

**THE FREE WORLD  
AND SOUTH AFRICA**

THE S.A. INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

**ARCHIVES**

**NOT TO BE REMOVED**

George McGovern

---

**OCCASIONAL PAPER**

**GELEENTHEIDSPUBLIKASIE**



**DIE SUID-AFRIKAANSE INSTITUUT VAN INTERNASIONALE AANGELEENTHEDE  
THE SOUTH AFRICAN INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS**

---

Senator George McGovern was first elected to the United States Senate from the State of South Dakota in 1962 and has twice been re-elected. He is a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and, since early 1979, is Chairman of the African Sub-Committee.

This Paper contains the text of Senator McGovern's address to a meeting of the S.A. Institute of International Affairs (Witwatersrand Branch) in Johannesburg on 7 December 1978.

The Senator's answers to the questions which followed his address are also included, as reproduced from a tape-recording, with a minimum of editing, but with the questions abbreviated.

It should be noted that, as the Institute is precluded by its Constitution from itself expressing an opinion on any aspect of international affairs, opinions expressed in this Paper are solely the responsibility of the author and not of the Institute.

THE FREE WORLD  
AND SOUTH AFRICA

George McGovern

CONTENTS

Address .....	page 1
Discussion .....	4

ISBN: 0-909239-52-5

The South African Institute of International Affairs

Jan Smuts House  
P.O. Box 31596  
2017 BRAAMFONTEIN  
South Africa

April 1979

This is my first trip to Africa and I have been struck during this visit by the fact that African countries are struggling with an issue which we in the United States have been grappling with since our nation was founded 200 years ago -- the problem of maintaining security and stability on the one hand while advancing freedom and justice on the other.

Today is December seventh, the anniversary of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. In Franklin Roosevelt's words of 37 years ago, it is "a day that will live in infamy." Paradoxically, that day of "infamy" united the American people and their view of freedom to a degree seldom achieved in our national history. As one of millions of young Americans who volunteered for service in that global struggle against fascism, I do not recall any period in my life when I was so sure of America's purpose in the world. My first awareness of the gathering storm came in 1935 when I heard on the radio that Mussolini's bombers had struck the villages and towns of Ethiopia. I read with horror the words of Mussolini's son-in-law when he described bursting bombs as beautiful budding roses -- a thrilling sight to behold. A few years later, I was in Italy as an American bomber pilot striking at the heartland of fascist power in Nazi Germany. Although I view myself as a man of peace, I have never regretted for one moment that my country and our numerous allies prevailed militarily against the fascist terror which threatened to extinguish freedom across the earth.

Then came the post-war period and, ironically, our understanding of the conditions of freedom became clouded. We found that it was not easier, but even more complicated to reconcile security and freedom after the war. We learned again that the slow, peaceful defence of freedom and human dignity is more demanding of patience and of will than the challenge of military struggle. And so, the Cold War became the dominant theme of foreign policy as enunciated by the Great Powers. Wartime alliances crumbled as allies became adversaries and former enemies became allies. Soon the globe was divided into the Free World and the Communist World, each competing for influence beyond its traditional sphere of influence. With the world divided into these camps, freedom was viewed not so much as an affirmation of "liberty and justice for all", as our founding fathers had prescribed, but as a protective security umbrella under which we welcomed even the most authoritarian tyrants, so long as they carried an anti-communist banner -- people like Franco, Batista, Salazar, Syngmun Rhee, Diem, Somoza and Pinochet. It was this negative definition of the Free World that led us into an interminable, self-defeating conflict in Indochina.

Were we in fact advancing the cause of freedom when we stood with Franco, Salazar and Diem? Can freedom be defined by what we fear or is freedom an affirmation of positive purposes and enduring values? Certainly, our free society is worth defending with the strongest security measures. One legitimately fears and opposes credible threats to the survival of a free society. But the quest for security has value only insofar as it protects and advances those interests that make life worth defending. Many thoughtful Americans have come to feel that if the quest for national security is conducted without reference to our constitutional ideals, then we actually weaken the nation's long term security as well as its standing and influence in the world. A too rigidly defined quest for national security opened the way not only for the tragedy of Vietnam but for the trauma of Watergate -- a mistaken venture abroad in the name of national security turned in on us to undermine those ideals and institutions that Americans hold most precious.

