



Trade for Democracy and Freedom

By Ewa Björling

J

H

S

This report is written by Ewa Björling on behalf of the
Jarl Hjalmarson Foundation
© Jarl Hjalmarson Foundation 2010

Free Trade – “the battering ram, obliterating every barrier”

*A vivid culture could not be locked in behind bars or borders.
It would wither or be trivialized. Cultures need the
freedom to interact with other cultures.*
- Mario Vargas Llosa

Why should we trade with other nations? The most common answer is that we benefit from trade. Exchange with other countries has made Sweden prosper. Trade enables us to concentrate on what we do best and exchange this for necessary goods and services produced by those who are better at making them. Trade gives us a greater variety of products and services and results in the fall in prices of goods needed in our own production, thereby making us more competitive.

Another common and relevant response is that trade is an important tool in reducing world poverty. Countries that integrate into the world economy and manage to develop their own production are also better equipped for developing their own wealth.

Once again, the economic arguments are center stage.

Few issues are as unifying for economists as the economic benefits of trade. It is broadly accepted that free trade in general – i.e. low tariffs, few technical trade barriers, lack of limits for FDIs, etc – contributes to the creation of wealth and eradicating poverty. Correspondingly, tariffs, quotas and other trade barriers work in the opposite direction and cause lower growth and a less efficient use of national resources. Obviously, it is possible to find experts who emphasize the importance of this or that specific tariff or quota – not in the least among economists working for a specific interest – a group who claims to be in particular need of protection from foreign competition. It could also be a group claiming that their specific issue – be it environment, job creation or the protec-

tion of a specific life style – is important enough to call for a restriction of the right of people and companies to trade with one another.

Generally, though, especially in a broad perspective, the experts agree: Trade benefits growth and lays the foundation for a much greater wealth. Should anyone have any doubts, there are hundreds of millions of people that are living evidence of the validity of this thesis. I am of course referring to all those who have been lifted from poverty, primarily due to their countries opening up to the rest of the world. Today's clearest example is the development in the so-called BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, India and China). Earlier, the Tiger economies of South East Asia have demonstrated the power of trade – their economies grew by 562 percent between 1975 and 2005. Historically, the development in Great Britain in particular has demonstrated the implications of trade on national wealth.

However, the role of trade as a creator of wealth is not the only argument for more free trade and openness. The value of free markets, growth and economic development reaches beyond pure economic profit. This is seldom spoken of, despite being far from a novel thought.

150 years ago, as Sweden set on the track from poverty to the welfare society of today by opening up its borders and deregulating trade and industry, the argumentation often went beyond the economical aspect.

Johan August Gripenstedt, one of the politicians who have meant the most for modernizing Sweden, gave an example of this in a Parliamentary debate held in 1857. Once he had stated the budgetary benefits, he exclaimed in a nearly spiritual way:

“But far higher than these material services, I hold the benefits of trade for humanity in the interest of cultivation and enlightenment. Thus, while the conqueror leaves behind nothing but burned down ruins covered in blood in the conquered land, the bitterness of the defeated hearts; when the missionary and scientist, whom no one hold in higher regard than I, seem as the mere ship at sea whose tracks close the moment the keel has torn the water's surface; trade pierces through like a battering ram, obliterating every barrier put up by ignorant statesmen and ignorant customs to halt the progression of the human mind. And I am not mistaken in believing that trade in all its global spread, constitutes the most powerful tool in the hands of providence to lift humanity, that it is the broad and deep, yet calm river,

that silently but steadily lifts the destiny of humanity to greater cultivation, a brighter light and a popular human brotherhood. Therefore, I tell thee once again: Glory to trade and its greater deed in the service of humanity.”

To those of us who are used to more restrained politicians in Parliament, this likely appears somewhat exaggerated. Trade as “a *battering ram, obliterating every barrier put up by ignorant statesmen and ignorant customs*” seems extreme.

