Support for democracy is one of the cardinal points of U.S. foreign policy in the Caribbean and in Latin America as a whole. This publication—based on oral and written testimony by Ambassador Langhorne A. Motley, Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs, before the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on July 31, 1984—discusses the status of democratic politics in the region. It concludes that democracy is proving to be a practical path to stability as well as to freedom. This conclusion, with the data that support it, parallels the finding of the National Bipartisan Commission on Central America that recent events have "destroyed the argument of the old dictators that a strong hand is essential to avoid anarchy and communism, and that order and progress can only be achieved through authoritarianism."

**THE BEST MEASURE OF FREEDOM**

Since November 1980, when the United States last went to the polls to elect a president, our southern neighbors have cast some 150 million votes in 33 elections in 24 countries. That is more votes in more elections in more countries than in any previous 4 years in the history of Latin America and the Caribbean.

In Latin America, voter participation has increased, sometimes dramatically. In fact, recent turnouts, in

---

### Selected Latin American Elections in a 20-Year Perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type*</th>
<th>Total Vote (thousands)</th>
<th>Adult Population Voting** (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>P, L</td>
<td>15,180</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>P, L</td>
<td>9,326</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>48,440</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>14,747</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>6,816</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2,834</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>P, L</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>P, L</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>2,024</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>P, L</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>1,856</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>P, L</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>P, L</td>
<td>22,523</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>P, L</td>
<td>9,422</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>4,030</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>P, L</td>
<td>6,741</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>P, L</td>
<td>3,126</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P = Presidential, L = Legislative, CA = Constituent Assembly.
**Estimates based on votes cast as a percentage of total population age 20 or over as reported in the United Nations Demographic Yearbook for the year in question.
some cases, have doubled those of 20 years ago in relative as well as absolute terms.

- More than 15 million Argentine voters went to the polls last fall. In the hotly contested election that ended nearly a decade of military rule, 9 out of every 10 adults voted. Raul Alfonsin became president with the largest vote in Argentine history, exceeding even Juan Peron's highest tally.
- In Brazil's 1982 congressional and municipal elections, 48.4 million Brazilians voted. This was more than three times the 14.8 million who voted in the 1962 legislative elections; the percentage of adults voting rose from 45% in 1962 to 81% in 1982.
- In May of this year, an absolute majority of all adult Salvadorans, some 1.5 million men and women, defied guerrilla violence to choose between Napoleon Duarte and Roberto D'Aubuisson. In the 1962 presidential elections, only 400,000 voters, roughly one-third of adult Salvadorans, had participated in an election dominated by an official military candidate.
- Two Constituent Assembly elections in Guatemala 20 years apart reveal a similar evolution: in May 1964, 337,000 votes were cast, 40% of those registered; in July 1984, the voters numbered 1,856,000, or 73% of those registered.

What lies behind this region-wide upsurge in democratic politics? Long-term development—including the revolutions in communications and expectations—is clearly, if slowly, making itself felt. A more immediate factor—one that has impressed many observers at recent elections—is voter desire to repudiate both dictators and guerrillas. To most Latin Americans, the uncertainties of democracy are preferable to the violence and abuse of leftist and rightist extremes.

The force of the democratic tide and the rejection of extremism can also be seen in what has not happened. Not a single country that was democratic 4 years ago has lost its freedom. The military coups predicted for El Salvador and Honduras did not take place. Bolivian democracy has not fallen. Not one guerrilla movement has taken power since 1979, when the Sandinistas replaced Somoza and abandoned their promises to hold free elections. And to
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Castro's frustration and surprise, Grenada's Marxist-Leninist dictators did not prove immune to their own abuses of power and were replaced by constitutional authorities committed to holding free elections by the end of 1984.

Elections by themselves cannot remake society or solve every problem. But competitive elections are, as Secretary Shultz has noted, "a practical yardstick of democracy. They are an inescapable test of public accountability." It is, therefore, U.S. policy to support free elections without reservation, seeing in them assurances that human rights will be protected, that reconciliation will reflect the work of people and not of guns, and that U.S. aid and cooperation will have firm local foundations.

The English-speaking Caribbean, Costa Rica, Colombia, and Venezuela are solidly based democracies of long standing. Over the last 5 years, elected civilian presidents have replaced military rulers in Argentina, Bolivia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Panama, and Peru. Additional countries as different as Brazil and Uruguay, Guatemala and Grenada are now also moving toward greater democracy.

The result is that more than 90% of the people of Latin America and the Caribbean are now living in countries with governments that are either democratic or heading there. For a part of the world often identified with dictatorship, this is something to cheer about.

As recently as 1979, two-thirds of our neighbors lived under military or military-dominated governments of both left and right. Any shift so striking invites skepticism. But measured in voter participation and in competition at the polling booth, today's democratic resurgence is astonishingly deep.

Our neighbors deserve the credit for the progress they are making. We can, in turn, be proud that we are cooperating with them. Freedom is not a zero-sum game. Everyone wins when democracy is strengthened.

**THREATS TO DEMOCRACY**

Despite this extraordinary pattern of progress, democracy in Latin America still faces many problems. Competitive elections can help measure success or failure in dealing with particular problems; the problems themselves do not automatically disappear at the ballot box, regardless of who wins. Democracy requires elections; but elections alone are not enough.

Democracies must establish a track record as problem-solving mechanisms. If democratic institutions cannot solve problems, they cannot survive. If we are interested in the survival of democracy, we must help democratic governments deal with their problems—even though it is they, not we, who must solve them.

Internal problems include unequal access to education, justice, and employment; the clash of indigenous and immigrant cultures; great disparities in wealth; government inefficiency and corruption; civilian caudillismo and military intervention. These problems do not, of course, all exist in every country. But they do persist in varying degrees in the region as a whole.

External problems include increased costs for imported oil; the decline in the global economy accompanied by reductions in export earnings and forced reliance on increasingly expensive borrowed capital; and active efforts by hostile powers outside the hemisphere to exploit local grievances and economic hardship. Again, the mix can vary greatly from country to country, but these external pressures are felt throughout the hemisphere.