And so I think that I can tell you today that my country is passing through a transitional period of searching for the proper and effective ways to defend

the Free World and the values for which it stands. It is not a period of weakness in the life of the U.S., as some observers would argue, in which we are unwilling to stand up to the threats to our freedom and security. Rather, it is a search to redefine both the conditions of security and the meaning of freedom in our world. It is a search, fundamentally, for the essential ingredients which will make the Free World truly free and truly strong.

What, then, is the Free World and what are the conditions of membership? These are questions which are being asked not only in America, but are questions that I have found on the lips of my hosts on this journey that began in the new post-Franco Spain and will end in the new state of Angola. They are questions that you, too, must address in this beautiful country that potentially has so much to contribute to the Free World. South Africa, like the United States, is richly endowed in physical and human resources, and you, too, are passing through an era of transition, searching for security and freedom from fear. Indeed, the entire continent of Africa is raising for its own peoples and for all the world the issue of reconciling what are often described as competing interests -- the claims of freedom and the demands of security.

Recognizing the limitations of our influence in any area of the globe so far from our shores, and mindful of the right of each country to answer these questions in terms that are meaningful to them, we are nonetheless inescapably entwined with the people of Africa and their struggles for racial justice, personal freedom, and national security. South Africa's value to the Free World has been defined in many ways. Traditionally, it is pointed out that the United States has both material assets and strategic interests in this country. But we can no longer look at South Africa, or the deep conflicts that divide the region that surrounds it, in outmoded Cold War terms that ignore the phenomenon of political self-examination that is going on within the United States itself. In facing up to our responsibilities as the leader of the Free World we must also face up to the responsibility of shaping our foreign policy in ways that are consistent with our own national values and beliefs. Similarly, leaders in this country must be sensitive now more than ever before, to the changing realities around them -- not only in the rest of Africa, which over the last two decades has undergone radical political transformations, but in the Free World as a whole.

We in the United States have learned that freedom and security are not necessarily conflicting interests. Indeed, we have found that nothing threatens the security and the survival of a society as gravely as the self-righteous certainty that one idea, one philosophy or one political group is synonymous with truth or patriotism. We are learning anew the wisdom of one of our most distinguished jurists, Learned Hand, who observed that "the spirit of liberty is the spirit that is not too certain that it is right." No single part of a pluralistic society is ever the sole guardian of its national interest. No single leader or party can be assumed to represent the public will of society as a whole. None of us, as politicians, should ever be certain that we are absolutely correct -- about the future of America, of South Africa, or of any country in the world. Such certitude is morally arrogant, politically unwise, and ideologically inimical to the free expression of ideas and the full protection of basic human rights that are the very foundation of a secure and democratic society.

In my view, the best way to oppose communism is to strengthen democracy. The pillars of national security must rest on the foundation of social justice and individual liberty for all men and women, whatever their origin, race, color or creed. As the late Senator Robert Kennedy said so eloquently in a speech he delivered in Cape Town in 1966, "The way of opposition to

communism is not to imitate its dictatorship, but to enlarge individual human freedom -- in our own countries and all over the globe ... the denial of freedom, in whatever name, only strengthens the very communism it claims to oppose." This, he reminded us, calls above all for courage, for every ten men who are willing to face the guns of an enemy there is only one willing to brave the disapproval of his fellows, the censure of his colleagues, the wrath of his society. "Moral courage", Senator Kennedy observed, "is a rarer commodity than bravery in battle or great intelligence."

It will therefore take great moral courage and a deep and abiding commitment to the fundamental values of democracy and justice to change this part of the world which is yielding most painfully to change. I am convinced, however, that this is what will be required for South Africa, Rhodesia, and Namibia to be fully accepted as contributing members of the Free World. No society can be regarded as free when eighty percent of its native born population is deprived of basic human freedoms. No society can be regarded as free when its government is not based on the consent of the governed nor is accountable to the people it governs. And no society can rest assured that it can defend itself against the threat of external aggression when it is itself so deeply flawed by philosophies, laws, and institutions founded on inequality and injustice.

The United States has experienced two centuries of a still continuing struggle to erase the evils of prejudice and discrimination. So I do not come here in a spirit of self-righteousness. We have come a long way. And we still have a long way to go. But we have made substantial progress. If there is one lesson that we have learned from our own painful experience that we might pass on to others, it is that justice and security are not divisible. For a society to be truly strong, it must also be truly free. In any contest between a closed society and an open one, it is the closed society that is threatened by the ideas, the values, the institutions and the way of life that a free society offers. Freedom is an irresistible appeal that neither fascism nor communism can adequately combat. Partial freedoms or partial societies can only offer partial security.

