

TANZANIA POLICY
ON
FOREIGN AFFAIRS

1980
PRINTED BY:
DAR BUSINESS MACHINE SERVICES
AND PRINTING WORKS
S.L.P. 20743 DAR ES SALAAM

ADDRESS BY
THE PRESIDENT, MWALIMU JULIUS K. NYERERE
AT THE TANGANYIKA AFRICAN NATIONAL UNION
NATIONAL CONFERENCE — 16th OCTOBER, 1967

~~FORWARDED~~ BY THE INFORMATION SERVICES DIVISION,
MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND TOURISM,
P.O. BOX 9142, DAR ES SALAAM

SPEECH TO THE TANU BI-ANNUAL NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON TANZANIA FOREIGN POLICY

My first task today is a pleasant one—to welcome you all to Mwanza, and to the National Conference of TANU. I wish to give a special welcome to all those Delegates who are here as a result of their compliance with the leadership qualifications of the Arusha Declaration, and a friendly warning to others that the “year of grace” is running out! But in addition I would like to express my own pleasure, and that of us all, in the presence of our guests from other African countries.

President Obote; you are very welcome to this TANU Conference. You are no stranger to Tanzania, or to Mwanza either, you come here as an old and valued friend. Your presence on this occasion is a special pleasure to us, both because of our old association, and also because of the difficulties which Uganda, under your leadership, has so recently overcome.

The President of Zambia, our good friend President Kaunda, is probably used to being mentioned last in international gatherings because of the habit of mentioning countries in alphabetical order. But I know that he does not misinterpret this. The friendship between Tanzania and Zambia under the able leadership of Kenneth Kaunda has never faltered; and it will not falter. We know the pressures he and his country work under. As Africans and as neighbours we take pride in the courage and skill with which these dangers have been met.

I would also like to welcome the fraternal delegations from Burundi, Congo, Guinea, Kenya, and Rwanda. We are sorry that Presidents Kenyatta, Kayibanda, and Mobutu, were unable to attend in person, but we are glad to receive their representatives. We hope they will take our greetings and good wishes to their respective leaders on their return home. We also send our fraternal greetings to the Democratic Party of Guinea, whose struggles to build a socialist society receive our full sympathy and acclaim. Ladies and Gentlemen: you are welcome here. We

hope that you will take back with you a message of friendship and solidarity from TANU and from Tanzania as a whole.

Finally, I am happy to express our welcome to Vice-President Karume, and to the other fraternal delegates from the Afro-Shirazi Party. More than that I need not say; we are all Tanzanians.

To all of you, Brothers, and to all our other guests, as well as to Delegates, I express a welcome to Mwanza. It was in this town that the Pan-African Freedom Movement for East and Central Africa was started in 1958, preparatory to the All-African Peoples Conference later that year. The presence of so many distinguished visitors at this TANU National Conference is thus a continuation of a traditional concern with African Freedom and African Unity—two things which are corner-stones of TANU international policy.

Party Responsibility

Of course, the Conference which is meeting today has a different function than PAFMECA had; nor is this an inaugural meeting. The task of this National Conference is to consider the progress which Tanzania has made towards the second objective of TANU. The first objective—*independence*—was achieved six years ago. The second is that of building a socialist nation in which all citizens live in decent conditions of human dignity, with as much personal freedom and freedom from hunger, disease, and ignorance as is consistent with equal freedom for all other citizens.

As the supreme body of the Party in a One-Party State this Conference has to consider the direction in which we are moving, and decide whether the nation is on the right path. It has to lay down the principles of action, and give guidance and leadership to the people. Its functions are thus of vital importance; but they are not unlimited. For the Delegates here come from the people, and are responsible to them. It is impossible for us at this Meeting to take over their responsibilities, or to act as if we had some God-given right to force goals of our choosing upon the people. It is impossible, and it would be wrong to try. Our task is a different one: it is to give leadership and

guidance along the path which both the people and TANU have already accepted. That is, the path which leads to human equality, to democracy, and to socialism in Tanzania. If the Party succeeds in this, then the people have already shown that they will succeed in their task— which is to guard and to develop our country.