**The Military and Democracy**

Essential to the survival of democracy is an apolitical military establishment—one which seeks not to defend one partisan interest or another but rather one committed to institutional democratic government. Significantly, the recent history of hemispheric democratic advance has been that of a transformation in which the military itself has taken an active part.

An example of this difficult process is today's El Salvador, which owes its agrarian reform to military support. After decades as defenders of the status quo, since 1979 El Salvador's security forces have made considerable progress toward improved field performance, greater respect for human rights, and an apolitical role in society.

Training and organizational changes are largely responsible. Merit promotion has been implemented. President Duarte has appointed a Vice Minister of Defense responsible for the three police forces, as well as new, able commanders to head each. Officers associated with human rights abuses have been removed and a unit suspected of human rights abuse disbanded.

This increased professionalism was reflected in the performance of the armed forces during this year's presidential elections and inauguration. The Salvadoran military, once considered an impediment to the establishment of political democracy, is today defending the future rather than the past.

These problems combine to create two immediate threats to democracy in Latin America today: political extremism and economic recession. To them must be added the growing international trade in illicit drugs, which degrades the rule of law as well as human dignity.

**Political Extremism.** The enemies of democracy often point to under-development and economic hardship to justify violence and dictatorship. The problem with their argument is that neither left nor right extremes are stable or productive.

Marxist-Leninist regimes have tended to perpetuate both the political and the economic backwardness out of which they grew. When feuding Marxist-Leninists plunged Grenada into murderous disorder, the United States, Barbados, Jamaica, and Grenada's eastern Caribbean neighbors came to the rescue. The result was restoration of legal order. This was a major defeat for the extremists and their Cuban and Soviet supporters, who nonetheless still support totalitarianism in Nicaragua and oppose the consolidation of democracy in El Salvador.

Like leftwing extremism, extremism of the right is weakened by economic development. Unlike leftwing extremism, it has few reliable external
A Precedent for 1984?

In 1972-74, Anastasio Somoza stepped aside from the presidency of Nicaragua, continuing as commander of the National Guard, and, after the 1972 earthquake, as President of the National Emergency Committee.

In 1974, disregarding the advice of friends who thought the time had come for the family to withdraw from active politics, Somoza decided to become president again. To do so, he had the Constitution amended and barred 9 out of 10 opposition parties from the presidential election. Nicaragua’s Roman Catholic bishops warned in a pastoral letter that these electoral manipulations amounted to “legal war.”

Under those conditions, Somoza received a smashing 96% of the vote: 216,158 votes to 11,997 for Edmundo Paguaga Irias of the Conservative Party. But the victory was Pyrrhic. Many Nicaraguans, including former close associates of Somoza, became convinced a democratic end to the Somoza dynasty had become impossible.

Economic Recession. During the last 8-10 years, economic mismanagement and pressures for reform contributed to the decline of several unrepresentative regimes. Yet if democratic governments cannot produce economic recovery, then they, too, can lose their mandate. Today, many democracies need to restructure their economies at a time when living standards have already declined.

The countries of Latin America and the Caribbean constitute the developing world’s most indebted region. External debt exceeded $330 billion at the end of 1983. In 1982 and 1983, interest payments alone added up to more than $40 billion per year. These payments were equivalent to more than 35% of the value of the region’s exports of goods and services—the world’s highest debt service ratio. In some individual countries the ratio exceeded 100% before debt rescheduling.

The region’s real per capita gross domestic product (GDP) has dropped by over 10% from its 1980 level (by far more in some countries), and there is little doubt that per capita real economic growth will again be negative in 1984. In nearly all countries, unemployment and underemployment are at levels not seen since the Great Depression.

It hardly needs to be pointed out how dangerous such conditions are to any government that has to face elections.

The Drug Trade. I illicit narcotics trafficking and consumption also threaten democratic development by fostering disregard for the law and corrupting institutions as well as individuals. In some remote valleys, the lure of extraordinary profits and the absence of productive alternatives have broken down social and political order; lawlessness prevails and drug kings hold sway, sometimes in symbiosis with guerrillas.

In the past, many Latin Americans considered illicit drugs a “U.S. problem.” Some even welcomed the increased employment and foreign exchange earnings brought by the drug trade. Today, they are increasingly aware of the enormous threat narcotics pose to the moral fiber of their own societies and to the legitimacy of their own political institutions. Democracy requires a collective victory over the traffickers and their allies.

U.S. POLICY IS TO SUPPORT DEMOCRACY

It is U.S. Government policy to support democracy and democratic institutions. This approach is neither interventionist nor a mindless export of ideology. It is legitimate, it is in our enlightened self-interest, and it works—not overnight or in 6-month increments but over time.

- Democracy is the best guarantor of human rights. A government responsible to its people cannot abuse them with impunity.
- Democracy is also the best long-term guarantor of stability. Democratic governments do not drive their people into armed opposition nor do they threaten or attack their neighbors.

American officials from the President on down have made clear our unequivocal support for democratic processes. During his trip to Latin America in 1982, President Reagan insisted that:

The future challenges our imagination, but the roots of law and democracy and our inter-American system provide the answers. . . . Together, we will work toward the economic growth and opportunity that can only be achieved by free men and women. We will promote the democracy that is the foundation of our freedom and stand together to assure the security of our peoples, their governments, and our way of life.

Support for democracy can mean everything from a public embrace for a new president of Argentina to sending qualified election observers requested by a government in Central America. It can mean encouragement of political dialogue and communication, technical exchange programs, specialized conferences, and even analytical publications. It can mean support for a strengthened administration of justice. During the last 4 years, it has meant all of these things—and more. We encouraged the open and competitive elections that took place in Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala. We urged the Sandinistas to honor the democratic promises they have abandoned and betrayed. We welcomed the return to democratic rule in Argentina. We made clear that we would favor a restoration of democracy in Chile and Uruguay. We showed our support for democratic legitimacy when President Siles was kidnapped in Bolivia. We let the Government of Paraguay know we were unhappy with the closing of the independent newspaper ABC Color. We let the Government of Haiti know of our concern at the arrest and mistreatment of opposition leaders.

