

PRESIDENT MAGSAYSAY ACCEPTS FREEDOM AWARD

Text of recorded remarks by President Ramon Magsaysay of the Philippines.

I am deeply grateful to Freedom House for conferring upon my unworthy self the Freedom Award of 1956.

In accepting it with humility, I am impressed by two qualities that make it truly unique and distinguished among the international awards of our time.

First is Freedom House itself. I know of the high purposes of that organization, the high caliber of its membership and its splendid work for the cause of peace and freedom. I know of its efforts to strengthen freedom by militant free action and recognition of the labors of other free men. I know of its alert, courageous and successful drive to keep itself free from intervention of those who would misuse every worthwhile democratic movement for the advancement of the anti-democratic plot.

All these things, I believe, make Freedom House a most worthy judge of actions of free men everywhere in the world.

Second is the obvious magnitude of the names of those who have preceded my humble self in the list of Freedom House awardees. It is not false modesty, I believe, to hesitate to be named along with Churchill, the leader; Eisenhower, soldier and statesman; Marshall, diplomat and planner; Gainza Paz, the fighting newspaperman; Ridgeway, the soldier; Conant, the educator; and the men who fought for world liberty on the battlefields of Korea.

It is honor enough to be named among them. It is greater honor still to be named by them as their fellow honoree, for I am informed that it is the panel of surviving awardees which has chosen me for this distinction.

And, as if these circumstances were not enough to stress my unworthiness, I am further honored by being credited in the citation with leadership in this area against the forces of tyranny that beset it.

Whatever claim to leadership in that sphere may be credited to this country, it is not to be credited to my humble self. God has permitted that I should be chosen to lead, in these times, my people whose solid Christian fortitude does not allow their national conscience the luxury of compromise in the face of struggle between freedom and slavery.

We are repeatedly told of alleged advantages, political and economic, in pursuance of that middle course of compromise. But our people will not have it so. Our people have faith that God will not deny His protection and His bounty to those who prefer to follow without qualification the ways of godliness and true freedom. They have faith we can make our independence secure, healthy and progressive within the framework of democratic world cooperation and without accepting tempting offers of assistance from the world of tyranny.

What will bring about permanent defeat of tyranny is the success of democracy. That is our obsession in the Philippines today — to make our democracy work politically, economically, and in all the fields of human activity, so that our own people and, if you will, people around us, might never again heed attractions of godless faiths.

That, I think, is the leadership people in this area are looking for—leadership which only successful democracy can generate and sustain.

In making our democracy work, we look to all free countries for cooperation and sympathy. We look to the United States, the country in which Freedom House was born and is thriving, for continued support and understanding.

Help us with our democracy and you will be creating the only leadership that cannot fail—that of contented millions whose faith in God and freedom may no longer be shaken.

May Freedom House continue to work and inspire the world in accordance with its mission. The world needs more men who appreciate the difficulties of freedom and who are willing to work for its success.

Board of Trustees

WHITNEY NORTH SEYMOUR
Chairman of the Board

HERBERT BAYARD SWOPE
Chairman, Exec. Committee

HARRY D. GIDEONSE
President

RALPH J. BUNCHE
LEO CHERNE
GEORGE B. FORD
Vice-Presidents

REX STOUT
Treasurer

MRS. HENRY GALE
Assistant Treasurer

GEORGE FIELD
Executive Secretary

Herbert Agar
Lyman Bryson
Cass Canfield
Harry J. Carman
Norman Cousins
Christopher T. Emmet
Thomas K. Finletter
Arthur J. Goldsmith
Nathaniel L. Goldstein
Harold K. Guinzburg
Helen Hayes
Henry Townley Heald
Mrs. Elinore M. Herrick
Henry W. Hobson
Mrs. Andrew Jackson
Jacob K. Javits
J. M. Kaplan
Maxwell A. Kriendler
Chester J. LaRoche
David E. Lilienthal
Goodhue Livingston Jr.
Elsa Maxwell
Edgar Ansel Mowrer
Allan Nevins
Ferdinand Pecora
Elizabeth M. Riley
Francis E. Rivers
Mrs. Kermit Roosevelt
Elmo Roper
George N. Shuster
Nathaniel Singer
Spyros P. Skouras
Louis Stulberg
Channing H. Tobias
J. Waties Waring
W. W. Waymack
Robert M. Weitman
William L. White
Roy Wilkins

FREEDOM HOUSE



WILLKIE MEMORIAL BUILDING
20 WEST 40 STREET, NEW YORK 18, N. Y.
LONGACRE 5-3344

AN EDITORIAL . . . October 9, 1956

The New York Times
ESTABLISHED 1851 REG. U. S. PAT. OFF.
"All the News That's Fit to Print"

FRIENDS OF FREEDOM

Luis Muñoz Marín, governor of the new American democracy of Puerto Rico, and Ramón Magsaysay, president of the new Asiatic democracy of the Philippines, are among the world's most interesting and effective champions of freedom. They have fought to make democratic government for their own peoples a practical and meaningful thing, and both have earned the respect of free men everywhere.