The TANU National Conference, then, has the duty of considering the whole range of policies and affairs, both domestic and foreign. For all these things affect the kind of society ours will become, as well as the speed and direction of our economic development. Domestic and Foreign Policies are inter-related, both are aspects of one overall task. It is obvious, for example, that international friendships or hostilities affect our internal progress. They do this even if by no other means than leaving us free to concentrate on development problems, or diverting our attention and our resources from them. It is my intention at this Conference, therefore, to speak on both aspects of our policy. But I shall do this on two separate occasions; today I shall concentrate on foreign policy questions; and at another session I will direct my attention to domestic affairs.

My task now, therefore, is to survey the international scene as it appears from Tanzania, to indicate some of the problems in which we are involved, and to outline the attitudes and policies we are adopting in the face of them. I shall do this from the basis of the fundamental principles of foreign policy which have been accepted by this country since independence—and which have not changed. For we have still to guard the integrity and security of our country, we persist in our attempt to follow a policy of non-alignment in the ideological and power quarrels of the world, committing ourselves to no great Power alliance, we continue to support, and to seek to strengthen, the United Nations in its search for peace and justice; we maintain our belief in African Unity as a vital objective for Tanzania and the whole continent; and we continue to support the movement for African liberation and freedom from racist oppression.

Non-Alignment

Let me first look at some of the problems of non-alignment. Tanzania has, over recent years, had so many quarrels with big Powers which are part of the Western

Bloc, that it is useful for us to stress, once again, that we have no desire to be, and no intention of being, "anti-west" in our foreign policies. We shall deal with each problem as it occurs, and on its own merits. We shall neither move from particular quarrels with individual countries to a generalised hostility to members of a particular group, nor to automatic support for those who also happen to be, for their own reasons, quarrelling with the same nations. We wish to live in friendship with all states and all peoples.

Before independence we had no direct contact with Eastern Bloc countries. After independence we began to establish such contacts and we shall continue to strengthen them. We desire friendship with these non-Western nations as well as with Western states, and on the same basis of mutual non-interference with internal affairs. We shall not allow any of our friendships to be exclusive; we shall not allow anyone to choose any of our friends or enemies for us.

It should also be clear that we shall not allow anyone—whether they be from East or West, or from places not linked to those Blocs—to try and use our friendship for their own purposes. Differences of opinion and clashes of interest between Tanzania and other nations are bound to occur—the more so as contact increases. We understand that because we understand that it is the responsibility of every Government to look after the interests of their country as they see them. But we shall always try to limit the effect of differences which occur, and to settle them by discussion and negotiation.

Only in the case of South Africa, the racist colonialism of Portugal, and the Smith Regime of Southern Rhodesia, does such settlement of differences seem inherently impossible. With those countries we can never negotiate until they abandon their present rejection of the basic principle of human intercourse—the equality of men. But in all other cases we believe that differences should be able to be settled without compromising the principles of our society, for the interests of every country are best served by mutual friendship and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

Our desire for friendship with every other nation does not, however, mean that we can be unconcerned with world events, or that we should try to buy that friendship

with silence on the great issues of world peace and justice. If it is to be meaningful, friendship must be able to withstand honesty in international affairs. Certainly we should refrain from adverse comment on the internal affairs of other states, just as we expect them to do with regard to ourselves. But to stay silent on such issues as Vietnam because one or more powerful nations do not like what we say would be a disgrace.

It is, I think, difficult for us in Tanzania to comprehend the full sufferings of the people of Vietnam in what is probably the most vicious and all-enveloping war which has been known to mankind. There is no security there—for anyone, anywhere in that country. Men, women and children, are all involved; peasants and workers, urban and rural dwellers—all of them live every hour of every day under the threat of death, or injury, or the destruction of their means of livelihood. It is said that more bombs have been dropped on the small country of Vietnam in the last two years than were used in the whole Pacific theatre of war from 1942 to 1945.

World-wide concern has been expressed about the dangers which would follow from bombs falling—accidentally or on purpose—on the territory of the People's Republic of China. We in Tanzania share that concern, for such an event could only lead to a world-wide conflagration. But the fact that Vietnam is a small, and underdeveloped, nation, does not mean that her people are immune from the effects of high-explosive, or that other small nations can turn their heads away as if this conflict is at present unimportant.

