

REMARKS BY SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE

I am grateful to the African Studies Association for this opportunity to put before so many scholars of African affairs my views on U.S. policy towards that continent, as contained in a speech in Lagos on March 7, 1971, and a subsequent statement on the floor of the Senate on May 5.

American attitudes and actions with respect to Africa have important effects there and in the United States. More importantly, they provide a litmus test of the nature of America's view of the rest of the world, and of ourselves. If we care about people and the quality of their lives, we must care about African development, independence, and racial justice.

I believe we can do so, and do so effectively, without illusion about the limits of our influence and resources.

We should heed the words of H.E. Sir Seretse Khama, President of the Republic of Botswana, when he said in Lagos last March that, *Relations between states, like relations between people, prosper best when there is an absence of illusion*. But an absence of illusion should not be allowed to degenerate into an atmosphere of indifference or mistrust.

An American poet once wrote: *There is only one man in the world and his name is all men*.

We are here to help translate these words into economic and political facts.

We all remember the fresh beginning of African independence in the 1960's. It was a time when a new relationship between Africa and America seemed inevitable. It was a time when Americans, who had won their independence from a colonial power nearly two hundred years earlier, responded sympathetically to the African struggle for independence and freedom and self-respect. It was a time when we thought we could see the end of colonialism.

We should not be surprised that colonialism has not ended easily, and we should not be surprised that independence has not made nation-building an easy task.

America won here independence through a revolution which did not produce a stable government until eleven years had passed. Seventy-one years after the inauguration of our first president the country was torn apart in a civil war. Our early growth was largely dependent on capital resources from Europe. Today, after two hundred years, we are still struggling with deep and divisive questions about freedom, equality, opportunity and justice.

The process of achieving nationhood — of establishing

a country in which men and women can live with freedom from fear, freedom from suspicion and mistrust, freedom from want and disease, and freedom to grow and achieve their natural potential — that process can be long and painful.

We who knew this from our own national experience knew also that struggling nations need help to grow. We took some steps to help, but the promise was easier than the reality. Once independence was achieved, once the new constitutions were adopted and the new flags were raised, once the difficult task of building new nations really began, our support fell short of what it might have been. It is not that the United States could — or should — have tried to manage and solve the problems of Africans. That would have been unwise and impossible. But, looking back, we can see how much more we might have done to help.

America was diverted by her own troubles. We had gone to war with Indo-China. Our attention was divided between that war and our internal problems. I am not here to tell you that this has changed. I cannot promise that there will be an upsurge in material support and assistance for African countries. We are still involved in a tragic war, and even if we end our military involvement in Indo-China — as I believe we must — many Americans will be reluctant to assume any involvement elsewhere in the world.

The problems in our own country, in our cities and towns and small communities, are enormous. They demand and they deserve a far greater share of our attention and our total resources than we have given them in many years.

Nevertheless, we do have concerns and responsibilities in the rest of the world. We have them here in Africa. Out of our traumatic experience in Southeast Asia we are seeking wiser ways to play our proper role in the affairs of mankind. I believe we can do more on this continent than we have been doing. I believe we can do so together with those who seek understanding, respect and friendship. I think the American people have a desire to do so.

This is not because of any direct security interest we may have in Africa, or because we should wish to compete for favors with other great powers. It is simply because we cannot be faithful to fundamental American values, unless we show our concern for the human condition wherever men and women live.

We should, all of us, realize by now that the problems of mankind and the promise of mankind are two sides of the same coin.

What, then, should America do?

First, I believe America should raise, and not reduce, the level of development aid. That aid should respond both to the needs for individual country assistance and to arrangements for regional development. Our support for regional and multilateral efforts should be no excuse for cutting our overall aid commitment, and it should not be a substitute for supporting assistance to specific countries where it is needed.

America's resources for foreign assistance are not unlimited. I would suggest that one of the most productive uses of this conference would be to discuss how these resources might be allocated. For example, the so-called *brain drain* has been a serious and continuing problem for many nations, especially in the field of medicine. Our programs in the 1960's for training men and women in the United States have been partly responsible. I believe the time has come to reinforce the capacities of educational institutions in Africa so that her people may receive the medical training they need on their own continent. We should assist African countries to develop health care systems suited to their needs.

We should consider the critical importance of long-term improvements in the quantity and quality of food supplies. The Institute for Tropical Agriculture here in Nigeria is an example of what can be done. I believe we should undertake additional cooperative efforts to help meet the growing requirements for basic foods in tropical areas.

