



3

SALIM AHMED SALIM/LECTURE(S) NOTES

LECTURES/SEMINAR

KWA: MAKAMANDA WA NGAZI ZA JUU WA JESHI - CHUO CHA TAIFA
CHA UONGOZI MONDULI

TO: (SENIOR COMMANDERS OF THE TPDF, CHUO CHA TAIFA CHA
UONGOZI MONDULI)

MADA: TANZANIA NA SIASA YA MATAIFA MAKUBWA

SUBJECT: (TANZANIA AND THE POLICIES OF THE GREAT POWERS)

TAREHE: ALHAMISI, DESEMBA 30, 1982

DATE: (THURSDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1982)

I. *DEFINING* THE GREAT POWERS: WHO ARE THEY? WHY AND
HOW THEY ACQUIRED THAT STATUS

(a) DEFINITION

It is difficult to have a clear cut definition of a great power except for the obvious Super Powers i. e. the USA, the USSR and very close to these two ranks the Peoples Republic of CHINA.



- 2 -

It is accepted that among the determinant factors include the following:

- (i) Historical circumstances
- (ii) Military Power
- (iii) Economic might
- (iv) Political Power
- (v) Global role and/or "responsibilities".

(b) The Five Big Powers

For the purpose of this discussion we shall refer to those countries which have been so recognized as great powers in the Charter of the United Nations and which have been given special role in the maintenance of international peace and security. These are the Five Permanent Members of the Security Council namely: The USA, the USSR, CHINA, FRANCE and the United Kingdom.

to

(c) The Big Five and how they conform/the "CRITERIA" of being Great Powers

(i) Historical criterion

The Emergence of the 'Institutionalised predominance' of the Big Five is the product of the Second World War.

Britain, France (which was itself ^{occupied} accepted), the USA and the USSR fought as allies against the Axis Powers (Germany, Italy and Japan). As the victorious powers they dictated the terms of a peace settlement that followed. When the United Nations was formed at Lake Success in San Francisco in 1945, the victorious powers gave themselves the special 'privilege'

.../3



- 4 -

Expenditure on Armaments

The amount spent on armaments is staggering. The military expenditures as a percentage of their Gross domestic Product (GDP) for 1981 are as follows:

U. S. A. 5.8%

USSR 9.1% for 1979 according to the Swedish SIPRI Estimates
(but Soviet official sources put the estimates for that year as
3.9%)

U. K. 5%

France 4.2%

CHINA - Figure not available.

^{World}
The Military Expenditures for these same powers for 1980 were:

U. S. A. - US \$111 billion

USSR - US \$107 billion

FRANCE-US \$19 billion

UK - US \$16 billion

CHINA - Figure not available

N. B.

From the Military view Point the USA and the USSR are the acknowledged powers. Their Nuclear and Conventional Arsenals are enough to destroy the world several times over.

- The statistics on military expenditure clearly reflect the disproportion of EXPENDITURE between the Two Super Powers and the other three.
- The case of FRG
- Yet it is important to bear in mind that if military expenditure were the



- 3 -

of being Permanent Members of the Security Council and with it the power to Veto any substantive decision of the Council.

Ironically, the case of China then under Chiang Kai-Shek was propped up by the United States., China which was itself under Japanese occupation, had fought among the allies. The nationalists who ruled Peking were not *ONLY* thought of as representatives of a potential Great Power but were above all considered close allies of the United States. Washington had miscalculated and had not contemplated the possibility of MaoTse-Tung's victory over the Kuomintang rulers. When the Peoples Republic of China was proclaimed in 1949, the US struggled and succeeded for more than 21 years in depriving the PRC from ~~assuming~~ its rightful role in the UN. The fiction of Taiwan's rulers being the representatives of China only collapsed in 1971 when PRC's rights were restored.

(ii) The Military Criterion

From the military view point all the Big Five are militarily ~~power~~ powerful. Among the characteristic features of their military arsenals the following need to be emphasized:

- (a) all ^{ARE} ~~the~~ nuclear powers;
- (b) all have some of the most up-to-date weapons and armaments;
- (c) all have vast armies, Navies and powerful airforce;
- (d) with the exception of China all have military bases or presence in foreign countries;
- (e) all and especially the two Super powers, the USA and USSR spend colossal sums on armaments.

only determining criteria to 'elevate' a power into a status of a Great Power than West Germany (FRG) would easily qualify over France and the UK. For the FRG outstrips both France and the UK as it spends in 1980 the Sum of US dollars 22 billion.

(iii) The Economic Criterion

While it is true that all the Big Five have basically either strong economies or potential strong economies (the latter case especially applies to the PRC), it is equally true that measured purely on an economic strength and performance there are some who are outside this club who do infinitely better. Japan's economic might is a case in point. It is not for nothing that Japan is dubbed an economic Super Power. The FRG's economy is also in a better shape than that of the UK and France. In fact if one uses the economic performance criterion (which the UN uses in its scale of assessment to the contribution of its budget) one notes that:-

U. S. A.	contributes	25%	of the Budget
USSR	"	11.10%	of the Budget
France	"	6.26%	"
U. K.	"	4.46%	:
China	"	1.62%	"

Interestingly enough FRG contributes 8.31%, while Japan contributes 9.58% of the budget. They contribute more than UK, France and China (which are Permanent Security Council members). China used to contribute 5% of the budget when its rights were restored in 1971 but had to accept the realistic assessment on the performance of its economy.