We are told that great principles are involved, and that the richest nation on earth is defending those principles against attack. What are these principles? There is the principle of self-determination for the people of Vietnam. For twenty years, with unparalleled courage and determination, the people of Vietnam have been fighting for a chance to implement this principle—first against the French; and now against the Americans. Certainly there are Vietnamese on both sides, some are conscripted, or try to find security with those who are strongest in their particular area. But if this is a civil war, what are outside nations doing in that conflict?

Again, we are told that democracy is being defended, and only last month there were some "elections" in South Vietnam. But these elections only covered the "pacified areas", and no candidate could stand on a clear platform of opposition to the war! And in any case these were the first elections since 1956, when South Vietnam came into existence, no one could possibly call the Governments of Mr. Diem, or his military successors, democratic.

Or we are told that the outside power responded to a request for assistance from a legitimate government which was threatened by aggression. One can only look at the figures of soldiers operating in South Vietnam and ask whose aggression?

I believe that two things are essential: first, an immediate and unconditional end to the bombing of North Vietnam. And second: a settlement should be reached on the basis of the 1954 Geneva Agreements. Neither North Vietnam nor the Vietcong can be forced to the Conference Table; that should by now be clear. The U.S.A. must recover from the delirium of power, and return to the principles upon which her nation was founded. Those millions of Americans who are now opposing their Government's policies in this matter, and calling for peace, are working for the honour of their country. We pray that they triumph soon.

In the Middle East we have seen yet another outbreak of dangerous and destructive war in recent months. The fighting there was brought to a halt very quickly, but the situation remains one of great danger to us all. Large areas of the U.A.R., Syria, and Jordan, remain under Israeli occupation. The Suez Canal is closed, and will obviously remain closed for some time to come; this affects Tanzania's trade by increasing the costs of our imports and reducing the price we obtain from our exports. We are thus very obviously concerned in the matter. But we have other interests too. It is not, and should not be, part of our policy to gloss over an act of aggression because we recognize and have diplomatic relations with the country which commits such aggression.

The establishment of the State of Israel was an act of aggression against the Arab People. It was connived at by the international community because of the history of persecution against the Jews. This persecution reached its

climax in the murder by Nazi Germany of six million Jewish men, women, and children—a number equal to half the population of Tanzania, and more than that of many independent African States. The survivors of this persecution sought security in a Jewish national state in Arab Palestine. The international community accepted this. The Arab States did not and could not accept that act of aggression. We believe that there cannot be lasting peace in the Middle East until the Arab States have accepted the fact of Israel. But the Arab States cannot be beaten into such acceptance. On the contrary, attempts to coerce the Arab States into recognizing Israel—whether it be by a refusal to relinquish occupied territory, or by an insistence on direct negotiations between the two sides—would only make such acceptance impossible.

In expressing our hope that a peaceful settlement of this terribly difficult situation will soon become possible, it is necessary for us to accept two things. First, that Israel's desire to be acknowledged as a nation is understandable. But second, and equally important, that Israel's occupation of the territories of U.A.R., Jordan, and Syria, must be brought to an end. Israel must evacuate the areas she overran in June this year—without exception—before she can reasonably expect that the Arab countries will begin to acquiesce in her national presence. Israel has had her victory, at terrible cost in human lives. She must now accept that the United Nations which sanctioned her birth is, and must be, unalterably opposed to territorial aggrandizement by force or threat of force.

That is Tanzania's position. We recognize Israel and wish to be friendly with her as well as with the Arab nations. But we cannot condone aggression on any pretext, nor accept victory in war as a justification for the exploitation of other lands, or government over other peoples.