In country after country in Latin America and the Caribbean, U.S. Embassies are today correctly perceived as supporting democracy. Local officials and citizens recognize in growing numbers that our representatives are patiently fostering democratic dialogue, constitutional procedures, and respect for political diversity.

We also have recognized that government officials are not alone in having a role to play in promoting
democratic values and traditions. Private citizens are ultimately the backbone of democracy, and we have attempted to catalyze broader private cooperation. The West German political foundations, the political internationals, our own American Institute for Free Labor Development, and many individual leaders have long proven that political cooperation among like-minded people and groups gets results.

The democratic tide has made it easier to build on these experiences. We have strengthened the ability of the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) to sponsor private exchanges. The National Endowment for Democracy and its constituent institutes are strengthening our national capacity to develop mutual support networks among democratic leaders and parties throughout the world.

The new Center for Electoral Advice and Promotion in San Jose, Costa Rica, is an example of how a regional institution can help nations translate democratic theory into the nuts, bolts, and ballot boxes of an open political system.

Democratic countries have a particular obligation to reach out and assist each other and those on the path to democracy. If they do not, they leave the field to those who are opposed to democracy. As President Eisenhower said on return from his 1960 South American trip:

...all nations—large or small, powerful or weak—should assume some responsibility for the advancement of humankind.... Cooperation among free nations is the key to common progress.

Citizens: the Backbone of Democracy

U.S. Government contributions to the National Endowment for Democracy support private sector initiatives to encourage free and democratic institutions throughout the world. These initiatives involve U.S. business and labor as well as political parties. They include cooperation and organizational activities that promote the pluralism, individual freedoms, and internationally recognized human rights essential to the functioning of democratic institutions.

Costa Rica's Constitution

After the short 1948 civil war, a coalition of Costa Ricans looked at their own and their neighbors' political experiences and set out to create a legal framework to prevent abuses and assure a democratic future for the country. The document they wrote has been religiously followed since. Among other things, the Constitution of 1949:

- Permanently eliminated the army (not as an expression of “neutralism”—the civil war resulted partly in the explicit choice of democracy over communism—but to end any institutionalized military threat to elected civilian government);
- Created an independent Supreme Electoral Tribunal,” a fourth branch of government co-equal with the traditional three and with remarkably independent powers designed to assure scrupulously clean elections;
- Elaborated a complex system of checks, balances, and independent financing aimed at preventing undue concentration of power anywhere in the government; and
- Prohibited presidential reelection (not only of the incumbent, but of anyone in his/her cabinet or immediate family).

Economic Growth and Adjustment

With economic recession challenging social and political stability in several hemisphere countries, economic adjustment is not a matter of choice but of necessity. If economies are to grow, they must do so in accordance with market forces, not in opposition to them. Stable and equitable growth in the future requires economic adjustment now.

We in the United States have learned that lesson ourselves. The decisions we took to foster the resurgence of the American economy were not easy. Costs were incurred. At the height of the adjustment process, unemployment reached painfully high levels and industrial production declined markedly. But we are now reaping the benefits of the hard decisions we made earlier. Industrial production is expanding. Inflation is down and personal income is up. And in the past two quarters, our gross national product (GNP) grew much faster than anticipated.

Direct parallels cannot be drawn between the situation in the heavily indebted developing countries of Latin America and the United States. But there is a lesson to be learned from our experience. It is clear that to achieve sustained noninflationary growth countries must develop policies that reflect economic realities and release the productive forces of their people.

Governments often face agonizing choices in the political management of adjustment. They must distribute the burdens of that adjustment. And they often must decide between taking hard measures at once or trying to postpone economic shocks—with the risk that those shocks will be more severe and violent later on. These are real dilemmas for which there is no simple or universal answer.

Democratic governments, with broad popular participation and support, are especially well positioned to deal with these tough decisions. As Costa Rican President Luis Alberto Monge told the International Labor Organization in Geneva on June 12, 1984:

We have drawn back from the gulf [by adopting] some very bitter and harsh decisions in order to improve a sick economy.... Democracy works as a means of settling the problems of production and to win battles in the struggle against under-development and poverty.

We are acutely aware of the scope and seriousness of the economic problems confronting the hemisphere. We are concerned, and we are helping.

The United States and the other industrialized countries will continue to respond constructively to external debt and other economic problems. It would be a disservice to all nations to weaken the very international instruments that can help troubled economies adapt to new economic realities. But it would be
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Thomas Jefferson wrote that “it is rare that the public sentiment decides immorally or unwisely, and the individual who differs from it ought to distrust and examine well his own opinion.” Scientific polling is a modern reflection of that sentiment—a common practice in democratic states, including in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Several dozen respected public opinion firms, from Mexico to Argentina, engage in a wide range of political polling, from in-depth inquiries into citizen concerns to candidate popularity polls. Some are associated with well-known companies like Gallup, and internationally accepted survey methods are the rule.

Individual companies have demonstrated the validity and usefulness of polling even in disturbed areas. In Central America, for example, pollsters have elicited public attitudes on such diverse themes as regional peace talks, the impact of U.S. policies, and the effects of economic adjustment.
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Foreign direct investment is, therefore, likely to grow in importance as an engine of development in Latin America. Direct investment, particularly new equity capital, offers the recipient country many advantages over external debt.

- Equity investment is cheaper to service, especially in hard times. Although interest must be paid regardless, profits are remitted only when they are earned.
- Equity brings with it technology, jobs, and management skills that are hard to acquire in other ways.
- Direct investment encourages integration into the world system, fostering a more open trading system where protectionist pressures can be resisted more readily.