That is why American foreign policy toward South Africa is undergoing change. In a sense, our policy is both a test of our own commitment to the defence of our constitutional values and, on the other hand, a reflection of the national debate in my country about the best way to defend freedom throughout the globe. If we welcome South Africa and all other countries as full and equal partners of the Free World, it should not be because of their mineral resources, their strategic geographical locations, or even their historic or cultural connections. Rather, we should welcome them because they, like the United States, represent the affirmative principles that provide the best weapons against tyranny. To support dictatorship, injustice, racial supremacy and economic privilege in the name of anti-communism, national security or cultural identity is only to fertilize the breeding grounds for communism and racial conflict. This, in my judgement, is neither in the interests of the United States, the Western alliance, or the Free World.

It is not for us to prescribe or dictate how other countries conduct their internal affairs. But we have a right -- indeed an obligation -- to defend the interests of the Free World and to preserve what are, for us, basic constitutional freedoms and universal rights of mankind. Southern Africa, as former Prime Minister John Vorster reminded us in his New Year's speech last year, is at a crossroads. It is for you to decide whether you can contribute to and receive protection from the Free World by solving the deep racial and ideological

problems you currently confront. Your self-examination, like ours, could have a major impact on the strength and direction of the Free World as a whole. And then you might discover anew that ancient wisdom: "When a man's ways please the Lord, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him."

## DISCUSSION

Senator McGovern's Answers to Questions after his Address:

Q. In your speech you mentioned freedom and the free world, and I think we need some elaboration of this. When we look at the free world, we see it diminishing on a daily basis with very little reaction from your country.

A. Let me try as best I can to define what the free world means to me. I would begin by suggesting what it does not mean. It is not defined purely in terms of what we are against, i.e. the kind of banner-waving anti-communism in which the U.S. and other countries in the free world are invited to contribute their young men and their resources to defence of a country simply because it announces that it is opposed to Moscow or opposed to Peking. I do not happen to approve the ideology that is preached in Moscow or Peking, but neither do I want my son to die or my country to use its resources trying to bail out corrupt, unjust and unfree governments that claim our support and our substance purely because they are anti-communist. This is the mistake that cost us so heavily in South East Asia, where for ten years young Americans bled and died in the name of "advancing freedom", as a result of the mistaken notion that, because we were killing communists, because we were fighting communists, we were somehow enlarging the areas of freedom.

What I am appealing for here is something more positive than that, for a recognition that the best way to combat not only communism - but also other forms of tyranny, fascism, the extremes on both the left and the right, that make impossible conditions of freedom - is to enlarge the areas of social, economic and political justice for those people who otherwise become easy targets of communist appeal.

I said in Rhodesia a few days ago, in answer to a question, "What country in Africa is a model of democracy?", that I did not see any model of democracy. I do not see any model of democracy in my own country or in Western Europe. What I see are countries going through a continuing struggle to define and to redefine the terms of freedom, to enlarge the areas of economic, political and social justice.

And that to me is the business in which the free world ought to be engaged. The free world ought not to be trying to rescue the Francos, the Pinochets, the Salazars and other authoritarian figures that I think set the stage for the very revolutions that you deplore.

Q. Senator McGovern has mentioned that he does not wish to prescribe to South Africa what line it should take to bring justice to the 80% of its population who have no say in the running of the country. I have heard the same type of statement from Secretary of State Vance, from the present US Ambassador to this country and from his predecessor, who have also said that the United States does not wish to impose a timetable, a blueprint or a framework for South Africa.

I accept this for what it is worth. Now, whether or not we agree with the idea of the homelands becoming independent, the fact of the matter is that two homelands have thus far, on their own, opted for independence, and two others are toying with the idea. Why then is it difficult for the US Administration to recognise the Transkei and Bophuthatswana?

A. Well, our position is that, if there were a free choice on the part of the peoples in those so-called homelands and if that is what they desire, we would have no objection to it. What we object to are people being expelled from the country where they were born, which they consider to be their homeland, which they hold precious, and being forced by a government in which they do not have a vote to move into an alien territory that is suddenly described as their homeland. Very few people, black or white, appreciate that kind of arbitrary decision over their lives. Now, if a legitimate election were held in which the people voluntarily opted for that kind of a choice, for a homeland, we would have no objection to it. We do not, however, see evidence that full freedom of choice has been involved in this situation.

Q. Senator McGovern, relating to the issue of the homelands, how would you look at the situation of the Indians in the United States?