Second, I believe America should do more than express her sympathies for the need to stabilize commodity prices, to eliminate trade barriers, and to establish tariff preferences for goods from developing nations. We should use this conference to discuss how we can act on these matters together.

Third, I believe America should encourage private investment in the independent countries of Africa, wherever it can help, and particularly where it will tend to stimulate local investment. We must do so with the understanding that when local capital becomes available, it has a right to participate in a meaningful way.

Fourth, I believe America should be ready to help where she can to meet the challenges of population growth and distribution. In too many instances in the United States and elsewhere, we have seen the pressures of increased populations causing problems in education, housing and the environment, undoing the benefits of economic development. We should not presume to suggest population policies, but we can help support the population policies African nations decide to pursue. Above all, we in America must be without preconceptions as to what African countries need. We must listen to African definitions of what should be done in African nations. That is one of the basic reasons why I am here.

If peace and progress in Africa depended only on friendly assistance, we could be satisfied with addressing ourselves to the practical problems of health, edu-

cation, housing, food, employment and the conservation of natural resources. But aid alone cannot ensure peace or defend the dignity of man. We know from our experience in the United States that relations among men depend on more than economic development. They also depend on mutual respect and equality.

That is why we must address ourselves frankly and openly to the problems of freedom, justice, discrimination and racial oppression. I did not come here to tell Africans how to solve these problems. As an American, I cannot tell you that our country has yet solved its own problems of racial injustice and racial discrimination. Indeed, before I left for Lagos, a student wrote me in these words: *Senator, please don't be the usual politician who tells it like he wants it rather than how it really is.*

More and more Americans are coming to recognize racial injustice for what it is. More and more Americans understand that no society can really be at peace so long as it sustains racial injustice. More and more Americans are committed to equal opportunity, in law and in fact.

But concern with the human condition cannot stop at our nation's borders. Every form of tyranny — wherever it occurs — is an outrage; and none is more evil than the oppression of a man because of the color of his skin. That is why I believe apartheid is wrong. That is why I believe white supremacy is wrong. That is why I believe colonial domination is wrong. These are not simply intellectual conclusions. They are convictions rooted in the experience and circumstances of my own life and background.

They are convictions which lead me to the conclusion that support of racial oppression in other countries by words or by silence, is against the best interests of the United States.

I know it is not easy to deal with these questions in terms of our relations with other countries. They are complex and they involve decisions of great difficulty, but they are questions which deeply affect the future development of this continent, and its capacity to achieve peace and justice for all its people, of all races.

How does one deal with questions of apartheid, white supremacy, and colonial interference with the rights of self-determination, particularly if you are a large and powerful nation such as the United States? The easy answer to some might appear to be massive intervention. But we have learned from our experience in Indo-China that intervention, even by a powerful country, does not produce the results we may want.

My strong opposition to the military involvement in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos is a reflection of my conviction that we have seen too much direct interference in the affairs of other nations by the so-called great powers. There has been too much exertion of military power in international affairs, with nations attempting to bend other nations to their will.

Does this mean that we should stand aside, ignoring

what is happening in South Africa, in Rhodesia, in Namibia, or in the Portuguese colonies? We cannot, if we are to do justice to our moral concerns. There should be two guidelines for our policies toward South Africa:

First, we must maintain our own arms embargo, and seek to persuade our allies to do likewise. Second, we must recognize that a relations-as-usual, business-as-usual, communications-as-usual approach is inadequate. A neutral attitude, whatever its intent, may in fact contribute to support of apartheid. We need communication with South Africa, if we are to have a positive influence. But it must not be communication which gives a badge of respectability to oppressive regimes, or which is only one-way, or which is only with the dominant minority.

Adopting these guidelines does not give us an automatic answer to the question of what actions would be both realistic and right. The last decade has shown that Americans and others have not yet found that answer. The years since the Sharpeville massacre have been marked by much talk outside South Africa; the tragedy within is no less cruel than before.

We in America cannot ignore that tragedy. It is a matter of importance, and it is urgent. It is no longer enough to try to deal with this festering and explosive situation merely by incantation or by ignoring it.

We must seriously re-examine our policies and practices with respect to South Africa. The conscience of an America determined to solve a racial problem of her own must explore ways and means of stimulating and supporting genuine changes in South Africa's racial practices.

