes are funding and securing approval for government-sanctioned and government-selected groups credentialed as NGOs but which are actually promoting the regimes’ agenda. They are creating coalitions to remove legitimate human rights groups who are critical of their poor human rights records.”⁴

Time for reform

This system does not make sense. The idea that responsibility for promoting human rights lies with countries such as China and Sudan who are in flagrant violation of the Declaration is bizarre. Furthermore, the United States, which is not only the major world power but also perhaps the strongest defender of the Declaration, has no seat on the Commission. Reform is overdue.

Re-defining Sovereignty

The UN’s inability to uphold the principles of its declarations and to enforce the provisions of its treaties is largely rooted in an out-dated and inadequate conception of national sovereignty. Currently under international law, recognition and legitimacy are given to a regime on the basis that it has effective control over a given territory. In other words, might is right. This definition of sovereignty is pragmatic and in the past it may have been unrealistic to call for alternatives. However to continue to rely on this definition makes the world a more dangerous place than it has ever been, as rogue regimes and oppressive states are granted undue influence. The definition of sovereignty in international law needs to be rewritten so that it is closer to its basis in reality.

Sovereignty belongs to and comes from the people. A regime that rules with their consent is sovereign and this should be respected internationally. The measure of whether a regime rules with consent is not necessarily through elections or universal suffrage. But a regime which wilfully and persistently violates the fundamental rights of the people under it *in order to retain or increase its position of governance* cannot be considered sovereign; it is impossible that people will consent to being thus violated.

Following World War II, the greatest threats to world peace were felt to come from aggressor states that would invade and tyrannise other countries. And so the UN Security Council was constituted to authorise force against any country which violated the sovereignty of another by invading it. However, it was also agreed as a basic doctrine of international law that the UN could not authorise force to intervene in a country’s “internal affairs”. This means that a sovereign state which is not an explicit threat to any other state has exclusive jurisdiction over its territory. This position in itself is eminently justifiable. However, is it disastrous when combined with the misapplication of

⁴ *Has the UN Commission on Human Rights Lost Its Course?*, by the Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, PoliticsOL.com, June 14, 2001

sovereignty. Since World War II the suffering and misery inflicted upon people by aggressive invading states has been far exceeded by the suffering and misery of peoples caught in interminable civil wars and those living under barbarous and oppressive regimes. Threats to people today are far more likely to come from their own government than from a foreign one. If the first duty of law is to protect people's well-being by promoting justice, then international law is failing utterly for the majority of the world's population.

To open the possibility for a remedy to this then either:

- 1) the definition of sovereignty must be rewritten in international law; that it is predicated upon people and it is bestowed upon governments only through people's consent;

OR

- 2) the right for the UN to use force should be extended so it applies not only against those regimes which threaten the security of people in other states, but also against regimes which threaten the security of their own people.

In either case, there will then be a legal basis for effective intervention against regimes which persistently violates the most fundamental human rights. Theoretically the UN already has the right to uphold human rights where member states have conferred sovereignty upon the UN by signing international treaties and covenants. However, the range of options available to the UN to uphold these rights is extremely limited, especially the use of force. In much of the world, sovereignty is shared then between a regime which has no interest in justice and a UN which has no power to administer it. This imbalance in international law does not protect people so much as it protects tyrants. Territorial integrity is over-emphasised at the expense of self-determination. And so if the law is not improved, then the law itself becomes an obstacle to justice and ultimately to peace.

East Timor

The case of East Timor illustrates the suffering caused by confusion over sovereignty. Almost every year since Indonesia's invasion of East Timor in 1975, the UN passed resolutions condemning the invasion, calling on Indonesia to withdraw from East Timor and demanding a peaceful negotiation and the right of self-determination for East Timor. Furthermore, Indonesia's sovereignty over East Timor was never recognised by the UN. Up until the referendum in East Timor in 1999, the UN recognised Portugal, the former colonial ruler, as the legitimate sovereign power. However, it never acted to enforce its resolutions.