The United Nations

In the face of these two great international conflicts, and with many other dangerous situations, the United Nations has been able to do very little. On Vietnam in particular it has been completely helpless; its Secretary-General has tried time and again to intervene in the cause of peace, and every time he has been rebuffed. Yet it is important that we

should not in consequence lose faith in the United Nations, nor reduce our support for it. The United Nations is weak when powerful states wish to ignore it. Its servants can only act when the sovereign and independent Member Nations agree that they shall do so. But these limitations must be treated as a challenge to us, and as reasons for Tanzania to give the United Nations all the support, and all the strength, which it is within our power to do. For there is no other instrument for international peace even as effective as this. Rather than abandon the United Nations we must work steadfastly and persistently towards strengthening it, and increasing its powers. This will not be easy. For Big Powers can live with the illusion of self-sufficiency; even now it is possible for them to imagine that the rest of the world is unimportant to them. They are therefore anxious to limit the powers of an international body. But we small powers can have no such illusions. Only in an organization such as the United Nations can we hope to make our voice heard on international issues, and only through the implementation of the principles upon which it is based can we hope to survive and grow in peace.

There is, however, one further point I must make with reference to the United Nations. For it has, at present, a basic weakness which is nothing to do with its structure, but everything to do with the independence of the Member States. That is the fact that the People's Republic of China is still excluded from the United Nations, and the Chinese seat occupied by representatives of a Government which was overthrown eighteen years ago. This is absurd. While the most populous nation on earth is excluded the United Nations will continue to be ham-strung on all Far-Eastern questions, and many other vital international matters. Tanzania will continue to advocate China's admission to her rightful place in the United Nations. We shall continue with our efforts to persuade our friends that whether or not they like or approve of the Government of the People's Republic of China, its existence must be accepted.

Africa is our Immediate Concern

But while our concern with world events is real and important, the events in Africa are of even greater and more direct relevance to us. Total African liberation, and total African Unity, are basic objectives of our Party and our Government. We recognize that our long-term interests,

as well as those of all other African peoples, are involved in these things. Certainly we shall never be really free and secure while some parts of our continent are still enslaved. If anyone had doubts about this in the past they can have none now. We have only to look at the threats which have been made against the Republic of Zambia in recent weeks—to say nothing of the constant threat to her power supplies since November 1965. Or we can look at the mines which have been laid in Tanzanian territory by the Portuguese colonialists, and which have resulted in the death of some of our citizens. Or again, we can look at the positions in which Botswana and Lesotho find themselves. Nominally independent, they have no real freedom to determine their own policies—either domestic or external—because they are held in thrall by the Union of South Africa.

The total liberation of Africa must be a continuing concern of every independent African State. And legal independence is not enough, legally the Union of South Africa is a sovereign state. The freedom we seek must be freedom for the peoples of Africa without distinction of race, colour, or religion. Racialist minority governments cannot be acknowledged because they are a negation of the very basis of our existence. Co-existence is impossible; for if the African peoples of South Africa and Rhodesia have no human right to govern themselves, then what is the basis of Tanzania's existence, of Zambia's, of Kenya's, and so on? If the principle of white supremacy is accepted anywhere in Africa it will seek to spread, and there will be no peace for any of us.

The struggle for freedom must go on. Our preference, and that of every true African patriot, has always been for peaceful methods of struggle. We abhor the sufferings and the terror, and the sheer waste, which is involved in violent upheavals, and believe that peaceful progress is worth some sacrifice in terms of time. But when the door of peaceful progress to freedom is slammed shut, and bolted, then the struggle must take other forms; we cannot surrender.

This has been the choice before Africa in relation to the Portuguese occupied territories. The Metropolitan Government claims that Mozambique, Angola, and

"Portuguese Guinea" are part of Portugal; there can therefore be no question of independence—and a call for it is regarded as treachery. Further, Portugal is itself a dictatorship; nothing can be achieved even through an involvement in their domestic politics. The only choice available is a violent struggle for freedom, or continued acquiescence in slavery.

The peoples of all the Portuguese colonies have now chosen; they are fighting. And they are doing their own fighting—let there be no mistake about that. Neighbouring territories give moral support to the freedom fighters; we support their cause in the councils of the world. But no outside person, however sympathetic, can make a people free; this they have to do for themselves, with their own hands and brains, and their own sufferings.

I ask this Conference to join with me in congratulating the freedom fighters for their successes so far. And I ask the Conference to send condolences to all those who have been injured in the fighting, and to the relatives of those who have given their lives for their country's freedom. The task of the Freedom Fighters is not easy. Portugal may be a poor country in European terms, but the resources at its command are not small, and recent military discussions between the three bastions of racialism in Southern Africa can only make the struggle harder. But if the African peoples of this continent, and of those areas in particular, are determined to be free—then in the end nothing will stop them.