A. I think it is absolutely deplorable. It is a dark and embarrassing chapter in the history of the American people. It is especially embarrassing and painful to me coming from a State, South Dakota, where I see, every time I return to my home State, what discrimination has done to the original Americans. And it is a dark stain on freedom in America that we have so abused the original residents of this great country of ours. We have shattered a proud culture. We have discriminated against a once proud people. We have broken their morale and we have forced them into homelands in the least desirable parts of our country. In a sense, we have also reduced them to second and third class citizenship. I come here to confess this as perhaps the darkest and most deplorable chapter in the history of human relations in the United States.

Q. Senator McGovern, am I right in thinking that you believe there is a correlation between the threat of external aggression and the issue of equality and racial justice in South Africa?

A. I think that in any society the appeal of subversion, whether from without or within, is enhanced by conditions of racism and injustice. Yes, that is precisely what I mean. I do not think the communists can made headway in any society where conditions of justice, freedom and economic opportunity for all the people prevail. There is no chance at all that communism is going to gain any significant foothold in the United States - not because we are a perfect society, but because we have painfully, over a long period of time, addressed some of the pockets of distress, of injustice, of inequality, to the point where I think American people of all races and creeds have begun to see that there is an opportunity for advancement and for control over their own lives that does not require a surrender to communism or fascism or any other authoritarian system. But I would also suggest to you that every society that denies equality, opportunity and participation to any sizeable element in its population, is that much more vulnerable to the insidious appeal of communism.

Q. Senator McGovern has said that raw materials and strategic importance should not be a criterion for American friendship with any country. However, Nigeria (which we all know has a military dictatorship) is America's second largest oil supplier, and it was President Carter's first port of call in Africa.



Secondly, we all know the type of democracy that prevails in Saudi Arabia, the principal supplier of oil to the United States. The US supplies Saudi Arabia with the most sophisticated aircraft and other war equipment, because that country is anti-communist. Thirdly, Iran is the third largest supplier of oil to the United States. We know the Shah has some good points, but we also know the sort of democracy that prevails in that country. And, finally, there is the Senator's forthcoming visit to Angola. We know America is busy trying to apply pressure on all sorts of people to see that Savimbi of UNITA, who appears to be quite democratic in his approach (at least more democratic than Dr. Neto has ever been), is deprived of (military) equipment.

The point I wish to make is that America appears to practice double standards when it comes to its global strategic interests, and especially when it comes to oil.

A. First of all, let me concede a major part of the point just made, namely that American foreign policy has been inconsistently applied in recent years. And, as I think I made clear in my opening remarks here, it is this willingness to concede too quickly to the demands of strategic mineral requirements, to concede too quickly to the short-term advantage of wrapping our arms around an anti-communist society, no matter what else it stands for, that has led us to the painful necessity of re-examing and re-defining where we are going in the world today.

Let me illustrate what I mean, using one of the examples you cited. Of all the countries you mentioned, far and away the biggest recipient of American arms in the name of free world security has been Iran. That country leads all of the others you mentioned by a wide margin as the possessor of American armaments. Iran is easily our best customer for the purchase of sophisticated American military equipment. We sold it partly because of the oil interest in Iran and, I suspect, partly because the Shah has been in the forefront of those claiming to be defenders of the free world against communism. But what is happening in Iran today? Is it a sure and a safe depository of the values of the free world? Is it even capable, with all of the military equipment we have supplied, of providing for its own internal security? Is it capable of withstanding the destabilizing and security-threatening forces that are moving in that country today, with all of the sophisticated equipment it has? What this suggests to me is that even the best in American arms that we can supply, even the closest relationship in terms of the purchase of oil and the recognition of strategic and mineral interests is not enough to guarantee the security of that country, if Iran does not address the internal demands of freedom for its own people. This all, it seems to me, only underscores the point I am making. I do not come here tonight to defend every aspect of American foreign policy. I do not come here to hold up our country as a model to the world. I do not come here to suggest that we have always been consistent and clear in the signals that we have sent, either to friend or foe. Rather I am trying to think through with you the common problems that we share, of societies in transition, societies that are trying to find some way to reconcile our own desire for security and safety and stability, on the one hand, with the pressing and urgent claims for freedom of those who have been too long deprived, on the other. This is the thesis that I would like to leave with you tonight.

Q. Senator McGovern has spoken at some length tonight about the merits of democracy. I am sure that most of us here would not wish to argue about this. But let me ask him to be more specific: Given South Africa's particular and difficult circumstances and the fact that democracy is nowhere perfect, not even in the U.S.A., what would he advise us to do?