Moreover, when negotiations finally took place in 1999 to prepare for a referendum, the three parties were the UN, the Portuguese and Indonesia, not the East Timorese themselves. The UN gave responsibility for security to Indonesia, despite dire warnings of the consequences, and when the Indonesian military and their militia unleashed a wave of violence after the referendum result, the UN insisted it could not send in an international peacekeeping force without the invitation of Indonesia because to do so would be an invasion of sovereignty – despite the fact that, officially, Portugal was still

the sovereign power in the UN's terms. Finally a force was sent to restore order and help East Timor implement its decision to become an independent nation, but only with the reluctant invitation from the Indonesian President BJ Habibie.

Enforcing resolutions

Without enforcing standards of membership, there will always be problems enforcing resolutions. This has been highlighted by the case of Iraq. Since 1991 numerous resolutions have been passed in regard to Iraq, demanding an end to human rights violations, full and unhindered access for weapons inspectors, and the return of all prisoners from Kuwait and other lands, and all of these resolutions have been defiantly ignored by Iraq. However, Article 25 of the UN Charter, which is legally binding on all member states, reads, "The Members of the UN agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council..." Manifest failure to do this led President Bush to say:

"All the world now faces a test, and the United Nations a difficult and defining moment. Are Security Council resolutions to be honoured and enforced, or cast aside without consequence? Will the United Nations serve the purpose of its founding, or will it be irrelevant?"

It is alienating for British people to be part of the current UN structures when many of the member states do not abide by UN principles. The UN's website has the slogan "United Nations. It's your world". But at the moment it does not feel as if it is our world.

The Conservative Party should advocate the following:

1. Membership of the UN General Assembly should be given only to those countries which accept, in theory and in practice, the principles of the UN; this means a willingness to enforce Article 4(1) of the UN's Charter, that "Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgement of the Organisation, are able and willing to carry out these obligations";
2. That UNGA member states that continuously flout the UN's principles should have their accreditation withdrawn;
3. Membership of committees and commissions should be determined by whether or not the country lives by the rules of that body, rather than simply by geographical representation;
4. Security Council resolutions should be enforced if the organisation is to have credibility;
5. Sovereignty should be re-defined on the basis that it lies ultimately with people, not governments.

Countries which continue to flout the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and many other international agreements should be barred from membership of the UN General Assembly until they can agree to adhere to the rules of the organisation. Then the UN may start to make progress towards seeing its values adhered to in the world. And then people in every member state can truly say "The United Nations: It's our world".

Chapter 5 - Business on our Terms

Conservatives believe in private enterprise and the free market. However, in any business negotiation you have certain conditions which you wish to see met by the other side. You want to know whether you can trust them. One can tell a lot about businessmen's ethics by the ethics of their business partners. You do not go into a business partnership, or an investment, with just anyone.

On the international level, we cannot dictate to other countries how they should treat workers or what corporate ethics they should adopt. We cannot force them to change. However, we can and should insist on certain standards before British businesses, or European businesses, can enter into a business deal in another country. If that country or company fails to meet those standards, then the deal should fall.

This is not a new idea. It is something that is currently much talked about in corporate circles, and is known variously as "corporate social responsibility" or "global citizenship". Many multinational companies have adopted "Codes of Conduct", setting out standards for human rights, labour and environmental protection for their subsidiaries in the developing world.

The Foreign & Commonwealth Office has published a paper called *Global Citizenship*, in which it acknowledges that companies which operate in countries where there are widespread abuses of human rights run a risk that their "operations could inadvertently be a party to human rights abuses". The Foreign & Commonwealth Office has taken the step, in co-operation with the United States State Department and several British and American companies and human rights organisations, of launching a set of "Voluntary Principles" to provide guidance to companies on how to fulfil human rights objectives.

However, these "principles" are still voluntary and many companies continue to operate in countries with regimes which have no regard for these principles. Our government also contravenes these principles. For example, the Department for Trade and Industry produced a publication promoting trade with Sudan. It is time to change.

The use of sanctions

Economic sanctions have long been used as a tool in foreign policy. From 1993-96 the United States promulgated 61 laws and executive actions imposing unilateral sanctions against over 35 countries. It has enacted specific laws against countries such as Burma and Sudan. Sanctions have been imposed by some countries to punish another country for its human rights record, its development of weapons of mass destruction, its protectionist trade policies or its failure to comply with international agreements.