The United States is the source of nearly 60% of all foreign direct investment in Latin America and the Caribbean. Investment flows respond to economic conditions and to fiscal, trade, and exchange-rate policies in the recipient countries. Nations that choose to create an attractive climate for foreign investors can expect to attract an increased portion of the available funds. They will thus reduce their dependence on debt for growth. We encourage this.

But we recognize that the debtor countries alone, even with wise policies, cannot surmount the current crisis. Our assistance is necessary—and we will continue to provide it. The cooperation of other lending countries is vital—and it has been forthcoming. The international financial institutions have an essential role to play—and they are playing it. With this support, we believe the responsible and democratic governments of the hemisphere can meet the economic challenges that confront them.

Security
The export of violence by Cuba and Nicaragua with Soviet backing is the principal external security threat to democracy in the hemisphere. U.S. security assistance and training are essential to help our neighbors defend themselves against this threat. As a demonstration of our resolve and to improve the capability of our own and regional forces, we continue to conduct joint exercises and maneuvers in the area.

At the same time, our diplomats are working actively to contain the threat posed by Nicaragua's military ties to Cuba and the Soviet bloc, its subversive activities, militarization, and internal repression. We believe the Contadora process provides the means to negotiate a comprehensive, verifiable, and durable regional solution.

The leaders of the Caribbean understand well the vital importance of collective effort. Pioneers of economic and political cooperation in CARICOM, they helped inspire the Caribbean Basin Initiative to broaden that cooperation to include both Central America and the industrialized world. Similarly, faced with what one Caribbean leader called "an ideology of violence whose aim is to undo democracy," the democracies of the eastern Caribbean, in particular, and the Caribbean as a whole did not vacillate in cooperating to restore order in Grenada in 1983.

Defense against the illicit narcotics trade entails cooperation of a similar kind among those in the region who recognize the threat and seek our active help—primarily in helping to fund what is, after all, a war against a well-armed and ruthless enemy.

AN END TO INDIFFERENCE?
Although its mandate was confined to Central America, the National Bipartisan Commission on Central America could not avoid a broader conclusion in its report to the President:

Powerful forces are on the march in nearly every country of the hemisphere, testing how nations shall be organized and by what process authority shall be established and legitimized. Who shall govern and under what forms are the central issues in the process of change now under way in country after country throughout Latin America and the Caribbean.

The United States is powerful enough to make a difference in favor of democracy. But successive U.S. Administrations and Congresses, Republicans and Democrats, have learned that our own democratic example and national power are not enough to make a decisive difference in the face of indifference abroad.

The important thing—the key to understanding how the United States should be conducting itself in this hemisphere—is that today indifference toward democracy is disappearing in Latin America and the Caribbean. Recent experience demonstrates this remarkable truth—in Central America, in the Andean countries, in Brazil, in the Caribbean, and in the Southern Cone. The voting statistics, the personal testimony of election observers, the palpable solidarity felt by anyone who has attended a Latin or Caribbean inauguration over the last 5 years—all evidence the growing sense of participation in national political life.

In international political cooperation today, the Contadora process is a critical experiment. It says a great deal about the invigorated power of the democratic idea that this group of countries has
reached the “revolutionary” conclusion that democracy is absolutely essential for peace and development in Central America (see above).

Are these—and the more specific benchmarks elaborated within the process since then—not standards which we can all support? Don’t they reveal both an understanding of democracy and a rejection of indifference?

Can there be any question of the results of any comparative application of these same benchmarks to the two Central American countries most often in the news: El Salvador and Nicaragua? Whose election experience or plans meet the standard? In which country is there “free access”? In which country are there “fair and regular elections”? Which country is promoting “national reconciliation efforts” on the basis of “fostering participation in democratic processes”? The answer in each case is El Salvador.

Those inclined to answer differently might ponder what Peruvian novelist Mario Vargas Llosa wrote in 1983:

> When an American or European intellectual—or liberal newspaper or institution—advocates for Latin American countries political options and methods he would never countenance in his own society, he is betraying a fundamental doubt about the capacity of the Latin American countries to achieve the liberty and the respect for the rights of others that prevail in the Western democracies. In most cases, the problem is an unconscious prejudice, an inchoate sentiment, a sort of visceral racism, which these persons—who generally have unimpeachable liberal and democratic credentials—would sharply disavow if they were suddenly made aware of it.

Vargas Llosa is right. Too many of us have not looked at what is happening in Latin America closely enough to get beyond the stereotypes.

It is time to bury the canard that Latin Americans are “incapable of democracy.” The United States cannot afford ignorance, indifference, or inaction.

Our policy must be a program of understanding, of action, and of democratic solidarity. Recent history proclaims the strength of Latin America’s drive for democracy. By encouraging it and supporting it, we are not “exporting” our own ideology or “imposing” something “made only in USA.” We are helping our neighbors fulfill their own aspirations. And in doing so we are confirming our own deepest and most hopeful convictions.
Argentina

On October 30, 1983, Radical Civic Union Party leader Raul Alfonsin was elected president after a hotly contested and free campaign against the candidate of the Justicialist (Peronist) Party. A record-breaking turnout of more than 15 million gave Alfonsin an absolute majority in the presidential vote. The Radicals also won control of the Chamber of Deputies, but no party obtained a majority in the Senate. One-third of the Senate and one-half of the House will be renewed in both 1985 and 1987.

Argentina’s return to democracy after almost a decade of internal conflict and military rule was one of the most significant political events in 1983. The inauguration of President Alfonsin in December was a powerful and emotional celebration. Vice President Bush headed the U.S. delegation. Representatives of countries that have become democratic in the past decade—including Spain, Portugal, Peru, and Ecuador—were prominent. The United States shares with other democracies a vocation to defend and promote the democratic process.