A. Personally, and I think I speak for the Government, although I am not here as an official spokesman for the US Government, I would like to see one thing above all

others from our friends in South Africa (and we do regard South Africa as a friend). I would like to see the people of this country engaged in a steady, sure and visible march towards full participation of all its citizens in the political process. I would underscore here again something that was referred to in one of the earlier questions. It is not mere rhetoric on our part when we say we do not propose to dictate the timetable. We understand that there are historical and cultural differences in this society, and that there are very stubborn practical problems to deal with that are not characteristic of my own country.

So, we do not set a timetable. We do not come with a mathematical formula. We would simply like to see evidence that the Government and the people of this great country are committed to the patient, slow but certain progress towards full participation in the political and economic benefits of South Africa, so that all its citizens can one day look forward to the time when they can claim to be full first-class citizens. That, I think, is what we would like to see on behalf of South Africa.

Q. Money can be used for two purposes, that is, for military and economic progress. We do not particularly want American arms, but we would certainly like American economic support for what we would like to achieve in South Africa. Will Senator McGovern take that sentiment back to the U.S. and can we expect a relaxation of restrictions presently imposed by the United States on trade with South Africa?

A. I think that a relaxation of trade restrictions will come when we see evidence of the kind of progress that I talked about in the previous answer. I am not here tonight to recommend the pullout of any corporations which are here; I am here as a member of the Congress that voted that American corporations should follow the Sullivan (employment practices) Code, in the relations they have with their own employees. I support the restrictions that have been placed on the use of Eximbank credits to support projects that we think in a sense endorse the concept of apartheid. But, if South Africa moves, as I think many of its people want it to move, in the direction of enlarging the areas of freedom and political participation, I would be the first to call for a relaxation of restraints on investment or on other forms of economic relations with South Africa.

Q. Senator, if you are sincere in saying that you would welcome any change towards a democratic system in any country in Africa, and you mentioned South Africa, how would you then explain America's hesitancy in accepting the internal settlement in Rhodesia, which will be based on a democratic election? Why is there some hesitancy in giving your blessing to change that is taking place in that country, which is based on democratic principles?

A. Let me attempt to define what I believe to be the position of our Government with regard to the internal settlement. We do not think it is the kind of arrangement that is going to bring about an end to the war in Rhodesia. We do not think it follows the principles laid down in the Anglo-American plan that we felt held out such hopes - for a termination of the military struggle and for initiating the kind of all-party conference and elections that would restore some degree of stability in Rhodesia. Our principle objection to the internal settlement is the very practical one that it has been totally rejected by the external forces that are challenging that Government.

Now, speaking for myself, I think it does represent a substantial step forward from where the Rhodesian Government was several years ago. Unfortunately the Government's offer was not made at a time when it might have been more readily accepted by the parties that form the Patriotic Front. We tried to work out an

arrangement that would bring not only Mr. Smith and the internal parties that are allied with him into a conference and into an election, but that would also hold out some hope for peace in Rhodesia. We also tried to use what influence we had through the Frontline States to bring along the revolutionary leaders who were challenging that Government. We still think that is the best way to arrive at a settlement in Rhodesia. I realize that neither we nor the British nor anyone else can dictate a solution in Rhodesia. But we do have the right to put forward suggestions that we think are practical, that hold out some hope for bringing an end to the fighting.

I came away from Rhodesia feeling that events have reached the stage there today where it is much harder for the United States or anyone else to put forward a proposal that is going to be accepted by the parties that are now in conflict. Even if the United States were to recognise the internal settlement, even if we were to go ahead, I see no evidence that this would end the bloodshed that is now tearing that country apart. Quite the contrary, I think we would see an intensification of the military struggle. You would see whatever government that is elected under those conditions attacked by those who were excluded, and so the war would continue. Accordingly I think it is the better part of valour for us not to endorse only one side in the conflict at this stage, but to continue to do what we can to serve as a mediator in bringing the parties together in some kind of meaningful conference.

I emphasise again that I make these observations with some degree of pessimism. The longer one stays in Rhodesia, the more one realises the complexity and the difficulty of getting any solution accepted.

Q. Senator, your subject tonight was "South Africa and the Free World", and you indicated that you would like to be able to welcome us into that free world, but only when we could show that all the citizens of this country were making some progress in the direction of full participation in the political and economic structure of South Africa. My question to you is, bearing in mind relations in Africa between the United States and some other African countries which are not democracies : How do you feel the double standards applied by the United States, and particularly by the United Nations, can be justified?