Many people now question the effectiveness of sanctions. There is an active campaign for the lifting of sanctions against Iraq, because – its proponents claim – the sanctions have little effect and are hurting the ordinary citizens of Iraq.

But those who support the use of sanctions do not generally argue that sanctions alone can change the situation. In an interview with the BBC, Burmese democracy leader Daw Aung San Suu Kyi said: “I don’t think it is sanctions alone which will make the difference, it is many things that will make a difference, including the efforts of the people of Burma themselves”. Sanctions are simply one tool among many.

Sanctions have the inherent weakness of providing a propaganda opportunity for targeted regimes to claim that they are being victimised by the outside world. So the beauty of offering business on strict terms, as suggested above, is that it is then clearly the offending regime itself which will be responsible for lack of inward investment, because they will effectively prohibit business if they insist on corrupt and unjust practices.

The question of whether or not investment benefits the local population depends upon the terms on which that business is carried out. So rather than the blunt instrument of blanket sanctions, a more sophisticated policy will be determined by assessing investment opportunities on a case-by-case basis.

For example, British American Tobacco (BAT) has defended its joint venture in Burma, claiming that to withdraw “would not be in the best interest of employees and would not benefit their communities”. The firm adds: “We believe that businesses can contribute to a positive future by operating within developing countries to internationally recognised standards of business practice and corporate social responsibility, and that multinational companies have a key role to play in leading by example and influencing in the areas where they can have influence, such as standards of employment, business practice, environmental management and community support.”

While this policy is undoubtedly a worthy aspiration, in reality it is not possible to cooperate with the Burmese military regime on respectable terms. In Burma, any joint venture with a state-owned enterprise is pumping money into the hands of that regime. This regime allocates over 40 per cent of its total budget to the military, so partnerships with the junta are, in effect, helping to arm them. Those arms will be used to continue the genocide against the ethnic minorities in that country. That is not in the “best interest” of the citizens of Burma, nor is it responsible investment.

However, the idea that businesses can help developing countries by operating according to internationally recognised standards of business practice is one which we support. That is why we believe it should be a legal requirement for British business to operate by internationally recognised standards – and to be prohibited from investing under any other terms.

By insisting on certain standards as a pre-condition of doing business, companies and governments in some countries may begin to change their ways. Countries such as China, India, Brazil, Kenya and Nigeria, which are already open to quality companies, will be prepared to move towards these standards if the companies demand them – and then their neighbours will follow. Currently the developing world needs Western investment even more than Western companies need their markets and resources.

The terms of business

So what are the terms under which business should operate? The International Labour Organisation's *Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work* is a starting point. Freedom of association, the elimination of forced labour, the abolition of child labour and a ban on discrimination on grounds of gender or race would be a start. Practices set out in the *Tripartite Declaration of Principles Concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy* should be enforced. And measures set out in a voluntary code for businesses by the United States Department of Commerce in 1996 provide an idea of the principles involved:

- No employment of children under 14;
- A maximum 60 hour working week;
- A ban on harassment and abuse;
- No forced labour;
- A voluntary, two-tiered monitoring system, one performed by companies, the other by independent external monitors.

And aside from any ethical considerations, the practice of slave-labour runs directly against Britain's economic interests. It is very difficult for British businesses to compete with companies which use slave labour, or corrupt enterprises, or those with no concern for the environment.

But, some companies may ask, how do we ensure acceptable practices in our subcontractors' factories? It is not difficult. It is easy to invite independent human rights organisations, or commercial investigators such as Pinkerton and Kroll, to carry out "human rights audits" of subcontractors' factories.

Many forward-looking corporations already take these issues seriously. However, in past years companies such as Nike, Reebok and McDonald's have had a bad press due to the sweatshop conditions of some of their factories in Asia. While some companies are forced to change their ways through poor publicity, sustained campaigns from human rights organisations and shareholder influence, would it not be better to prevent them engaging in business deals that fail to meet internationally accepted standards in the first place? That requires legislation. Wilberforce and Shaftesbury fought for legislation against unjust practices in their times. So should we. The UK can take a lead in this, and aim to bring the EU with us.