Antigua and Barbuda

Antigua and Barbuda gained its independence from the United Kingdom in November 1981. Prime Minister Vere C. Bird, Sr., leads the Antigua Labour Party (ALP). The Progressive Labour Movement (PLM) is the major opposition party but lost its representation in Parliament when the ALP swept open elections in 1984. A third party, the Antigua Caribbean Liberation Movement, has little support.

The Bahamas

The 1982 elections gave Prime Minister Lynden O. Pindling’s Progressive Liberal Party (PLP) its fifth straight victory. Four other parties contested the elections, but only the Free National Movement received sufficient support to be represented in the Parliament. All parties had free and equal access to the media.

Barbados

One of the most stable and prosperous countries in the Caribbean, Barbados is an open parliamentary democracy in the British tradition. J.M.G. “Tom” Adams, leader of the Barbados Labour Party (BLP), is Prime Minister. The main opposition is provided by the Democratic Labour Party (DLP).

Belize

Belize, which achieved independence in 1981 after an extended period of internal self-government, has a democratic and parliamentary form of government. By law, general elections must be held by February 1985. In the 1979 election, the People’s United Party, led by George C. Price, won 52% of the vote and the United Democratic Party 47%. The upcoming election also will be contested by the Christian Democratic Party.

Bolivia

After 18 years of military rule, Bolivian democracy was restored on October 10, 1982, when former President Hernan Siles Zuazo was elected president in a second-round vote by Congress and installed as constitutional president. Siles had obtained a plurality of the 1.4 million votes cast in June 1980 but had been prevented from assuming office by a July 1980 coup that led to three military regimes. Congress is responsible for setting election dates and seems likely to return to the traditional timetable by which a new president would be inaugurated on August 6, 1986.

U.S. support for the constitutional order has been a significant factor in buttressing Bolivian democracy, which faces difficult political, narcotics, and economic problems. President Siles publicly thanked the United States for its role in helping to frustrate the June 30, 1984, coup attempt in which he was kidnaped.

Brazil

Brazil has taken significant strides toward a fully representative government. Its opening to democracy, or abertura, was amply demonstrated in the November 1982 congressional, state, and municipal elections in which over 45 million voters chose some 40,000 officials. The opposition parties won 10 of the 22 contested governorships, including all but one of the important industrial states in populous southern Brazil. In the 69-member Senate, the governing Democratic Social Party (PDS) won 15 of the contested seats for a total of 46.
or a two-thirds majority. The major opposition party, the Brazilian Democratic Movement (PMDB), won 9 seats for a total of 21. Of the 479 seats in the Chamber of Deputies, all of which were at stake, the PDS won 235 and the PMDB 200, so that neither of the major parties commands a majority.

The 1982 elections also determined the composition of the electoral college which will select the successor to President João Figueiredo on January 15, 1985. The 686-member college will consist of all Federal Senators and Deputies and six members of the majority party of each state legislative assembly. Only the two major parties are presenting candidates. The PDS has nominated São Paulo Federal Deputy Paulo Maluf; the PMDB has chosen Minas Gerais Governor Tancredo Neves. The election, which is expected to be hotly contested, will produce Brazil's first civilian president in over 20 years. Both candidates are campaigning on platforms calling for direct presidential elections in 1988. As elsewhere, U.S. policy is wholeheartedly in support of the democratic process, but neutral about who wins.

**Chile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Election(s)</th>
<th>Date of Most Recent Election(s)</th>
<th>Date of Next Election(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plebiscite</td>
<td>Sept. 1980</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chile came under military rule in September 1973. A constitution ratified by plebiscite in September 1980 took effect in March 1981. Though its provisions and the conditions under which it was ratified were criticized by opposition groups, this constitution confirmed Augusto Pinochet as president until 1989, at which time another plebiscite is scheduled to vote on the junta's nominee to succeed him. If the nominee wins, he would be inaugurated on September 18, 1989. If the nominee is rejected in the vote, Pinochet would remain in office, and open presidential elections would be held on March 18, 1990, concurrent with elections for Congress. Opposition groups have proposed several changes to this election timetable process.

Some political liberalization occurred during 1983. The government is now considering a law which would legalize some political parties. There is no formal dialogue between the government and the opposition but informal contacts have taken place. The U.S. strongly supports the return to elected, democratic, civilian government in Chile. We hope the process of communication between the government and the opposition will produce a consensus on a return to democracy.

**Colombia**

- **Parliament, State, Local**
  - Mar. 1982
  - Mar. 1986

- **President**
  - May 1982
  - May 1986

- **State, Municipal, Territorial**
  - Mar. 1984
  - Mar. 1988

Colombia has been an active democracy for more than 25 years. Power has alternated between the Liberal and Conservative Parties. Belisario Betancur of the Conservative Party was elected president in May 1982, winning decisively over Alfonso López Michelsen, a former president and Liberal Party candidate.

Colombian democracy confronts a low-level but persistent Cuban-backed insurgency, as well as the narcotics scourge. Colombia has begun to take extraordinary steps to stamp out narcotics trafficking and President Betancur has negotiated a cease-fire with the largest guerrilla group, offering them the opportunity to lay down their arms and join the country's free political life.

**Costa Rica**

- **President, Legislative Assembly**
  - Feb. 1982
  - Feb. 1986

The elections of 1899 began a trend of free and honest elections that have enabled Costa Rica to evolve into a democratic republic with a strong system of checks and balances.

The electoral process is supervised by the powerful Supreme Electoral Tribunal, selected by Costa Rica's Supreme Court of Justice. The purpose of this unique fourth branch of government is to guarantee free and fair elections.

President Luis Alberto Monge is a member of the leading political party, the National Liberation Party (PLN). The PLN is social-democratic in philosophy. With but one exception, the PLN and various non-PLN coalitions have alternated in the presidency in every election since 1953.

**Cuba**

- **Plebiscite**
  - Sept. 1980
  - 1999

Cuba is a communist one-party state, and the key exception to the prevailing democratic environment in the Caribbean. Although a self-professed champion of "national liberation" where other countries are concerned, Cuba itself is one of the least democratic, least independent countries in the world.