Witnessing the billions of people who have been lifted out of poverty in just a few decades and how globalisation has contributed in spreading new technology and knowledge to almost all parts of the world, as well as the spread of democracy and human rights – then Gripenstedt’s admiration does not seem as farfetched. Trade, i.e. commercial exchanges, has played a decisive part in this development. I am convinced that trade may contribute to values beyond economical values – to peace, human rights, freedom and openness. The basis for this contribution is two effects that I aim to develop further.

Primarily, trade indirectly contributes to a greater respect of human freedom and rights by contributing to an increased wealth. This wealth in turn enables people to struggle for increased freedom.

Secondly, trade has a more direct effect on democracy and human rights by spreading technology and ideas all over the world, increasing transparency in closed countries and creating meeting points for people who would otherwise never meet.

I want to emphasize that free trade and openness are no universal cure (regardless of Gripenstedt’s beliefs). Just as free trade in itself is no guarantee for economic development in countries that fail to cut through reforms needed to build competitive companies, it is, unfortunately, still possible to combine free trade with political oppression. It is, nevertheless, far more difficult for regimes in open countries to oppress their citizens. Once they have cut travel restrictions and trade barriers and opened up their countries to development, the transparency and contact channels that will open through trade make oppression increasingly difficult. ■

Boycott, sanction and isolation – does it work?

We don't mind having sanctions banning us from Europe.
- Robert Mugabe

I have some understanding for those who instinctively view boycotts and sanctions as the only reasonable way of dealing with certain countries, regimes and regions.

Does it really stand to reason that we should have any interaction whatsoever with countries where people are stoned to death, where ethnic minorities are being oppressed and where women are not allowed even the freedom to drive a car? Would it not be reasonable to cut all links to such countries? Is it not our duty to act?

A fundamental question for each and every person using that kind of reasoning is “Who would benefit from the sanctions and isolation?” Could it be that we are the ones who would feel good because we are “doing something”? Is it the oppressed or even the oppressor? These questions do not always have simple answers. Far too often, it is the exact people whom we want to punish that have the most to gain from the implementation of sanctions.

He, who is prepared to judge all citizens in a country as an entity, of course has the right to do so. Not at least as a consumer, you have the possibility to refrain from buying goods from a country that you do not wish to support. The core issue, though, is whether it contributes to the defined purpose or whether when you buy goods consciously by excluding the olive oil from one country and the grapes from another – it is at the expense of workers, entrepreneurs and other who have little to do with upholding targeted oppression.

The isolation of Gaza is one example of how forced isolation seems to counteract the set purpose. There was no lack of motives to deal with the Hamas regime when they took power in Gaza. Once an organization, which has been identified as terrorist by the EU and the US, captures such a power-

ful position, all means to counter violence and oppression must be taken into consideration. There was indeed justification for strong actions to restrict Hamas possibilities to access weapons and to prevent them from new acts of terror. Regardless of one's opinion on the matter, it strikes as evident that the strict isolation of Gaza – which has gone far beyond trying to undermine the Hamas and to restrict the weapons import – has failed in certain aspects, in the same way as boycotts and sanctions often do, when used as blunt and generally formed tools.

Karin Olofsdotter, PhD in Economics at the University of Lund has identified the problem in hitting the target using sanctions. Trade boycotts are not the optimal choice for anyone that cares about the population of the countries being boycotted. Such a measure could easily take on the opposite effect and play right into the hands of the regime. Domestic hostility towards outsiders is a likely outcome.

The risk is, thus, that a boycott is used by the rulers in a certain country or region to cover up their own mistake by blaming an outside enemy. Thus, isolation may very well be a conscious strategy used by oppressive regimes. Olofsdotter has mentioned Burma and North Korea as examples of countries that have chosen isolation since they fear that increased trade would bring with it openness and less controllable subjects.