If the United States could legislate against corrupt practices overseas in its Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, and Britain endorse the same principles by signing the OECD's *Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions*, why should we not legislate against abuse of workers in the overseas factories of British companies? All that is required is to make it law for every British business that operates overseas to adopt the principles of corporate social responsibility, and to enforce them. All it requires is legislation that means British companies say "no"

to practices abroad that they would not accept at home. We are not proposing new regulation, only that existing regulation be applied to a wider area.

Chapter 6 - The Arms Trade

The sale of weapons to foreign countries arouses strong emotions. Some people feel a sense of outrage that British manufactured arms are sold to regimes which then use them to crush their own people or to threaten others. But other people argue that thousands of British jobs depend on the arms trade, and that if we do not sell arms, our competitors – such as France or the USA – will eagerly fill the gap.

Economic impact

According to a report by the Campaign Against Arms Trade (CAAC)⁵, arms exports account for two per cent of British exports.⁶ A total of 45,000 British jobs are directly dependent on military exports, and a further 45,000 indirectly dependent. This amounts to 0.3 per cent of all British jobs. This industry is heavily subsidised, receiving an estimated £760 million a year from the Government. Britain is the second largest arms exporter in the world after the United States, exporting over £27 billion of military equipment in the past five years alone⁷. The worldwide trade in arms is worth about £35 billion per year.

However, whatever the short-term economic benefits of our current arms trade, it cannot be in Britain's long-term interests to sell weapons to people who may use them in acts of aggression, in oppressing their own people, and ultimately even against Britain and her allies. To fail to understand that economic goals must be balanced against broader political goals is inexcusable; and to underrate the value of lives and peace is abominable. That is why, in this pamphlet, we argue that a future Conservative government should adopt a clear policy restricting the sale of arms solely to Britain's allies. Any country that is not an ally should not be a recipient of British arms. And these arms should be sold only on a contract which guarantees end-user accountability, including the provision that they will not be re-sold. To facilitate this and greater transparency, Britain should co-operate fully with the UN register for arms transfers.

Who are our allies?

A future Conservative government should draw up a clear set of criteria for countries to fulfil before we sell them arms. History shows that countries which are free do not begin wars and they do not attack other countries which are free. Therefore we can safely sell arms to any country which possesses:

- A free press
- Freedom of assembly, association and belief
- A transparent system of government
- An independent judiciary.

This definition of "allies" will result in some difficult decisions. Countries like Malaysia, Singapore, Turkey, and traditional allies like Brunei, do not fit the definition. However,

⁵ Campaign Against Arms Trade (CAAC), *The Employment Consequences of a Ban on Arms Exports*

⁶ CAAC

⁷ *A Call To Conversion*, Background Briefing, Pax Christi

rather than seek an immediate ban on future deals, which would cause very negative political fallout, Britain should make it clear to its trade partners that in future deals will depend upon our partners goodwill in making progress towards these freedoms. This goodwill should be measured against a clearly mapped out set of criteria and cases, and any country which proved intransigent should then find that arms deals with Britain quickly dry up.

Build the best, sell to allies

And this makes sense militarily. Competitive advantage is maximised not only by securing the best equipment for ourselves, but also by denying it to those who may become our opponents.

Thus our arms industry should concentrate on developing and producing the best possible equipment for ourselves, and such equipment that our allies – the United States, members of the European Union, Canada, Australia and New Zealand – will be attracted to. There is still a significant market among free countries if we produce quality products. According to SIPRI, between 1997 and 2001 the top five countries importing British arms were:

- Saudi Arabia – US\$1,784 million
- Canada – US\$731 million
- Malaysia – US\$530 million
- Australia – US\$354 million
- Brazil – US\$341 million.

According to these figures, we would lose about 60 per cent of our export arms trade by restricting our sales to free countries. This would mean heavy job losses and that political reality must be faced. When a change in government policy results in severe job cuts, then the government has a responsibility to alleviate the worst effects. The government should be willing to explore ways in which the people employed in the arms industry could be productively employed in other fields, especially where their scientific, design and manufacturing expertise would be valuable.