Candidates for "election" are determined by the Communist Party. There is no concept of legal organized opposition. Suffrage, limited to voting for local assemblies, is universal for citizens aged 16 and over except for those who have applied for permanent emigration. Only sitting members of the local assemblies may vote to choose members of regional assemblies and of the National People's Assembly. Membership in a local assembly is not, however, a requirement for candidacy to the National Assembly. This assures seats to all Politiburo members and other high-ranking government and party officials. The National People's Assembly selects a council of ministers, again under the direction of the Communist Party.

Twenty-five years after coming to power, Fidel Castro rules through classic Marxist-Leninist methods, including direct repression. Behind the ideological smokescreen he has established, Castro's government is the despotism of the traditional caudillo aggravated by unprecedented subservience to foreign interests. Cuba adheres closely to Soviet political and military guidance. Only a massive Soviet subsidy of $12-$13 million per day keeps the Cuban people from even greater privation.
**Dominica**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Election(s)</th>
<th>Date of Most Recent Election(s)</th>
<th>Date of Next Election(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House of Assembly</td>
<td>July 1980</td>
<td>June 1985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prime Minister Mary Eugenia Charles and the Dominica Freedom Party (DFP) gained control of the House of Assembly in a fair and open election. The DFP currently holds 17 of 21 seats. Opposing parties are the Dominica Labour Party, the Democratic Labour Party of Dominica, and a leftist grouping called Dominica Liberation Movement Alliance.

**Dominican Republic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Election(s)</th>
<th>Date of Most Recent Election(s)</th>
<th>Date of Next Election(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President, Congress</td>
<td>May 1982</td>
<td>May 1986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Dominican Republic turned to democratic institutions after a long period of dictatorship and social and political upheaval. In spite of destabilizing economic problems, democracy continues to gain strength there, as evidenced by strongly contested elections in 1978 and 1982. Suffrage is universal and compulsory for those over 18 or married.

Three major parties contested the 1982 presidential elections in which 1.7 million citizens elected Salvador Jorge Blanco of the Dominican Revolutionary Party as president. The opposition parties, the Reformist Party and the Dominican Liberation Party, have representation at all levels of the government—federal, state, and local.

**Ecuador**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Election(s)</th>
<th>Date of Most Recent Election(s)</th>
<th>Date of Next Election(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislative, Municipal</td>
<td>Jan. 1984</td>
<td>July 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>May 1984 (2d round)</td>
<td>Jan. 1989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

President Leon Febres-Cordero was inaugurated on August 10, 1984, marking the first transition in 24 years from one elected democratic government to another. President Febres-Cordero, a businessman, is a member of the Social Christian Party (PSC), which allied itself with several other parties in a coalition called the National Reconstruction Front to oppose Rodrigo Borja Cevallos, the candidate of the Democratic Left (ID), also supported by a coalition of political parties, some of which supported the outgoing government of President Osvaldo Hurtado.

**El Salvador**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Election(s)</th>
<th>Date of Most Recent Election(s)</th>
<th>Date of Next Election(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Assembly, Municipal</td>
<td>Mar. 1982</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>May 1984 (2d round)</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

El Salvador's political structure is established by a constitution that entered into force in December 1983. The Constitution was written by a constituent assembly elected in a direct popular vote in 1982. The 1982 elections for the assembly were part of a program of democratization agreed to among the military officers responsible for the coup in 1979 and the Christian Democratic Party. Automatic registration for the elections was offered to the political parties allied with the guerrilla umbrella organization, the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMLN), but rejected by them.

Jose Napoleon Duarte was elected president on May 6, 1984. International observers attested to the fairness of the 1984 presidential elections. Eight candidates representing a broad political spectrum competed in the first round. Jose Napoleon Duarte, a founder of the Christian Democratic Party, won 54% of the votes in a run-off against ARENA [National Republican Alliance] candidate Roberto D'Aubuisson. Over 80% of the electorate went to the polls.

Despite communist subversion, rightwing terrorism, crushing economic difficulties, and a history of repression, the people of El Salvador have persevered in constructing democratic institutions. The legislative and municipal elections to be held in the spring of 1985 will provide a further opportunity for political parties associated with the guerrillas to compete democratically for power. The United States strongly supports President Duarte's efforts to bring about such a national reconciliation through democratic procedures.

**Grenada**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Election(s)</th>
<th>Date of Most Recent Election(s)</th>
<th>Date of Next Election(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parliament</td>
<td>Dec. 1976</td>
<td>By the end of 1984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The erratic rule of Sir Eric Gairy was forcibly ended on March 13, 1979, by Maurice Bishop and the New JEWEL [Joint Endeavor for Welfare, Education, and Liberation] Movement. The Constitution was suspended, elections postponed indefinitely, and an extraordinary military buildup begun under Cuban and Soviet advisers.

In October 1983, Grenada's eastern Caribbean neighbors proved their democratic mettle when they acted—without hesitation and with the support of other democratic nations, including the United States—to restore order in Grenada after the country had fallen prey to a bloody power struggle among its Marxist-Leninist leaders. Their collective action made it possible for Grendians to resume their democratic heritage. An interim government was appointed by Governor-General Paul Scoon in November 1983. Parliamentary elections are expected to take place before the end of 1984.

**Guatemala**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Election(s)</th>
<th>Date of Most Recent Election(s)</th>
<th>Date of Next Election(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Mar. 1982</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent Assembly</td>
<td>July 1984</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On March 23, 1982, Efrain Rios Montt was named president after Gen. Lucas Garcia was ousted in a bloodless coup. On August 8, 1983, Gen. Oscar Humberto Mejia Victores seized power from Rios Montt and pledged a prompt return to democracy. International observers invited to witness the Constituent Assembly elections, held July 1, 1984, were favorably impressed by their
fairness; 73% of registered voters participated. The assembly, inaugurated on August 1, 1984, will write a new constitution and electoral law. The expectation is widespread that presidential elections will facilitate a return to civilian control in 1985.