These two leaders were appropriately honored by Freedom House Sunday night with its 1956 awards; and it is not surprising that the thoughtful response of both Governor Muñoz Marín and of Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo, who accepted the award for his President, should have been of unusual interest. These two spokesmen for democracy in lands that were not so long ago part of a great colonial empire both referred to the challenge of the century: the challenge to free people to sustain freedom and to help others gain and enjoy it.

By implication reminding his audience that free countries temporize with freedom at their peril, General Romulo expressed his concern that the rerouting of shipping around the Cape of Good Hope as a result of the Suez dispute might tend to make of the Union of South Africa a strategic "bastion" of the free

world. "Has anybody paused to wonder," he asked, "what the effects would be on relations between the Western peoples and the rest of the peoples of Africa" and Asia by thus strengthening ties with the race-supremacists of the Union? General Romulo didn't try to answer the question, but the problem he raised cannot be overlooked.

Governor Muñoz Marín posed the challenge in different terms. Noting "the threat to freedom" raised by the "extreme poverty prevailing among great masses of mankind," he urged the United States to offer help not in the spirit of "competitive bidding" against the Russians but as an expression of "faith in what our civilization means."

This means that we are being advised by a good friend that our foreign aid should not be given on condition that its recipients turn their society into our kind of society, for which they may neither have any desire nor any need. It means simply that our aid should be given to help them achieve their own kind of freedom. Freedom is incompatible with lack of freedom, and therefore it is incompatible with the Soviet system. If our aid were offered on the broad philosophical base that Governor Muñoz Marín suggests, we would be making friends for freedom and at the same time constricting a growing Soviet influence throughout the uncommitted world.

GOVERNOR MUÑOZ ACCEPTS FREEDOM HOUSE AWARD

Address by Governor Luis Muñoz Marín of Puerto Rico at Fifteenth Anniversary dinner.

Of all the varied honors that can come to a man these days, I know of none that would be more precious to Puerto Ricans than that one of their number should receive an award in the name of freedom. For the award to be given to me as a freely elected official of Puerto Rico is particularly meaningful to my people, I am sure, because more than any personal recognition it is a tribute to the love of freedom that all Puerto Ricans have. I need hardly say how grateful I am personally.

The people of Puerto Rico are in a dynamic moment of their history. They have looked at freedom afresh and so they are developing a new form of political freedom in an association of common citizenship with the United States.

We have redefined the concept of freedom—the whole of it. To us the house of freedom is the residence of the good life. The good life may be lived in different ways in different places. The architects of freedom must be ready with different designs in constructing the house of freedom for different peoples.

Freedom is not so much threatened by nuclear weapons any longer. They are developing a coexistence of their own. The real threat to freedom—a still more explosive threat than atomic fission—is the extreme poverty prevailing among great masses of mankind. With the hope or hopelessness of some two billion impoverished people lies the challenge to our liberty in the West and in the world. It is at the same time a challenge to action—action, not by military strength, but by ideas and ingenuity and dedicated energies.

Military strength there must be, to be sure, and enough of it, but the real job to be done is of the heart, not of the trigger.

They say the United States has never entered a war properly prepared. There never was a war for which the United States was so eminently prepared as this war against want that looms before us.

The two Eastern empires, implementing their tradition of despotism with modern techniques, are shifting their strategy from the total war because it is obvious to them that means impartial total annihilation of both sides. Instead they now bring to the poverty-stricken peoples the helping-hand that can so easily become the closed fist. We should not rely on the

belief that the material help they offer will always turn out to be meager, illusory, deceitful. If the two Eastern empires believe that their new method is effective for their purpose of getting two thousand million people on their side, their own people will be made to shoulder in privations whatever the cost of the strategy turns out to be. There is a significant chance that underdeveloped areas will get real aid from the Soviet in their fight against poverty.