Southern Rhodesia

Recent weeks have also seen the outbreak of fighting in Southern Rhodesia—fighting which was so intense that Smith had to call upon his blood-brothers from South Africa for assistance. Once again the situation is such that Africa has no alternative but to welcome this development. For year after year we urged patience upon the nationalist movements of Southern Rhodesia; we pointed at the official British Policy of colonial freedom, and joined with them in putting pressure upon successive British Governments with the aim of achieving a prospect of peaceful advance. Even after Smith's Declaration of Independence, we urged that the responsible authority for dealing with this is the

British Government. We did everything possible to avoid the dangerous necessity of guerrilla fighting of black against white, for we are aiming at human dignity, not racial wars. But it is now quite clear that only the African people's own efforts can turn the tide in Southern Rhodesia.

It may be that external developments will even now be able to limit the necessity for military action by the people of Southern Rhodesia. The whole of Africa must work for that end. But it is beyond our power to ensure success in obtaining the necessary international action. In the meantime we are therefore forced to welcome the fact that Smith can no longer bemuse the world by claiming that the Africans of Southern Rhodesia support his regime. Now he is forced to devote resources to trying to put down the uprising of the people he claims as "his".

We hope that the freedom movement will grow stronger; we hope that the nationalist movements of Southern Rhodesia will unite for greater effectiveness. But in any case we must continue to support the struggle against racialism and minority control in that colony. We cannot acquiesce in the establishment of another South Africa in our continent.

Delegates to this Conference will remember that it was on this issue that Tanzania broke diplomatic relations with Britain. We took this action because we believed that we had committed ourselves to it when we put our name to the O.A.U. Resolution in December, 1965. This called upon all African States to break diplomatic relations with the country which claimed sovereignty over Southern Rhodesia, but which was doing virtually nothing about the illegal assertion of power by the racialist white minority. We believed also that the full implementation of that Resolution would bring effective pressure to bear on Britain, and make her Government wake up to its world responsibilities. And at the same time we drew attention to the fact that even then Britain had still not stated her own policy objectives in Southern Rhodesia. We therefore demanded, once again, a commitment to the principle of no independence before majority rule.

These things mean that Tanzania's action in breaking diplomatic relations with Britain had two facets. The first was one of principle—that we had to honour our

word to the O.A.U. The second was one of tactics—that we would be taking part in what we hoped would be an effective exertion of African pressure on the United Kingdom Government. That was two years ago. The question we have to consider now is whether our cause is best served by continuing with this policy, or whether some other might be more effective.

So far just one of our objectives has been achieved—and that in words only. In December last year the British Government, with great and obvious reluctance, finally said that all past constitutional offers to the Smith Regime were withdrawn, and that a settlement would have to be based upon the principle of majority rule before independence. We gave a cautious welcome to that statement—and our caution has been justified. There has already been a resumption of what is called “informal contact” with Smith, on the basis of quite different proposals! But still the commitment stands, and it will not be easy for the British Government to get out of it without further international disgrace.

For the rest, Smith continues in command, with ever-increasing support from South Africa and Portugal. International sanctions—in the manner in which they have so far been applied—have proved ineffective. Most other African States took a different view of the O.A.U. Resolution than we did, and of those that acted with us some have now reconsidered their position. In these circumstances it will be for the Tanzanian Government in the coming months to consider what action will best serve our continuing purposes. For the one thing Delegates may be absolutely certain of is that Tanzania will not change its objective in Southern Rhodesia. Our aim is to contribute to, and to assist in, the achievement of democratic independence in Southern Rhodesia.

African Unity

In the light of this continuing problem it is doubly unfortunate that over the last two years so many independent African states have been involved in domestic upheavals and internal conflicts. It is not our business to comment on those changes of Government which have not directly affected the total African scene, much as we may regret some of them. But there have been others in which we do have a direct interest. No one, for example—and

certainly not a neighbour—could have failed to rejoice when President Mobutu replaced Moïse Tshombe as the effective ruler of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. By that change Africa moved from the position where an African traitor was in charge of one of the largest, and potentially most powerful, of its states, to a position where an African nationalist and patriot took control. President Mobutu's accession to power did not mean an end to the difficulties of the Congo; these are not ended yet. But the difficulties now are those of progress and reconstruction. The last mercenary revolt was a rear-guard action of men who knew that their reign was being brought to an end. We wish President Mobutu and his colleagues all success in their continuing struggle for the real freedom and independence of their country.