Guatemala faces formidable social, cultural, human rights, and economic problems, but the 1984 election, which was conducted openly and fairly, has encouraged democrats everywhere. We support continued progress toward democratization.

### Guyana

| National Assembly | Dec. 1960 | None scheduled |

While Guyana maintains the structure of a multiparty parliamentary republic within the Commonwealth, its 1980 Constitution defines the country as a "democratic sovereign state in the course of transition from capitalism to socialism." The ruling party and its leader, Forbes Burnham, have imposed a minority government on the nation, resulting in an erosion of democratic practices.

### Haiti

| National Assembly | Feb. 1984 | 1990 |
| Municipal | Apr. 1983 | None scheduled |

Impoverished and lacking democratic traditions, Haiti follows a constitution which, as amended in 1983, provides for lifetime President Jean-Claude Duvalier to designate his successor and legislative elections to be held every 6 years.

Although violence has been reduced, major human rights problems exist, including abuse of due process and a lack of freedom of speech, press, and association. For the first time, however, the government has announced plans for legislation governing political party activities; recognized a labor federation; and called for judicial reform, strict observance of legality, and an end to interference in the judicial process. Press controls have been theoretically relaxed, but the recent temporary detention of several journalists raises serious questions about this process.

### Jamaica

| President, Congress | Nov. 1981 | Nov. 1985 |

Jamaica has been a stable functioning democracy since obtaining independence in 1962. Elections are held at the discretion of the Governor-General upon advice of the Prime Minister, but not less than every 5 years.

Prime Minister Edward Seaga's Labour Party (JPL) won the December 1983 elections. The chief opposition party, the People's National Party (PNP), led by Michael Manley, boycotted the elections and did not post any candidates. JPL candidates won all but 6 (contested by small minority parties) of 60 Parliament seats. Thus, although the JPL and the PNP have regularly alternated in power, the JPL now heads a single-party government. Many observers anticipate that with the clarification of the voter registration issue that resulted in the PNP boycott, PNP participation in the electoral process will resume.

### Mexico

| Deputies, Certain State Governors, Municipal | 1984 | 1985 |
| President, Senators, Deputies | July 1982 | July 1988 |

Miguel de la Madrid Hurtado was elected president on July 4, 1982. President and senators are elected for coinciding 6-year terms; governors at staggered intervals for 6-year terms; deputies and municipal officials for 3-year terms.

Mexico has had an evolving democratic system for more than 50 years. Recent constitutional amendments led to expanded representation of opposition parties, including the National Action Party (PAN) and the Mexican Unified Socialist Party (PSUM), which in 1982–83 carried some important municipal elections traditionally won by the ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI). President de la Madrid and key advisers are deeply engaged in efforts to resolve Mexico's most serious economic and financial problems since the Great Depression; his administration's programs include broadening popular participation in government.

### Nicaragua

| President, Council of State | Sept. 1974 | Nov. 1984 |

Sandinista Nicaragua contrasts sharply with progress toward more open and tolerant societies elsewhere in Central America. Despite promises of free elections and nonalignment, the Sandinistas in the 5 years since taking power in 1979...
have developed a militarized Marxist-Leninist state with close ties to Cuba and the Soviet Union.

Widespread internal pressures and disillusionment abroad led the Sandinistas to announce elections for November 4, 1984. A genuine political opening in Nicaragua would be welcomed by the United States and others in Latin America and Western Europe. Pervasive FSLN [Sandinista National Liberation Front] presence and control throughout Nicaraguan society and its close identification with the government and armed forces provide it with enormous leverage in an electoral situation. The coordinating body of the democratic opposition has called on the Government of Nicaragua several times, and the Sandinistas to announce elections for November 4, 1984. A genuine political opening in Nicaragua would be welcomed by the United States and others in Latin America and Western Europe.

President and Congress serve concurrent 5-year terms. President Alfredo Stroessner was reelected in 1983 to a seventh term that ends in February 1988. The elections resulted in his Colorado Party receiving over 90% of the votes cast in a process flawed by campaign and media restrictions. Only two of the legally recognized opposition parties participated, the Liberal and the Radical Liberal parties.

There has been little change in Paraguay's political system in recent years. A state of siege is continuously renewed, and human rights problems persist. At the same time, the government has taken some positive steps, such as releasing almost all political prisoners, allowing some political activists to return to Paraguay after many years of exile, and arresting some police officials for abuse of authority.

Fernando Belaunde Terry, founder of the Popular Action (AP) party, was elected president for the second time in 1980. Reelected 12 years after he was deposed by a military coup, President Belaunde leads a democratic government that faces severe economic strains and terrorism from the indigenous Maoist guerrilla group, Sendero Luminoso. Nevertheless, Peru remains firmly on its democratic course. National elections planned for April 1985 will pave the way for the first constitutional turnover of power in 40 years.

Belaunde's coalition partner, the Popular Christian Party (PPC), withdrew from the government in May 1984 in anticipation of the 1985 elections. Candidates from the American Popular Revolutionary Alliance (APRA) and from the United Left (IU) did well in the 1983 municipal elections.

Nicolas Ardito Barletta was elected president in May 1984 in Panama's first direct presidential election in 16 years. More than three-quarters of Panama's adults, 717,000 voters, participated in what proved a very tight race. The opposition Democratic Opposition Alliance (ADO), its candidate Arnulfo Arias, and the government party challenged votes in many districts.

Paraguay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>President, Congress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 1983</td>
<td>President, Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 1988</td>
<td>President, Congress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peru

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>President, Congress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 1980</td>
<td>President, Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>President, Congress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parliamentary elections in Peru had been postponed, and the last elections were contested in 1979.

Nicolas Ardito Barletta was elected president in May 1984 in Panama's first direct presidential election in 16 years. More than three-quarters of Panama's adults, 717,000 voters, participated in what proved a very tight race. The opposition Democratic Opposition Alliance (ADO), its candidate Arnulfo Arias, and the government party challenged votes in many districts.