Middle East

For decades a pillar of British foreign policy in the Middle East has been to try to maintain a balance of power between Saudi Arabia, Iraq and Iran. This was done regardless of the nature of those powers, and in disdain for the rights and sentiments of the peoples who have had to live under those powers. The deep ignorance of this policy is now resulting in the greatest threats to global stability since World War II.

And even if we have finally recognised the folly of selling arms to Iraq and Iran, many would argue that it remains very much in our national interest to sell arms to Saudi Arabia. Virtually all our sales to Saudi Arabia are fighter planes, and supposedly these deter external aggressors and thus maintain the peace. It is argued that the planes are very unlikely to be used for internal oppression. Furthermore, the technology of the Tornados we sell is 20 years old, hardly cutting edge. Yet this is not true of the very

modern missiles and radar systems with which the planes are now fitted. And the whole approach overlooks the reality of growing instability in the country, and the grave danger that arms and training supplied by Britain could end up being used by very hostile hands. We surely need to acknowledge the full consequences of the closed and oppressive nature of Saudi society under the current system. More than any other country, Saudi Arabia was the source of money, personnel and ideology behind the September 11th terrorist attacks. Continuing to arm a repressive Saudi Arabia will continue to fuel the rise of militant Islamist terrorism.

Long-term security versus short-term money?

In October 2002, the Special Operations Forces Exhibition (Sofex) was held in Jordan. Britain's Ministry of Defence sent a delegation and ten British arms companies were represented. The British publicly funded arms export agency, the Defence Export Services Organisation (DESO), part of the Ministry of Defence, had a stand in the exhibition, as did the British Defence Manufacturers Association. The companies represented produce a variety of weapons, including anti-tank missiles, fighter jets, long-range land-attack cruise missiles and tanks.

Official delegations from 46 countries attended, and these included five of the seven state sponsors of terrorism listed by the United States State Department in *Patterns of Global Terrorism 2001*: Sudan, Iraq, Iran, Libya and Syria.⁸

Was it wise for Britain to be present at such an exhibition?

In this increasingly unstable world in which international terrorism is growing, it is essential to ensure that weapons do not fall into the wrong hands. If Britain sets the example, it will gain enormous kudos around the world with millions upon millions of people. That is excellent politics.

Furthermore, a principled stand will also appeal to many people within the UK, especially perhaps to younger voters, whose sense of idealism seeks a foreign policy with genuine respect for human rights.

⁸ CAAC FAO Newsdesks 15 October 2002 – see Press Releases on www.caac.org.uk

Chapter 7 - The Environment from a Foreign Policy Perspective

The Conservative Party should be the natural party for the environment. It is, after all, a party which values the countryside and all its traditions and pursuits. The environment is one of the issues younger people are most engaged with. If the Conservative Party wishes to connect with young people, it must therefore begin to think seriously about this issue. And beyond all this, the importance of protecting the environment is far greater than party politics and electioneering: our health, our livelihoods and our future depend upon it.

There is a great deal of debate on what the content of environmental policy ought to be, and for good reasons that debate is moving up the domestic and global political agendas. It is vital to get that content right. However, it is essential to recognise also that our domestic environmental policy will be of insignificant impact as long as billions of people across the world are denied their civil and political rights.

Over 2 billion people live in China and India alone, and currently the vast majority of these people are powerless to resist threats to, and degradation of, the environment in which they live; they do not have the voice, organisations or opportunities to hold polluters and developers to account, and nor to exert their influence on the political authorities.

When factories pour toxins into streams, killing the fish and poisoning fields and land, thus destroying the livelihoods of nearby villagers, then it is extremely unlikely that the poor will have their views recognised by officials within corrupt systems.

Most governments are fiercely determined to increase their industrial output, for their economies to grow, and so very often the environment is neglected in the drive for growth at any cost. On a national level this means that the developing world is only just beginning to pollute in a way which the West mastered 150 years ago, and there is no end in sight to the frightening growth of this pollution.

Given the sheer numbers of people in the developing world, it is clear that unless their rate of increase of pollution falls, then the domestic environmental policies of European countries will be quite irrelevant. No matter how environmentally responsible our own behaviour is, we will not be able to withstand pollution and climatic changes caused elsewhere but which recognise no national borders.