The objective of this re-examination must be to identify every present relationship and form of cooperation which may have the effect of aiding and abetting the present denial of equal rights to all South Africa's citizens. The United States cannot and should not try to solve the problem — which is the right and responsibility of Africans. But it must not — even inadvertently — make their problem worse.

Unless men can find the answer to this problem of relations among races — which spreads across the face of this planet — there can be no peace. It is the problem of all nations. If South Africa were on the road to justice for all its races, it would move us all down the road toward peace and understanding throughout this continent and the world.

The Rhodesian situation continues to be troublesome for all of us. We hope the United Kingdom can work out a settlement to prevent the creation of another South Africa in Rhodesia. But until and unless a settlement respecting the rights of black Rhodesians is achieved, we should be completely scrupulous in fulfilling the obligations we have assumed under the economic sanctions imposed by the United Nations.

In the case of Namibia, I believe the right course for

the United States is to support peaceful efforts under the United Nations to stop this spread of apartheid and to make international responsibility for the area effective.

The question of the Portuguese colonies in Africa presents other problems for the United States. We have treaty commitments with Portugal, primarily through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Those commitments are related to the general defense system developed between the United States and its Western European allies. They are not commitments which can be taken lightly by any responsible American leader.

They represent one side of the Portuguese colonial issue for the United States. The other side of the issue is represented by our concerns and interests in Africa. For too long some Americans have held that only our European commitments and only our military-strategic interests are important. According to that view of the world, at any time they intersect with other interests or concerns, narrowly defined military-strategic interests should prevail.

If the world is going to survive, and if American society is not to be ripped to shreds in dissension and disillusion, this way of viewing American interests in the world must be changed. We do have interests and responsibilities in Europe, but we also have interests and responsibilities in Africa. These interests must be given their full weight and importance in our policy choices.

Some of those interests relate to our increased economic investments in Africa. Some relate to the importance of avoiding the horrors of war and its impact on the world community. More important still are our interests in the principles of human freedom and national independence. We do have an obligation to set an example in human decency, generosity and concern for the rights of others.

How, then, do these general principles apply to our relations with Portugal and the issue of her African colonies? Some of us thought a new government in Lisbon might pursue new policies in Africa. But no real change is apparent. Instead, we have seen a continuation of the fighting to preserve colonial control. We have seen indications that planned movement of more Portuguese settlers to Africa will further complicate the problem. We have seen no break in her determination to withhold the right of self-determination from 13 million Africans.

I believe the United States has a duty to itself as a nation committed to the principle of self-determination to make our views known to the Portuguese government in no uncertain terms. I believe we have a duty, as a friend of African independence and peaceful development, and as an ally of Portugal, to work as hard as we can to persuade Portugal to change her colonial policies.

We have an obligation to try to persuade Portugal to see the wisdom and necessity of bringing to a prompt end her military activities in Africa and to grant the right of self-determination to all people in her overseas territories.

If Portugal refuses to end her colonial policies in Africa, we may be confronted with a hard choice between our treaty relations with Portugal and our interests in the peaceful development of self-determined nations in Africa. I hope they change their policies, and we are not faced with that choice. But if we are, then we must not operate on the automatic assumption that these relations with Portugal are more important than our African interests and responsibilities.

I have spoken at some length of the negative actions the United States must take or consider in opposition to racial injustice and oppression in Africa. Such actions are important, but they are not all we can or should do to encourage the growth of freedom and equality in Southern Africa and throughout the continent. Our commitments must include equality in Southern Africa and throughout the continent. Our commitments must include economic and technical assistance to help strengthen the promise of independent Africa.

Americans do not have all the answers in a troubled world. We know, however, that peace and the dignity of man cannot be maintained in isolation from other nations.

More than ten years ago, before he was President, John Kennedy said that *"Every American is now involved in the world."*

Our involvement with Africa provides us with an opportunity. We have an opportunity on this continent to prove that cold war politics need not be the basis for American foreign policy. We have an opportunity to prove that compassion and conviction and moral obligation can and should be the moving forces of that policy.

I do not believe we can expect change to be apparent overnight, but I believe relations between Africa and America can be strengthened in the 1970's. I believe they will be strengthened, provided we have the courage always to speak honestly and to continue our dialogue in friendship.