Burundi is another neighbour of ours which has experienced a change of political system since our last ordinary meeting. The present Republican Regime there has replaced a feudal monarchy, and now has the heavy task of reorganizing the nation on different principles at the same time as it deals with serious economic problems. We are extremely sorry that the effects of his motor car accident have prevented President Micombero from joining us this week, and on your behalf I would like to wish him a speedy and complete recovery.

Uganda too has changed its type of Government. From being something of a hybrid—neither monarchy nor republic, but with elements of both—it is now beginning with a new system which promises to be more stable. I think all of us understood the motives which caused the Uganda people to try a unique type of constitutional arrangement; I think we can all sympathise with them on the circumstances of its failure. All these matters are the exclusive responsibility of President Obote and the citizens of Uganda, but I do not think I will be misunderstood when I express Tanzania's interest in the unity and progress of our East African partner. Differences of economic and political organization can certainly be accommodated within the arrangements for East African co-operation; yet it would be stupid to pretend that the feudalism, and parochialism, which were enshrined in the old Uganda constitution did not have some effect on the degree of unity which was possible between our three states.

But although these three developments—unpleasant as they were in their immediate effects—were both inevitable and probably necessary for progress in Africa, many other political developments in Africa have to be deplored without reservation. The cumulative effect of them was such that until two months ago it appeared that all hope of African Unity, and even the existence of the O.A.U. was in jeopardy. Every African leader knows that separately our individual states are appallingly weak in the face of any political or economic pressure from outside our continent. All of us must know that in unity we could be incomparably stronger. Yet our petty inter-African difficulties, and our internal squabbles, have time and again over-shadowed the most basic requirements of the greater goal. African diplomats have been incarcerated by other African states on their way to and from international gatherings; boundary disputes have been allowed to poison all-African meetings; economic favours of a European power have seduced some of us from our loyalty to the wider African community.

In the face of all these difficulties—to say nothing of the tribal massacre and civil war in Nigeria, and the strong but conflicting views of different states on Middle East questions—optimism about the Kinshasa O.A.U. Meeting was impossible. But that Meeting was a success. Africa is now looking forward again,—working to settle its own disputes, making arrangements for practical co-operation in small but vital matters, and so on. Delegates will know that, with great reluctance, I decided that it was my duty to stay in Tanzania at the time of that Heads of States Conference. Therefore I need have no hesitation in paying an unreserved tribute to all the participants. In particular I would like to congratulate President Mobutu, the Chairman of the Conference, and Presidents Kaunda and Obote whose work contributed greatly to the success achieved.

But this does not mean that the path to African co-operation and unity is now clear. Many difficulties remain, and others will undoubtedly occur. What has been demonstrated, however, is that we must never give up. However far back from our goal we seem to have drifted, we must keep working for unity and co-operation. Yet we must not indulge in day-dreams, nor imagine that unity and harmony is round the corner. We have, instead, to look hard at the current situation, and work forward from a full acceptance

of it. Conflicts do not disappear because they are a nuisance; nor are they less important to the people involved because others are unconcerned or think them due to a misunderstanding. Indeed, many disputes in Africa are caused by very real short-term conflicts of interests; that they could be overcome in the long-term by greater unity, or even greater goodwill, does not mean that they can be dismissed now. The only way forward to African unity is a prior acceptance of Africa as it is—misunderstandings, disputes, and differences of beliefs, loyalties, and international economic links included.

For us in Tanzania this means that the first thing we have to recognize is that Tanzania is responsible to Africa for Tanzania, and for Tanzania's actions towards her neighbours and towards the liberation of Africa. We are not responsible for any other nation. We must accept the full implications of the existing separate sovereignty of all African states. We have to recognize that whether or not we like the government and policy of another African state, it is still the Government of that state, and has full freedom to make its own decisions.