St. Christopher-Nevis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>House of Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 1984</td>
<td>House of Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By June 1989</td>
<td>House of Assembly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

St. Christopher-Nevis, which achieved independence from the United Kingdom on September 19, 1983, is a parliamentary democracy with a strong tradition of peaceful electoral change of government.

Prime Minister Kennedy A. Simmonds, leader of the People's Action Movement rules in coalition with the Nevis Reformation Party led by Simeon Daniel. This coalition government was recently returned to power in peaceful democratic elections. The leader of the opposing St. Christopher-Nevis Labour Party, Lee Moore, lost his seat, thus limiting his ability to challenge the present government.

St. Lucia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Parliament</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 1982</td>
<td>Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Aug. 1987</td>
<td>Parliament</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The St. Lucia Labour Party (SLP) won the first postindependence elections in 1979, winning 12 of the 17 House of Assembly seats. By 1982 the political tide had turned, and Prime Minister John Compton's United Workers' Party defeated both the SLP and the Progressive Labour Party (PLP), winning 14 of the 17 seats. The PLP has been largely discredited since trying to send 14 students to Libya for military training.
St. Vincent and the Grenadines

House of Assembly | July 1984 | By 1989


Suriname

Until a violent military coup in February 1980, Suriname was a functioning democracy with a history largely free of violence. The military government headed by Lt. Col. Desire Bouterse has suspended the constitution and has not announced any plans for elections. In December 1982, 15 national leaders were killed while in government custody. There has been some dialogue among various political and social groups, but power remains in the hands of the army.

Trinidad and Tobago


Trinidad and Tobago has been a functioning and stable democracy since it achieved independence in 1962. Prime Minister George Chamber's People's National Movement (PNM) won the 1981 elections. Of the eight political parties contesting the elections, the PNM, the United Labour Front (ULF), the Democratic Action Congress (DAC), and the Tapia House Movement (THM) won seats in the assembly. The elections were hotly contested with all parties actively campaigning for popular support.

Uruguay

President, Congress | 1971 | Nov. 1984
Plebiscite | 1980 | Not applicable

Uruguay has been under military rule since 1973. In 1980 a constitution drafted by the military and widely criticized as undemocratic was rejected in a plebiscite. In September 1981, the military selected a retired general, Gregorio Alvarez, as president.

Since 1981, Uruguay has proceeded on an accelerated course toward a democratic transition. The military recently deproscribed the Blanco and Colorado parties and most of the constituent member parties of the Broad Front. An agreement has been concluded between the Colorados, the Broad Front, and the military governing the modalities of the transition to civilian rule. Elections are scheduled for November 1984. Although the Blanco Party did not participate in the agreement because of the detention of its leader, Wilson Ferreira, it does plan to take part in the election. The United States firmly supports the return of democracy to Uruguay.

Venezuela

Municipal | May 1984 | 1989

Venezuela has had a democratic government for over 25 years. Although smaller parties represent a full spectrum of political tendencies, Venezuelan politics have evolved into a two-party system made up of COPEI and Democratic Action (AD), typifying respectively the classic international competition between Christian Democratic and Social Democratic currents. Continuing a tradition of alternation of power with COPEI, the AD's Jaime Lusinchi was elected president in December 1983—the first president to be elected by an absolute majority since the restoration of democracy in 1958.

After the ouster of dictator Marcos Perez Jimenez in 1958, the country successfully fought both Cuban-backed insurgents and rightwing extremists in the early 1960s—but without sacrificing respect for human rights and the rule of law. Few Venezuelans have forgotten how close their country came to losing its liberty, and 90% of Venezuela's adult population typically turns out for presidential elections.
Dependent Territories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Election(s)</th>
<th>Date of Most Recent Election(s)</th>
<th>Date of Next Election(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Anguilla**

Legislative Assembly

Mar. 1984 1989

Separated from St. Christopher-Nevis in December 1980, Anguilla remains a British dependent territory.

**British Virgin Islands**

General Elections

Nov. 1983 Nov. 1988

The British Virgin Islands is a British Crown Colony with a parliamentary system of government. The most recent elections brought the United Party, under the leadership of Cyril B. Romney, to power. The Virgin Islands Party forms the opposition.

**Cayman Islands**

Legislative Assembly

Nov. 1980 Nov. 1984

The Cayman Islands is a British dependency with a parliamentary form of government. The legislature is comprised of 12 elected members and 3 members appointed by the Governor. Although there are no highly structured political parties, there are loosely structured political organizations or "teams." The Unity Team and the Progress with Dignity Team are represented in the Legislative Assembly.

**Montserrat**

National Parliament, Chief Minister


Montserrat is a British Crown Colony. Elections are held every 5 years. In March 1983, Chief Minister John Osborne was re-elected, but his People's Liberation Movement lost two of its seven seats in Parliament to the opposition People's Democratic Party.

**Netherlands Antilles**

Federal Parliament

June 1982 1986

The Netherlands Antilles has been a stable parliamentary democracy since the beginning of autonomy in 1954 as a part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands. Federal Parliamentary elections are mandatorily held every 4 years but may be called sooner should the party or coalition in power lose its majority. None of the 12 parties participating in the Federal Parliament election in 1982 received a majority of the vote, and a coalition government was formed.

Each of the islands has its own representative body, the Island Council, which enacts laws regarding local island affairs.

**French Overseas Departments**

**French Guiana**

General Council

Mar. 1983 1988

French Guiana normally holds elections every 5 years. It elects one Senator and one Deputy to the French Senate and National Assembly.

**Guadeloupe**

General Council, Municipal


General Council elections normally are held every 5 years. Guadeloupe elects two Senators and three Deputies to the French Senate and National Assembly.

**Martinique**

General Council


General Council elections are usually held every 5 years. Martinique elects two Senators to the French Senate and three Deputies to the National Assembly.