Statement in the Senate, May 5, 1971

I invite the attention of the Senate to an article published in the Washington Post of April 4. The article, entitled *Arms From East, West Used in Africa*, was filed from Luanda, Angola, by Mr. Jim Hoagland, a veteran African correspondent for the Post and a recent recipient of the Pulitzer Prize for his series of articles on Africa. Mr. Hoagland treats the question of arms and related items sold by outside countries for use in the wars in Portugal's African colonies.

In spite of our declaration in 1961 embargoing the sales of arms to Portugal for use in that country's African colonies, we continue to supply the planes that fly Portuguese soldiers there.

In his 1971 state of the world message, the President made a protest against policies which serve colonialism in Africa. He said:

Both our statements and our actions have made it patently clear to all concerned that racism is abhorrent to the American people, to my administration, and to me personally.

We cannot be indifferent to apartheid. Nor can we ignore the tensions created in Africa by the denial of political self-determination. We shall do what we can to foster equal opportunity and free political expression instead. We shall do so on both moral and practical grounds, for in our view there is no other solution.

Mr. Hoagland's article points out some practical steps which have in fact been taken to support, rather than to oppose, the denial of political self-determination in Portuguese colonies. The article notes:

Two or three times every week the [Portuguese] military charters Boeing 727 jetliners from the government-owned airline to transport troops to Mozambique. Charters have also been arranged in Boeing 707's to bring troops from Portugal to the three territories.

These are planes whose sale was approved by the U.S. Government to Transportes Aereos Portugueses.

Now, Mr. Hoagland continues, the Portuguese Government will not have to charter the planes from its own airlines. In January, the administration approved the direct sale of two Boeing 707's to the government.

This action was defended by the administration in a letter from the State Department to the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Case), published in February in the **Congressional Record**. A spokesman described the sale as "deemed not to come within the terms of the 1961 embargo on the export of arms for use by any of the parties to the disputes in Portuguese Africa."

Portugal's foreign minister Rui Patricio, Mr. Hoagland notes,

Said flatly in a recent interview in Lisbon that Portugal would not give any assurances about the use of the planes.

"If I buy an American car, can America tell me how I can use it?" he asked. "If I want to drive it in Africa I will drive it in Africa. The Boeing is not an arm," he said with a smile.

Hoagland also reports an American diplomat in Lisbon defending the sale in the same way: *The airplane is not an arm, and does not fall under the arms embargo.*

What practical meaning is there in a foreign policy which would condemn colonialism verbally and support it with material goods? Boeing 707 jetliners may not, strictly defined, be arms under the terms of the 1961 embargo. They may fall into that gray area that exists between the intent of a measure and its language.

But the airplanes are clearly used to further repressive policies in Africa, policies the United States is on record as opposing. It will certainly be so regarded by Africans.

In another instance, last September a State Department spokesman indicated that the administration stood ready to approve sales of small, civilian aircraft to South Africa. This amounted to a reversal of the policy of the Johnson administration, which had held that such aircraft could easily be adapted to military purposes, that they thereby fell into the same gray category, and that their sale would not, therefore, be approved.

Similarly, the administration has failed to take a strong stand against Britain's violation of the South African arms embargo in its recent provision of helicopters to the South African Government. As I have said before, I believe we must both maintain the arms embargo ourselves and seek to persuade our allies to do likewise.

If there is to be any strength of purpose to this country's policies, it will be determined by the actions we take, not simply by declarations of high moral purpose.

If we exploit ambiguities, take actions abhorrent to the intent of our declared policies — the world will be aware of the emptiness of our words.

This sale of jets to Portugal is clearly such an action.

I addressed this question in a speech delivered at the opening session of the African-American dialogues in Lagos, Nigeria, last month. I said then that:

We have an obligation to try to persuade Portugal to see the wisdom and necessity of bringing to a prompt end her military activities in Africa and to grant the right of self-determination to all people in her overseas territories.

If Portugal refuses to end her colonial policies in Africa, we may be confronted with a hard choice between our treaty relations with Portugal and our interests in the peaceful development of self-determined nations in Africa. I hope they make that choice. But if we are, then we must not operate on the automatic assumption that these relations with Portugal are more important than our African interests and responsibilities.

Neither our interests in Africa nor our responsibilities are well-served by this sale of jets.

I would hope that the administration would reconsider and reverse its approval of the transaction, before it is completed. But failing that, perhaps the best safeguard against further such action lies in broadened public awareness of such activities by this country in support of colonialism in Africa.