It is time we pause to take stock of the nature of this new contest with the greatest stakes in human happiness the world has ever known. Is it to be simply a competition in the puissant arts of the investment, the loan and the handout? It certainly should not be, or even look like, a global seduction with their side offering money in exchange for the sacrifice of freedom and our side offering money in exchange for the adoption of capitalism. It should not be a match between two salesmen. The other salesman would have the advantage. He is offering the underdeveloped areas the progress they want in return for merely the submission to which they have been accustomed for centuries. It is a tempting offer because hardly have they had time to familiarize themselves with freedom, even though most of them now have free national governments. They are being offered material improvement, a surcease from want, in return for giving up the hope of a shadowy thing that for ages they did without.

Are we to compete on these terms? If so, what are we offering? Freedom, of which the experience of the peoples concerned has been limited? Capitalism, which rightly and wrongly they mistrust?

No, let's not undertake the new task as a sales campaign. Let there be the death of at least one salesman in this contest. Let the West apply itself to its great creative job as an adventure of the spirit, in a steady course of action motivated by the understanding that, somehow, beyond legalism and nationalism, the two billion men, women and children of whom we are talking in Asia, Africa and Latin America, are our fellow-citizens—again, not legalistically, but in a deep human sense. It is as such that we must aid them to aid themselves in a vigorous emergence out of extreme poverty. And let us do this because we have faith in what our civilization means, and therefore, faith that the basic dignity of all peoples will express itself, if given a real chance, in terms of freedom.

What I have described is no more nor

less than what has transpired in the relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico. That relationship includes a bond legalistically defined, to be sure, but the real basis of it is a human solidarity that can bind any two lands, great or small.

My invitation to you is that you summon your strength and your will, your feeling for the value of human dignity and freedom, that you renew your creative sense of history, and make a real offer of your own to these two billion people, not in the spirit of competitive bidding, but as you would to your own fellow-citizens, as you have done to your own fellow-citizens of Puerto Rico. I do not mean showing a few examples of technological progress and saying, "these come from a civilization in which freedom plays an important part." The Soviet can show very good technological progress that has occurred under quite different conditions.

I greatly admire the Technical Assistance Program. My Commonwealth is poor, but my people take pride in contributing their own money toward the support of this program of the United States. Yet Western freedom today depends on prompt recognition of a sometimes unpopular fact — the Technical Assistance Program and some billion and a half in other forms of non-military aid are simply not enough in the face of the emerging Soviet policy of making gifts with a hidden red string attached.

As we embark on this new adventure, let us remember that the substance of freedom lies in concepts of equality, of human dignity, of free choice, not in any particular form of thinking, or dealing or living. Let us avoid a confusion that has sometimes stirred mistrust against the West. We know that a free enterprise system is impossible without freedom. But we should not assume from that that freedom is impossible without a free enterprise system. Capitalism is a dynamic social tool for the West. But freedom for those needing help is the right to accept capitalism or reject it, or compromise with it. The only thing freedom is not free to reject is freedom itself. Let us not evangelize our fellow humans in this great adventure with concepts that they may judge to be less than evangelical.

With the right kind of help, wisely given, the impoverished peoples of the world will develop tremendous unused energies. I am speaking for a people that did. They will seek out their naturally gifted sons and daughters, as we do in Puerto Rico, and give them practically

unlimited educational opportunities. They will develop groups of young people who will show extraordinary enterprise in converting inert natural resources into national wealth, who will be dedicated to their communities' progress, who will endeavor to endow all this with a meaning and a serenity, perhaps by reaching deep into their ancient philosophies. These people will discipline themselves, instead of having to be disciplined by others. It is so happening in my own Puerto Rico.

When these young people dig into the great stock of innovations of the Twentieth Century, we should not expect them to come out every time with those we prefer. Every innovation has to be grappled with indigenously. They may prefer, for example, to form cooperatives instead of companies. They may prefer village community work, administered by the people themselves, to government-directed work. We must respect them, even when they do not imitate us. Perhaps they deserve even more respect from an enterprising people for having the creative courage not to imitate, side by side with a non-nationalistic eagerness to learn freely all that there is to be learned from whatever source. The great and only question is whether the product of their hands and minds goes to increase human freedom and human happiness.