However, it is not only politically impossible for us to impose environmental policies on other countries, it would be quite repugnant for us to try, and hypocritical given our own terrible record of polluting. We need to get our own house in order before we think about lecturing others. Yet we should not abandon the goal of a clean world.

This whole pamphlet argues that we should adopt a foreign policy that promotes civil rights, freedom and the rule of law. We argue that it is always in Britain's best interests

that populations abroad should be emancipated from oppression, that they should be empowered to determine the direction and conditions of their lives. The value of this approach is clear when considering the environment. Although we have no place or ability to prevent, say, China from polluting, we can be sure that if China were a free and democratic country, then the Chinese people themselves would make every effort to keep their country just as clean as we aspire to keep ours. The key to capping pollution in the developing world is not through imposing limits on other countries, but it is by setting people free from powers and authorities which exploit and ravage both them and their environments. And it is precisely in that freedom that we are able to develop ever cleaner technologies.

Population pressures

Many people are afraid that the world has become severely overpopulated, and that this is causing an unbearable strain on the environment. Others argue that in fact the world has bountiful resources but we have not yet learnt how to share these or distribute them fairly. In any case, the fact is that in countries where people enjoy prosperity, education and good health-care, population growth is stabilised or even falling.

It should be obvious to us that the very best way to avoid pressures of over-population, and the poverty and environmental strains this can cause, is to promote development. This in turn is dependent upon freedom and civil rights. And this approach to demographics shows far more respect for the individual than policies of forced sterilisation and infanticide.

Indeed what a terrible violation of freedom and privacy it is when governments and international agencies dictate how many children people may have. Yet this is exactly what the agenda of the United Nations Family Planning Agency (UNFPA), funded by the taxpayer, involves. What can be more fascist than the UN and some Non-Governmental Organisations, supposedly in the name of “development”, coercing people into not having children and even killing unborn babies? It is an attitude which seems to say: “we don’t want to share the world’s resources with you, so we don’t want you to breed” – and it is wrong.

Chapter 8 - Education

Education is the foundation of society. If we do not get education right, then not only are young people given a poorer start in life, but our economy is weakened, and the social and moral fabric of the nation is undermined.

And good education is about more than teaching mathematics, science and English language. It is about giving young people inspiration for life.

Values as well as skills

The Conservative Party should therefore adopt a broad approach to education policy. In addition to addressing issues such as A level standards, school discipline, teachers' morale and parental choice, our education policy should include provision for our children and young people to be taught about the following:

- International prisoners of conscience, political and spiritual heroes. In General Studies, History or Political Studies, pupils should hear about British and foreign people of conscience, such as William Wilberforce, Oscar Schindler, Father Maximilian Kolbe, Vaclav Havel, Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and Nelson Mandela. In addition, local schools can identify local role models.
- International relations, other countries and cultures - Through encouraging children to develop pen-pal relationships with children in the developing world.
- Their spiritual and cultural heritage – It is important for us to learn about the roots of our culture and to understand from where many of our values have emerged. In history lessons and religious studies, pupils should be taught early Church history, the values espoused by men such as Thomas Aquinas and St Augustine.

How?

Schools can work with development agencies, churches and Non-Governmental human rights organisations such as Amnesty International, Christian Solidarity Worldwide and the Jubilee Campaign to develop material that is an appropriate way of informing young people.

Some people may be concerned that extremist organisations – religious fundamentalists, left-wing activists, militant campaigners – may use this as an opportunity to indoctrinate young people with unhealthy propaganda. To overcome this problem, parents and school governors should be invited to view the material before it is taught. The broad subject matter should be included as a general requirement in the National Curriculum, although the implementation should be up to teachers, school governors and parents to decide.

Chapter 9 - The 'Right Way' not the 'Third Way'

The Conservative Party and the other major British parties have been developing alliances with like-minded parties in other countries, through, for example, the Westminster Foundation for Democracy. This is a worthwhile and important part of foreign policy and should be continued and expanded.