South Africa is often mentioned as an example of successful sanctions. However, this is far from unambiguous. The sanctions on South Africa were never as severe as we sometimes believe in Sweden and no one can possibly claim that the political change came as rapidly as had been hoped for in Western Countries. Furthermore, it is far from certain that the sanctions forced democratization.

In a study, the Peterson Institute for International Economics argues that the sanctions may have sped up the process of democratization somewhat, although they "clearly did not cause the National Party to decide to abandon apartheid".

Comparing the development in South Africa with that of countries like Taiwan, Chile and South Korea, countries that are but a few decades from authoritarian regimes that oppressed the rights of the citizens – it is obvious that there are other far more effective ways of affecting countries than calling for sanctions and boycott.

In this regard, openness to trade and exchange appears to be an im-

portant tool. They contributed in creating transparency in the country, gave possibilities to influence the development and made it far easier for people in the countries to access new influences and ideas from the outside world. And maybe most importantly, it paved the way for a growing political middle class with the time and energy to call for political reforms. The development in these countries, had the West introduced extensive trade sanctions, would be unimaginable.

Sanctions could be justified in some situations, primarily in the shape of arms embargos and travel restrictions for key officials, and it goes without saying that Sweden honors sanctions decided on by the UN and the EU. However, as a tool to help accomplish political change, forced isolation is far from the sharpest tool in the shed. It is a weapon that causes collateral damage while it strengthens the position of those that make up the primary target. ■

Technology and progress – two-edged swords?

There are those who argue in favour of export control in order to make sure that oppressive regimes cannot access more effective technologies that could be used to enforce the oppression. This might seem reasonable, but I would once again like us to consider the possible consequences. Before elaborating, I want to stress that I do not believe that we should trade everything with everyone. Some lines are easier to draw than others. We should certainly not contribute to giving totalitarian regimes access to weapons of mass destruction. Thus, a restrictive and well functioning export control is crucial, and we must take part in the important international cooperation for disarmament and non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Nevertheless, it is far from simple to tell what is an appropriate product or service to sell to a certain country. It is important to remember that some products may be used in both negative and positive ways.

A cell phone system could be used by an oppressive regime to monitor and harass dissidents. However, it could also be used to spread information on events in the country internationally and to gather information and influences from other parts of the worlds. Champions for democracy in China have shown how improved means of communication – an area where Swedish companies have contributed – has improved their ability to act more efficiently. Correspondingly, improved communication also brings several products, which are neither good nor bad – neither moral nor immoral. ■

Less poverty = Less oppression

“[B]ack in 1776, our Founding Fathers believed that free trade was worth fighting for, and we can celebrate their victory. Because today, trade is at the core of the alliance that secures the peace and guarantees our freedom; it is the source of our prosperity and the path to an even brighter future.”

- Ronald Reagan, 1998

I started this report by noting that the most important argument in favour of free trade is that it strengthens our wealth as well as the wealth of others, and we need not divert far from that argument before realizing that there are greater profits to be made than the purely economical.

As poverty decreases and people are better off, their abilities to pose demands and to struggle for human rights increases. Someone who is forced to work from dusk until dawn while eating at most one proper meal a day, often lacks both the energy and the skills to fight for something other than survival. As trade contributes to economic growth and decreased poverty in a country, respect for human rights and the possibility of political reform increases as well. This effect is due to the emergence of a politically conscious middle class.

Örjan Sjöberg, professor in Economic History at the Stockholm School of Economics notes that “[Trade] may not lead directly to democracy [...] but it creates a far more room for people to make decisions in their daily lives. This is an important first step”. He claims that although leaders in totalitarian states could use trade to give themselves an advantage, the long-term effects tend to be that the current power structures are dissolved. [Trade] helps in tearing down those walls set up by dictators around their countries and citizens. In the 70’s and 80’s we witnessed that development in Eastern Europe.

Increased trade is not a universal cure for totalitarianism but in general, it has a positive effect. Other scholars have found that economic development in authoritarian countries that have opened up to trade and integrated into the world economy, in the long run tend to undermine their own powerful position.