My invitation then is that you give these two billion people, not just the fullest economic support, but a spiritual welcome into the realm of freedom; that you say to them: "We are ready for a long pull with you for a generation in a great common effort of fellow men, of fellow dwellers in the house of freedom. We will not ask you to pledge yourselves to us in any way. What we do we will do because we have faith that a world of men struggling toward freedom, no matter how wide the differences of opinion, will be a better world for all of us, certainly far better than a world of men who would no longer be free to even dream of freedom. We will do this because we have faith in the fellowship and dignity of all men and are willing to back that faith with our brains, our muscle and our substance."

If you speak thus, you will not be alone. Just as I know that my own people would want to participate in this great adventure of the spirit, would want to contribute greatly of their small substance and freely of themselves, just as confidently, I can promise you that as other underprivileged peoples raise themselves to freedom in that full meaning we have come to give it, they too will join in what can become the greatest crusade the world has ever known.

GENERAL ROMULO ISSUES A TIMELY WARNING

Address by Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo upon receiving the Freedom House Award in behalf of President Ramon Magsaysay of the Philippines.

It is a great pleasure to accept this award in behalf of President Magsaysay. He has asked me to thank you, not only in his name, but in the name of all our countrymen who are toiling with him at the great task of making freedom meaningful.

In our country, the Philippines, as in so many parts of the world—including, I might say, the United States—this task often resembles the labors of Sisyphus. It taxes all the stamina we have, it calls for immeasurable devotion and infinite perseverance. These are qualities often outweighed by human frailty. We count ourselves fortunate in my country that we have a leader in President Magsaysay who possesses them in extraordinary degree and who makes it impossible for others to lie down on the job, quite simply by being the one who never lets up himself and who sees in every failure only the need for a new beginning.

These tasks are great enough in our single small country of the Philippines; but how much greater they become still when we see them in their true perspective. In considerable parts of the world, the problem is not even yet how to use freedom, but to win it. And to win and use freedom meaningfully has become for every people in the world the great historic challenge of our century.

The task of—to quote from your citation—"demonstrating the advantages of the democratic way of life" is not merely a task to be faced in newly-emergent countries only beginning to establish their own institutions; it is still a major challenge for those who think of themselves as democratic by tradition and by long history. The President of the Philippines may have to face this need—again quoting from your citation—"in an area of the world sorely beset by the forces of dictatorship." The President of the United States, whoever may happen to occupy that exalted post, has to face it in areas in his own country sorely beset by the forces of neanderthalic racism and ignorance. This, too, is part of the struggle for a democratic way of life—I have to ask you to note carefully that I added that important syllable—"ic"—I can't afford to jeopardize my diplomatic—or should I say diplomat?—status.

For the United States, moreover, these issues rise as crucial issues not only at

home but all over the globe—and I assure you that we do not envy you the burdens of your greatness! It would be staggering enough a task to help win, defend, and use freedom meaningfully even if the world were embarking upon it with a clean slate. But we are dogged by the past, and by its survivals into the present. We have to bear the sins, unto the fourth generation and beyond.

There is a remorselessness about this that gives one pause and makes one wonder if there isn't some great master of irony out in the beyond, watching with an amused smile as we struggle in the coils of our own making. I am sure that when the agreement was signed that assured foreign control of the Suez Canal until 1968, that date seemed almost as far away as infinity itself, far enough away to leave ample time in between to meet any problems of renewal that might arise. But the years and the circumstances have now overtaken the heirs of the signers who no longer enjoy all the freedom of choice their fathers had. So the mortally grave issue of war or peace has to hang for a while over the common efforts made to find some kind of way out of the difficulty.

But not even this is enough. Answers to one crisis can turn out to be the makers of another. I discuss this certainly not to express any official policy or position on this difficult issue (my Government has not given me any instructions on the matter)—but merely to point a moral, expressive only of my personal opinion—and to suggest how powerfully the issues force themselves upon us whether we like it or not. In all discussion of meeting the Suez problem by turning to the alternate route around the Cape of Good Hope, I have heard no one as yet raise some of the new issues this so clearly foreshadows.

Capetown would become one of the crucial ports of the world. Financial and military-strategic investments in Western relations with the Union of South Africa would acquire new dimensions and new importance. The Union would become a bastion of what people like to think of as the "free world." What then?

Has anybody paused to wonder what the effects will be on relations between the Western peoples and the rest of the peoples of Africa? I do not, surely for this audience, have to characterize the place and nature of the "way of life" of the South African Union, or to point out its great symbolic weight in the minds of the peoples of Asia.