Tony Blair, Bill Clinton and Gerhard Shroeder are not Conservatives' favourite people. Their electoral appeal may be strong in the short-term, but their political foundations are shallow. Each one of them stripped their party of its core beliefs for the sake of winning votes, and in that they were very successful, but they have lost their anchor. But however much we may dislike that abandonment of principle, there is one thing we can and should learn from them without mimicking the shallowness of the venture, and that is building relationships with like-minded parties in other countries.

It would be to the Conservative Party's advantage to work more closely with sister parties around the world. At the moment informal relationships exist with some, notably the Republican Party in the United States, and at elections advisers are sometimes sent from one side of the Atlantic to the other. But it would be good to develop ideas together and to work together on an international basis.

The Conservative Party in Britain could join forces with Conservatives in the United States, Australia, Germany, France, Canada and others around the world, to develop an international free-market agenda. This could be done through:

- Regular policy forums
- Links on the Conservative Party's website to websites of relevant parties abroad and to policy discussion sites.

These should not be the preserve of our current political leaders, but should be open to grassroots Party members.

It could develop to a further stage, whereby Conservative Associations around Britain develop 'twinning' relationships with sister parties' branches in other countries.

Most importantly, these relationships could be used to provide support to new free-market parties in fledgling democracies. The Republicans do this already through their International Republican Institute, and the Conservative Party in Britain could adopt a similar approach and establish the International Conservative Institute. Party members, regardless of their position in the Party, could go individually or in delegations to emerging democracies to advise like-minded parties on:

- Free markets
- Multi-party democracy
- The concept of a 'loyal opposition'

➤ Campaigning strategies.

Parties around the world that share our commitment to small government and individual liberty should be willing to take a stronger stand against regimes which blatantly disregard concern for human dignity and freedom. Joint statements by conservative parties in the democratic world condemning the human rights violations in countries such as Burma, China, North Korea, Zimbabwe and Sudan would show the world a unity of purpose.

Conservatives need not feel like a beleaguered minority. Their values are shared by the majority of people in the world today. By establishing the 'Right Way' to deepen relationships among conservative parties around the world and to counter the intellectual shallowness of the 'Third Way', Conservatives will regain confidence in the power of their ideals.

Chapter 10 - The Neutrality of Language

Certain terms which should be non-partisan and available for use by all people have been hijacked by the Left and have become loaded with political bias. It is time for Conservatives, through our own language and our attitudes towards education, foreign policy and international development, to reclaim such terms and re-establish their political neutrality.

The following are just some of the terms which arouse suspicion among some Conservatives and which are banded about by the Left as if they had a monopoly over them. In reality they concern issues which should be far beyond party politics.

Human rights – The Left sometimes attempts to portray themselves as crusaders for human rights, battling against the establishment on behalf of the poor and the persecuted. Yet at the heart of Conservative philosophy is the principle of the unique value of each and every individual human being. Conservatives should therefore once again become champions, in word and deed, of international human rights. Conservatives should argue, loudly and consistently, that around the world, regardless of race, religion, gender, sexuality, class background or income, every human being should be treated with dignity.

Justice – Everyone should be given a fair chance in life, and everyone should be equal before the law. The rule of law is essential for proper criminal justice; the free market is a way of promoting social justice. But justice should not mean, as the Left sometimes propose, state-sponsored levelling of wealth or positive discrimination. Justice does not mean absolute equality of income or lifestyle – it means striving to provide equality of opportunity. That is done through promoting freedom of choice, civil society and the rule of law.

Equality – Since we believe in the unique value of each individual, we do not believe people are the same. Rather we believe in diversity. For equality of outcome is impossible without suffocating creativity, individuality, opportunity and, indeed, justice. But true “equality” is much greater than simply “sameness”. As stated above in relation to justice, we believe in working for equality of opportunity.

Globalisation – Globalisation is a fact, not a philosophy. The world has become more inter-connected, through technology, trade and travel. “Globalisation” should be a neutral descriptive word, not a political agenda.

Compassion – There is a perception that the Left is compassionate and Conservatives are hard-hearted. But the difference between Conservatives and the Left is not over whether one is compassionate and the other is not, but over how compassion is delivered. The Left believes the state is the best channel for compassion. Conservatives believe compassion best comes through people, neighbourhoods, communities and voluntary organisations, not through the state. The role of the state is to protect and support the free institutions of society.