Justin Yifu Lin and Jeffrey B. Nugent in a study from 1995 noted that:

[A] dictatorship or authoritarian regime may not be compatible with long term economic growth. The more successful such a state is in achieving economic development, the more likely it is that the state will face a legitimacy crisis. This is because both a financially independent middle class and the integration of the domestic economy with the world economy are at the same time both necessary conditions for, and natural effects of, economic success in the modern world. As a result, the democratic ideology of DCs [developed countries] may penetrate the middle class and undermine the legitimacy of the regime. These pressures may also force the state to cut its own power of intervention in order to make credible its commitment to such reforms. Thus, authoritarian states may gradually be transformed into democratic states, as seems to be happening in Korea, Taiwan and Chile.

Other scientists have reached similar conclusions, not the least those scientists who have studied historical data. He who scans the world could of course find states that have remained authoritarian also since they've opened up to the rest of the world. My experience nevertheless tells me that there is a clear link between economic development, trade and, if not democratic reforms, then at least a step in the right direction in the area of human rights and civil liberties.

The former American president George W. Bush made a similar observation when, in a speech in 2003, he called for support of the democratic tendencies in the Muslim world:

“Historians will note that in many nations, the advance of markets and free enterprise helped to create a middle class that was confident enough to demand their own rights. They will point to the role of technology in frustrating censorship and central control – and marvel at the power of instant communications to spread the truth, the news, and courage across borders.”

I believe Bush has a point. The combination of liberal markets, new ideas, an emerging middle class and new technology – that is a formula that could spread freedom all over the world. ■

Transparency and information

*Books won't stay banned. They won't burn. Ideas won't go to jail.
In the long run of history, the censor and the inquisitor have always lost.
The only weapon against bad ideas is better ideas.
- Alfred Whitney Griswold, 1959*

When entering my computer at the hotel room in Shanghai on April 30th this year, I faced the line:

"Kindly be advised that that some known websites such as Facebook, YouTube, Twitter and tw.yahoo are not accessible in Mainland China."

Naturally, I was aware of Chinas censorship before visiting the country for the inauguration of the Swedish pavilion at the World Exhibition Expo 2010 in Shanghai. As is commonly known, China is far from a democracy. It is a country where human rights are violated, an issue that has been brought up by the Swedish government at all our visits to China. Nevertheless, we need to acknowledge that China in many areas is moving in the right direction and has done so for the last few decades. I am fully convinced that the exchange with the rest of the world has been an important, if not crucial, factor.

China's impressive economic development can be traced back to the year 1979 when Deng Xiaoping initiated the reforms which brought China from being one of the world's most closed countries to the largest open economy in the entire world. Between the years 1965 and 1978, before the reform process, China's yearly growth measured a mere 2.6 per cent per capita. Between 1978 and 2005, China grew by an average of 9.7 percent per year. The country's average tariffs have decreased in the same period from 65 to 10 percent and has, in combination with other reforms, resulted in millions of people being lifted from poverty.

The development of wealth has a humanitarian value of its own. The fact that an increasing number of people have enough to eat every day, more children get to go to school and more people get access to medicines

and health care, better housing and more spare time are other examples of the positive development. Nevertheless, the development has also caused changes beyond material effects. The 350 million Chinese, more than in any other country, who are able to access the Internet is perhaps one of the most visible changes – and a change that has radically altered our possibilities to access information from China and the opportunity for the Chinese to access our ideas and thoughts.

The Globalisation, the technological development and the greater flows of trade and people can open up channels and contact areas, unimaginable to previous generation.

The communist regime can ban individual web pages, they can try to influence Google and other companies to direct the Internet usage and they can try using other methods to prevent people from accessing certain information. But their opportunity to completely control the citizens and the flow of information is, nevertheless, starting to slip away. In the long run it is not possible to control people who are separated from the world by a mere click. Information will slip into China and information will find its way out.