We have to accept Africa as it is, and not imagine that we have any more right to interfere with the internal affairs of others than they have to interfere in ours. Of course there will be some Governments and policies which we like and approve of more than others, and it would be absurd to ask any one state to be equally friendly and sympathetic to all others. But we must be ready to co-operate with all African states in African affairs, regardless of our opinion of their internal—or even their external policies. Only where a free African state is betraying the liberation of Africa or deliberately and avoidably damaging the degree of co-operation which already exists, has Africa, or any African state, the right to protest. And even then we should make our protests as one brother to another—in private and in a fraternal spirit.

Socialism or capitalism is a matter for each separate nation; the interpretation of our common policy of non-alignment is a matter for each government and people—at least at this stage of our development. Only co-operation in the enslavement of our brothers in Southern Africa must be excluded from our mutual toleration.

It is important too that we in Tanzania, as well as other nations, should learn a little humility in considering the actions of other African states. Certainly we must make judgements about all sorts of things; but we must remember that our decision may sometimes be proved wrong! We must never be unwilling to revise our judgements of other countries, other governments, or other policies. And we must try to understand the practical difficulties which face other countries, not hasten to condemn them from our own different position.

All independent Africa, for example, calls for the complete trade boycott of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. But if Lesotho or Botswana tried to implement it they would be condemned to complete economic collapse—and might even be militarily occupied by South Africa as well. In neither case could the rest of Africa do anything effective to help. The job of these two countries is to survive, with as little co-operation as is consistent with that survival. We can ask that they should not embrace the racist states which surround them; we can ask that they should do everything possible to assert the principle of human dignity. But we should not ask them to commit suicide.

Our neighbour, Zambia, also has real and practical difficulties which prevent her full and immediate implementation of such policies. But the fact is that no state could be doing more to extricate itself from its economic and communications inheritance, or could act with greater courage than Zambia has been doing. It is Tanzania's responsibility to do everything in our power to help in her efforts to establish new trade and communications patterns. And in the meantime I hope that we shall agree to send a message of full support to our sister Party—UNIP—and that this TANU National Conference will re-dedicate itself, and all TANU members, to work for the speedy fulfilment of the tasks which lie ahead for our two countries.

Neighbourliness

But talk of All-African co-operation and understanding can only too easily degenerate into meaningless clichés. If it is to become meaningful it must be put into practice at a neighbourhood level. And this demonstrates the difficulties! For it is one thing to say all African states must accept each other as they are; it is another to accept your

neighbour if you disagree with what he is doing or saying, or if he seems to be bringing danger to your doorstep. Yet this is what mutual acceptance, non-interference, and African co-operation must mean in practice. It is no use a man preaching goodwill to all men if he spends his time quarrelling with the man who lives in the next house; his words will then be shown to be without meaning.

We have to accept that close contact between any two men, or any two nations, has certain implications. It means greater opportunities for co-operation for mutual benefit. It also means greater possibilities of conflict. Tanzania, for example, has feelings of warm friendship for the Government of Guinea under the leadership of President Sekou Toure; its feelings are less warm towards certain other West African states. But just as the practical effect of our friendship with Guinea is limited by the distance which lies between us, so too our reservations about those other states do not lead to practical conflict. But lack of sympathy for the Government of a neighbouring territory is a different matter, wherever it occurs. It means that every little quarrel between citizens on different sides of the border can easily become an international issue; it means that the natural patterns of trade can be interrupted, or can be the cause of heated and public dispute, and so on.

On the other hand, it is neighbours who can make a reality of African co-operation and friendship. If each accepts the full sovereignty of the other, and within this framework endeavours to maximise co-operation in all fields, then African co-operation will be maximised. For we are all neighbours of one another. If Tanzania works in harmony with Kenya and with Zambia, then Kenya and Zambia are linked together. If Kenya then co-operates with Ethiopia, then Tanzania and Zambia are both linked to Ethiopia—and so on throughout our continent. This is the way forward for Africa now. We can have our all-African meetings, both political and technical. But experience has shown that the success and the effectiveness of these meetings depends upon good neighbourhood relations in all the different parts of Africa. When these exist, then all-African meetings can facilitate and speed developments. If these do not exist, then the all-Africa meetings have to devote their time to patching and mending the torn fabric of co-operation, instead of helping the move forward.