Freedom – freedom is an end in itself, because when people are free to choose, they have more opportunity to help each other, and assistance at a personal level is often far richer and more holistic than the help which could be rendered by the state. But freedom cannot be imposed. It can only be achieved through each and every human heart, and thus mistakes will inevitably be made. But Conservatives should fight against futile attempts to legislate and regulate error out of our lives when the price of this is freedom itself.

What can a Conservative do?

“The only thing needed for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing”
Edmund Burke

Every Conservative, from the Shadow Cabinet right through to branch members across Britain, could take some of the following steps:

- Know Conservative values, live them and articulate them to people when asked why you are a Conservative;
- Urge your local Association or Conservative-run council to consider taking up the idea of sponsoring volunteers to work in the developing world;
- Visit countries oppressed by tyrannical regimes yourself, make contact with pro-democracy activists in those countries and in exile, become involved in campaigning for human rights, justice and democracy around the world. Be willing to visit people who are suffering at the hands of tyrannical regimes, if necessary crossing borders without a visa if such a visit would be welcomed by local people;
- If you travel for your work anyway, try to make contact with like-minded parties abroad, and if you have skills in business, law, education, language, politics, local government, share them with like-minded parties in emerging democracies;
- If you use the internet, communicate with sister parties overseas;
- Write to Britain’s Ambassador to the UN in New York to urge wholesale reform of the UN’s practices and systems; lobby the Government and the Conservative Party to look at urgent reform of the UN;
- Lobby for legislation on corporate social responsibility;
- Lobby the Government to adopt stricter controls on the sale of arms;
- If you are a councillor, school governor, parent, or teacher, encourage schools to adopt some of the ideas suggested in this pamphlet, even while the Conservatives are in Opposition at a national level;
- Use the terminology which has been hijacked by the Left in conversation – don’t regard them with suspicion – reclaim them

About the authors:

Benedict Rogers is a journalist and human rights advocate, and author of *A Land Without Evil: Stopping the Genocide of Burma's Karen People* (Monarch, 2004). He works with the international human rights organisation Christian Solidarity Worldwide (CSW) in London, and has travelled extensively to Burma, East Timor, China, India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Armenia and Nagorno Karabakh. He has contributed to a variety of publications, including *the Asian Wall Street Journal*, *the Hong Kong Standard*, *the Times*, *the Sunday Times* and *the Daily Telegraph*. He worked as editorial writer and columnist on the *Hong Kong Standard* from 2000-2002, and for Euromoney/Institutional Investor Publications from 1997-2000. He is co-author of *The Life & Death of a Dotcom in China* (Asia Law & Practice Books, 2000). In 2003, he lived in Washington, DC where he established CSW's presence on Capitol Hill. He served on Board of Trustees of CSW UK from 1996-2003, and founded CSW Hong Kong. He is a Trustee of HART (the Humanitarian Aid Relief Trust) and the Metta Trust for Children's Education, and is a member of the panel of advisers to Generositywithoutborders.org. He has appeared regularly on radio and television, and briefs Members of the British Parliament, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, the European Union, the UN Commission on Human Rights, the US State Department and US Congress on human rights and religious freedom. He has spoken at the White House, the US Congressional 'Faith and Law' Fellowship, the Heritage Foundation, the Conservative Party Conference, and in churches, conferences and demonstrations around the world. He holds a B.A in Modern History and Politics from the University of London, and an M.A in China Studies from the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London and is a member of the Conservative Christian Fellowship and the Bow Group.

James Mawdsley campaigns for democracy, the rule of law and respect for the dignity of the person. He has written for local and national newspapers and is author of *The Heart Must Break: the Fight for Democracy and Truth in Burma*, an account of what he has witnessed in Burma's border areas and prisons. He is a frequent public speaker on democracy, speaking throughout the United Kingdom and in Europe, USA, Asia and Australia. He is the founder and Chairman of the Metta Trust for Children's Education (MTCE). He is a member of the Conservative Christian Fellowship and a prospective Conservative Party candidate for the North West Region for the June 2004 European elections.

For further information, you can contact Benedict Rogers and James Mawdsley on: info@newground.org.uk