One example of this was the events in Tibet in 2008. Within hours, the world knew about the violations committed by the communist regime.

I am an optimist, although this does not stop me from recognizing that the development goes back and forth. Authoritarian regimes bear a tendency to try and hold on until the last minute. We have witnessed this as Egyptian bloggers have been put in jail after posting texts critical of their regime. We have seen it as the Iranian regime blocked cell phones at a protest for democracy. We have seen it in the shape of police brutality in the streets of Minsk. But at all these occasions, information has slipped past. We have witnessed the events. And we witnessed them rapidly. This is in itself a huge leap forward.

Today, thanks to the technological development, to globalization and to global trade, we have new possibilities to follow the development, also in the most isolated parts of the world. With a few exceptions – North Korea, Burma and some other states that try their best to prevent their citizens from accessing the development in the rest of the world and the rest of the world from accessing them – we have radically improved means to observe the development. With these changes our possibilities to act improve as well.

Those calling for boycotts and sanctions, whenever they note that

something awful has happened in a certain place, should at least stop and ask themselves.

Who would benefit, had we not had the transparency of today?

Who would benefit if our companies packed up and went home?

Who would benefit if the authoritarian regimes were able to commit even graver atrocities without us having eyes and ears to bear witness.

Not the oppressed people in the countries we speak of anyway. ■

Human Rights inc. – consumers in the service of good

In January 2010, several instances were reported of serious forced computer entry aimed at Google by hackers, supposedly hunting for notes stored on their servers by Chinese Human Rights activists. The suspicions soon hit the Chinese regime and Google threatened to stop all their activities in the country. This is remarkable, not in the least as it concerned a threat from a company that has, at least previously, aided the Chinese regime in their censorship based on limiting the search results for Chinese users.

This path taken by Google was a setback to many who believe in democracy and human rights and their sudden u-turn ignited some hope. After an intense media storm in which Google was accused of doing the bidding of the Chinese regime, the company threatened to leave China entirely after the hacker attacks – despite a growing market that already contains some 350 million users and that is expected to grow by 40 million annually as the 3G network is expanded.

The reason for Google's actions was likely that the company realized the threat to its own brand was too great. It is simply not commercially motivated to do just anything for anyone. The power that lies within the hands of the consumers, opinion makers and others in our globalized world sometimes exceeds what is commonly understood.

The positive force that lies within brand preservation concerns not only companies. Countries also have to cherish their national brands if they want to stand out in the international competition and benefit from the possibilities of globalization. In the long run, they cannot abstain from taking into account the international image of the country – at least not if they want to attract investments and increase exports.

For the Expo 2010 in Shanghai, the Chinese authorities for instance declared that they had lifted the entry ban on people with HIV. To some, this may appear a minor step, but it indicates that even authoritarian regimes bow to criticism. The Chinese interest in our Swedish work with Corporate Social

Responsibility is yet another example of an ambition to change things for a broader population – and for the better. Evidence indicates that one of the major reasons for the changes is that the Chinese realize that it would benefit their own competitiveness if they behave in a way that is acceptable to business partners and clients in other parts of the world. ■

Exporting democracy, sustainable development and human rights

“It is sports, culture and trade – the cooperation in the trade sector – that can open doors, closed to both diplomats and politicians. [...] I believe that if we want reasonable and good connections to Iran, we need to start with this way of including some of our customs and our thinking. That may open doors that will remain closed to politicians”

- Ingvar Kamprad, 2009

New ideas and new technologies are not the only ways for globalisation to channel the ideas of freedom and human rights to authoritarian regimes and oppressed people. When establishing in difficult markets, Swedish companies bring a good amount of Swedish thinking and values. Through the business culture, through key staff and in contact with clients and contractors, they show in their daily work that it is possible to do business and run industries while simultaneously taking on a responsibility for the environment, the employees and the local community.