A. Let me say that I think in the case of the countries you have mentioned, we have applied exactly the standards which I have suggested, namely some evidence of progress towards enlarging the areas of participation in the life of those countries. Obviously there is a vast variation in the range of countries you mention, and I have said repeatedly here tonight that I fully recognise that we have not in recent years always applied our foreign policy standard consistently around the globe. I do not think it is necessary for me to repeat again that we are not asking for models of perfection. We are asking, as a condition of American support, as a condition of investing our own prestige and our own resources in assisting other countries, that they give us some evidence that they are enlarging the areas of participation in those societies on the part of their own peoples.

I personally think that such enlargement of participation has taken place in African countries. But in Uganda above all others there is a situation that we find deplorable. By an almost unanimous vote the Congress of the United States, once confronted with the evidence of what was going on in Uganda, voted to apply full sanctions against that country. We have not applied sanctions against South Africa, and I do not advocate sanctions against South Africa. All we have suggested is that our Government should not, as official policy, encourage the expansion of investment in this country, until we see some evidence that there is also an expansion of the degree of political participation.

Q. Senator McGovern, what is the United States doing to get South Africa's external enemies off our backs now, so that we can develop in the line of freedom?

A. I would say that there would be considerably more enthusiasm in the United States for joining with South Africa in defence of this country in the event of attacks and of a real threat from the outside, if there were some evidence that the Government and people of South Africa had made all possible efforts to enlist the support and the confidence and participation of their own people. I do not know what you expect of us, in answer to your question as to what we will do to help you against your external enemies that are threatening you from abroad. However, I can assure you that there would be enthusiasm for coming to your defence, if the danger that you have indicated materialises, if we felt that we were truly battling side by side with a full member of the free world.

Q. The Senator has implied that the United States does not apply pressure. The latest Anglo-American recommendations for Rhodesia state that Rhodesia ought to be governed by a council consisting of 50% of members of the Transitional Government and 50% of the Patriotic Front. I submit that there is no evidence whatsoever, and I refer to the black people of Rhodesia, that 50 or 30 or even 20% support the terrorists of Mugabe and Nkomo.

A. I hope that the implication of those observations is not that I am sympathetic to the Patriotic Front or any other particular faction in Rhodesia. I said earlier today at another venue that one of the most interesting observations we heard in Rhodesia (passed on to one of the reporters in our party) was from an experienced journalist in Rhodesia, who said that the more one looked at the claims of the various parties in Rhodesia, the more one thought they were all right - not a hundred percent right, but that all (the Rhodesian participants) have some insight, all of them have some legitimate grievance and some claim that they are attempting to put forward what needs to be heard.

Now, I suppose that is another way of saying they are all partially wrong, that not one of them has a monopoly on the truth, that can embrace all of the aspirations and all of the concerns of that country. That is the real reason why the United States attempts, through its good offices, to bring all the parties into a conference where they could sit down and work out the terms of a settlement. I would concede to you readily that we cannot map out a detailed blueprint of what would emerge from such a conference. I do not know how to apportion blame for the fact that the conference is not being held; that is difficult to assess. It sometimes appears that Mr. Mugabe and Mr. Nkomo are willing to enter into such negotiations and that the (Rhodesian) Government is unwilling. Then again, it now appears to be the other way around. We get conflicting reports about it. But what I would say about Rhodesia is that we know we cannot spell out a detailed blueprint for the future of any country. Working with the British, we thought we had spelled out the terms under which a conference could at least begin, and that the parties sitting around the conference table would then hammer out the outline they thought was acceptable, under which a constitution could be written and an election held. But I do not think there is any disposition in the United States to try to impose an American solution on Rhodesia.

I must tell you that everywhere we went in Rhodesia and in other parts of Africa, we met thoughtful people urging precisely that course on us, that either

the United States or Britain or both should simply take the reins in their hands and impose a solution, if necessary through a military presence, on Rhodesia. That is not, of course, politically acceptable in the U.S. No American Government could sustain that kind of policy. I doubt if any British Government could.

Thus I close here on the note that I have sounded so many times this evening: We are not attempting to force an American solution on any country. There are certain principles that we think represent the minimum that will open the way for the people of individual countries to make their own choice. And it is that freedom and self-determination, that freedom of national choice in which the citizens of the country freely participate, which I at least would hope would be at the very centre of American policy and American influence everywhere in the world.