We in East Africa have, I believe, learned this lesson. The Conference of eleven African states which was held in Nairobi in March 1966 under the able Chairmanship of President Kenyatta, had the sole purpose of increasing understanding and co-operation between East Africa and its neighbours. It achieved that purpose; indeed the Tanzania delegation was unanimously of the opinion that we had never attended a more useful and constructive political gathering. Of course that meeting did not solve all the problems of this part of Africa; some of them are too deep-seated and too complicated to be susceptible to such treatment. But the meeting did create an atmosphere in which problems could be tackled; it did contribute greatly to our common progress.

Economic Co-operation

Certainly we in Eastern Africa can take justifiable pride in the degree of international co-operation which has already been achieved, and in the progress we are making in such matters.

The East African Treaty of Co-operation marks a vitally important step forward for Uganda, Kenya, and ourselves. We have now agreed on a thorough and complete reform of the arrangements for economic co-operation which we inherited from our ex colonial masters; we have established what can become a real common market, and really effective instruments for joint economic services. The discussions were long and sometimes difficult, for there were real short-term conflicts of interest to be accommodated. But I would like to use this occasion to pay tribute to both President Kenyatta and President Obote, and their respective Governments, for the spirit in which these discussions and negotiations were conducted. I would also like to pay tribute to the work of Minister Amir Jamal who led the Tanzanian delegation, and to his colleagues Ministers Nsilo Swai and Paul Bomani, and the staff who so ably supported them. Between us all we managed to confound the pessimists and purveyors of gloom who were expecting—or hoping for!—yet another breakdown in inter-African co-operation. We have a right to be proud of this, even while we recognize that other difficulties will occur,—indeed we have already made arrangements for dealing with

them! But there will be no danger while all problems are approached in the same spirit, of friendship and determination to agree which we enjoyed earlier this year.

This is not all. Tanzania is one of eleven nations involved in discussions which could lead to the creation of an Economic Community of Eastern Africa. We have a long way to go and a great deal of hard work to be done before any of us will derive practical benefit. But, if we succeed, we may in time be able to do away with internal tariffs from the Sudan, south and east, up to Zambia. And even if that objective is many years away, practical co-operation in more limited fields is a real possibility. I can assure this Conference that Tanzania will endeavour to play a full and constructive role in the discussions which have started.

These discussions, however, do not yet include the Congo or Rwanda, both of whom—along with Burundi—have a direct and continuing interest in practical co-operation with Tanzania, just as we have with them. For the Eastern part of the Congo, as well as for Burundi, Dar es Salaam is the most convenient sea-port. Even Rwanda finds this outlet useful. It is our responsibility to work with these countries in making that port effective for their needs as well as our own. I can assure Delegates and Guests that we shall do this to the best of our ability. Detailed arrangements are still being discussed about how our co-operation can best be organized in the long run. But there should be no doubt about Tanzania's full acceptance of the responsibility which the accidents of geography and history has placed upon her.

Dar es Salaam is also, of course, an increasingly important port for Zambia—along with Mtwara in the south. Delegates will have heard with the same joy as President Kaunda and myself that there is a real prospect that the railway linking our two countries will now be built. The engineering survey will start soon; after that we have, from the People's Republic of China, such assurances of further practical and financial help that completion need not be doubted. This project has been talked about for a long time. There have been feasibility studies, economic surveys, and several different estimates of costing. But now we

are making progress. Now we shall proceed at maximum speed, and with a full consciousness of the importance, the urgency, and the implications of this project.

Conclusion

Distinguished Guests, and Delegates. I could go on longer by indicating the great amount of work which remains to be done, and the great efforts which will be required from us all if this country is to develop the kind and degree of international co-operation which we desire. But I will conclude by repeating the assurance that Tanzania will remain true to the international principles which she has proclaimed.

We shall work for ever increasing friendship, co-operation, and unity, with our neighbours, and with all other free African states. We shall never give up the struggle against racialism and colonialism. We shall endeavour to play a proper role in the hard struggle for peace and justice in the world. And at all costs we shall defend the integrity and the security of the United Republic against any attack, or any attempt to diminish our sovereign independence.