In different parts of the world, I have witnessed how Swedish companies act as role models and inspire others to improve. This is done in many ways, from combating the spread of HIV in Africa to improving the indoor environment in clothing factories in China. Swedish companies act this way, not just because it is human or good, but because they realize that CSR (Corporate Social Responsibility) is a tool for competition. If you invest in education for the employees in a country where 20 percent are affected with HIV, but without making sure that they get an adequate treatment, then this is a bad investment. If you invest in a clothing factory without making sure that it keeps the high standards expected by aware clients in other countries, then you stand the chance that customers will abstain from your products once they find out the workers' conditions.

The British 19th century liberal Richard Cobden is famous for push-

ing through a groundbreaking treaty on free trade between Great Britain and France that paved the way for an extensive free trade period in the European History. Already 150 years ago he held a firm conviction in the ability of trade to spread the light of civilization around the world. In the pamphlet "Commerce is the Grand Panacea" from 1853, he discusses how those in favour of political reform and enlightenment in other parts of the world should embrace free trade.

"To those generous spirits we would urge, that, in the present day, commerce is the grand panacea, that, like a beneficent medical discovery, will serve to inoculate all the world's nations with the healthy and life-saving taste for civilisation. Not a bale of merchandise leaves our shores, but it bears the seeds of intelligence and fruitful thought to the members of some less enlightened community; not a merchant visits our seats of manufacturing industry, but he returns to his own country the missionary of freedom, peace and good government – whilst our steam boats, that now visit every port of Europe and our miraculous railroads that are the talk of all nations, are the advertisements and vouchers for the value of our enlightened institutions."

Just as our Swedish Gripenstedt, Cobden was indeed a true optimist, and it is easy to smile a little at the naïve certainty with which they both assumed trade would automatically spread compassion and justice around the world. But the basic thought remains valid and for those who cannot accept that it concerns "all the nations of the world" but rather most of the countries that are prepared to open their borders, there is hope for a positive development in their reasoning that can be supported even today.

The contacts made by Swedish companies all over the world – and the corresponding companies from other countries that invest in Sweden – spread good ideas and humane thoughts. Sure, this may seem like a small step, not in the least in countries that suffer from grave problems, but they are steps that move us forward. These are steps that, together with other steps, improve the conditions for moving in the right direction. ■

”Trading Tyranny for Freedom”

a study by the Cato Institute

I have met people whose life stories have convinced me that the value of trade reaches beyond its economic benefits. Some of these stories, I have brought up previously. I have been to meetings between people who most likely had not met, had it not been for the underlying business motive, but who have formed a friendship. I have experience an openness in complicated areas which, I am sure, had not been there had it not been for commercial needs. I have seen people reach for rights of which their parents weren’t even able to dream. It is possible because of a higher standard of living which has given them the chance to get an education and to set higher goals than just survival.

Is there, then, any evidence of a general correlation? Is there any proof that countries that open up to trade also open up to freedom?

John B Londregan and Keith T Poole have studied the correlation between trade and democracy. They have empirically shown that higher income also benefits democracy. In a study presented in World Politics 1996, they conclude that their results:

“[...] suggest a revaluation of policies designed to foster the replacement of authoritarian regimes by democratic ones through free trade.” Although, some studies have reached slightly different conclusions, their findings are supported by Daniel T Griswold from the American think tank Cato. In a study bearing the suitable name “Trading Tyranny for Freedom”, Griswold conducts two studies: the first measuring the degree of economic freedom and openness in several countries, the second measuring political rights and civil liberties. He concludes that there is a strong correlation between political rights and economic openness. The first study used by Griswold is the think tank Freedom House’s yearly report that ranks the degree of personal and political freedom in countries around the world. In this study, countries are divided into three categories: “free”, “partly free” and “not free”, based on indicators such as the possibility for citizens to influence the political process through general elections, the respect for free speech, the presence of well functioning institutions and respect for civil liberties.

The other study is the think tank Fraser Institutes' "Economic Freedom of the World" which measures taxes, trade barriers and economic regulation. When combining the data, the correlation between economic and political freedom is striking. Of the 25 most economically open countries, 21 are ranked as "free" by Freedom House, three are ranked "partly free" and only one is considered "not free". When studying the 25 least economically free, there is a similar pattern. Seven are "free", nine are found to be "not free" and another nine are considered "partly free".

It is thus three times as likely that the citizens of the most open and economically free countries enjoy political freedom and civil liberties whereas oppression and violations are nine times as common in the least open countries.

It should be mentioned that the Griswold study was published in 2004. It is possible that some countries have moved in a positive direction whereas other has moved in negative directions since the time of the study. Some of the new EU members are, for instance, likely to have moved towards a greater economic openness.

The general link between economic openness, democracy and human rights, on the other hand, has in essence remained the same. Intuitively, the general picture painted by Griswold appears reasonable.

It should be noted that there are countries that do not move with the general trade. Among the 25 countries that are the most open to trade, there are those who are "partly free" and one "not free" country – The United Emirates. Meanwhile, there are also countries who are politically free but who still belong to the group with the lowest degree of economic freedom such as Senegal, Barbados and Bahamas. ■

When choosing between freedom and oppression – what’s the vote?

Free trade is not based on utility but on justice.
- Edmund Burke

It appears easy for many politicians, from right to left, to defend free trade in general but regularly ignore it in crucial situations. It does not cost them anything to state that “trade is good and important” if it can be followed by, “but in the current situation, we need to protect industry X, at least for a few years” or “although we would like to sign a free trade treaty with Y, we cannot possibly sign until they have made the change Z”. I do not claim that there are no situations where we should abstain from signing a free trade agreement. Neither am I ruling out that there might be reasonable cause for sanctions or other kind of restrictions. Earlier I have mentioned the need for a restriction on weapons exports to prevent the production and spread of weapons of mass destruction. However, the conditions for trade are seldom so restrictive. Too often, politicians are far too keen on using easy arguments to stop free trade.

It might be that the politicians are not considering what is really at stake. They choose to ignore the greater political consequences of their actions. Wasting tax payers’ money may be easy to get away with but the question is whether it would be so simple for democratic leaders to forget their responsibilities if other, in many ways greater, values were at risk?

Previously mentioned Daniel T. Griswold argues that this would indeed be the case.

“[P]oliticians who consistently vote against more open markets at home and market-opening trade agreements with other nations need to realize the effects of their actions. They are, in effect, voting to keep millions of

people locked within the walls of tyranny – and millions more trapped in a partly free netherworld of half-rights, half-freedoms and half-democracy.”

It is possible that Griswold takes his reasoning too far, that he does not realize the complicated nature of these matters or that he cannot imagine the real life situations for those who suffer from foreign competition due to falling tariff barriers. This may be an argument, but it doesn't make Griswold's point less true.

Every time someone calls for a boycott or a sanction, these questions should be posed:

- How do you want to change the situation for the general population in that country?
- How do you want to help the oppressed population and the suffering people?

The answers to these questions are lacking far too often, even in the Swedish debate.

Thus, free trade and openness should be the primary measure taken. Blocking and isolation should be the last resort. ■

The Jarl Hjalmarson Foundation

was founded in 1994. The Foundation is promoting development and European co-operation/integration on the basis of freedom, democracy and market economy. This goal is achieved by activities such as lectures and seminars intended for political parties and organisations promoting the development of democracy.

All projects are primarily funded through the Swedish International Development Authority (Sida) as a part of the Swedish government's development aid. According to the government's guidelines this aid will: "facilitate the materialization of a well functioning party structure in countries of Central and Eastern Europe as well as in the developing world. With the further aim of, promoting democratic and representative governments in those countries."



The Jarl Hjalmarson Foundation
Box 2080
SE-10312 Stockholm
Phone +46-8-676 8000