(iv) The Political Criterion

The Political criterion is influenced by the military and economic .../6

criteria. Thus it is not a clear cut criterion. The more military power a country has, the more political clout it has; the more economic power, the greater the political influence. This is reflected in the international system which reserves special privileges for the big powers e. g. special weighted voting in international financial institutions, the Veto power in the Security Council etc.

ψ (v) Global Role and or 'Responsibilities'

As earlier stated, with the exception of China, all other Great powers are involved militarily beyond their borders. Some have given themselves the role of international gendarmes. The Western Powers have dominant role in most third world countries while the USSR has "a protective" umbrella over most of Eastern Europe besides being involved in places like Afghanistan.

Summing up the determinants of a Great Power

Thus in terms of determining a great power, the dynamic international situation makes it difficult to define. For example in the 19th and early part of the 20th^{CENTURY}, the UK was the world's mightiest military and naval power - to the extent that the jingoism of the sun never setting on the British Empire developed. Then after WW₂ the UK declined and was overtaken by USA and USSR. The same was the case for France.

In sum the great powers of the post WW₂ are a historical de facto situation inherited by the international community. Because of the inbuilt system in the UN Charter, we are faced with a static situation which cannot be changed without the consent of the five.

II. THE INTERNATIONAL SETTING: the Nature of the International situation

In assessing the policies of the GREAT POWERS it is imperative to understand and evaluate the nature of the international situation. For it is amidst such an international setting that these powers, like the rest of the world, operate.

In historical context the following factors need to be taken into account:

(a) The Cold War and the Bipolar World

No sooner had the war ended the allies during the war developed mutual suspicious, recriminations and confrontation; the US accused the USSR of expansionism in Eastern Europe and of meddling in the Greek civil war; US sought to 'contain' Soviet expansionism. This policy of containment was given effect in both military and economic terms. The Marshall Plan (after Secretary of State George C. Marshall) under which US \$12 billion was provided for the recovery of Europe, was launched.

The enemies of yesterday became the allies of post war. Japan and the FRG ^{WERE} ~~was~~ rehabilitated and assisted to develop.

In April 1949, 12 Western powers led by the US established the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to "defend the Western alliance."

In May 1955, the Warsaw Treaty Organization was signed by the USSR and her East European allies.

- By then the Cold War was in full swing and it was to last through-out the 1950s. And during the period a bipolar distribution of power in the world emerged.

-This was a period of constant crises and confrontation e. g. : the Berlin crisis.

(b) The Emergence of New Centres of Powers: From a BIPOLAR TO A MULTIPOLAR WORLD

(i) The Emergence of China, Japan, the EEC and to a lesser extent the third world (through the Non-aligned Movement) transformed a bipolar into a multipolar world;

(ii) In the context of the new nations the significant era of decolonization and other factors led to the growth of UN Membership from 51 (at the time of the UN's founding) to 157 (in 1982).

(c) The Era of detente

- Subsequent to the 1962 Missile crisis.
- Peaceful co-existence was essentially KRUSCHEV's contribution though subsequently vigorously pursued by Brezhnev.
- Yet despite detente, the arms race and Super power involvement in regional conflicts had continued unabated.

(d) The collapse of old alliances and Myths: The Sino-Soviet split

- One of the significant events of the international situation in the early 1960s was the rupture of the USSR - PRC alliance;



- 9 -

- the transformation of erstwhile allies to militant opponents had far reaching political and geopolitical repercussions
- At the political level the myth of a monolithic International Communist System was shattered;
- Geopolitically the confrontation between the USSR and China altered to not an insignificant degree the balance of power.

(e) The US/USSR/CHINA chess game

- How the US has attempted to play the China card-
- The reaction of the USSR to this (N. B. the two communist giants have thousands of miles of common border. Over $\frac{1}{2}$ a million some soldiers with most up to date equipment and armaments deployed.
- The Talk of USSR pre-empties STRIKE against the PRC;
- How the USSR has tried to woo China;
- How the PRC - post Mao - under Teng Hsiao-ping has been trying to play the USSR card in the advert of the policies of Reagan towards Taiwan.

(f) The Return of the Cold War: East-West Confrontation

- (i) The Arms Race and Reagan's doctrine of US military supremacy and its repercussions;
- (ii) The collapse of SALT II in the wake of the U. S. Senate's refusal to ratify it during the Carter Administration and its rejection by the Reagan Administration.

(g) Hotbeds of Tension

POLAND

AFGHANISTAN (Both these have cold war connotations)



- 10 -

The Middle East Conflict

The Gulf situation ^{and} of the three ^{to} at the oil supplies; (the meaning of the US's Rapid Deployment Force)

Central America

Southern Africa

The Horn of Africa

The South East Asian Situation with special reference to Kampuchea

The International Economic crisis with particular emphasis on the plight of the developing countries.

(h) Changes of leadership in the Big Five: What prospects for changes towards greater cooperation?

- (i) The Reagan Administration perhaps the most ideological of U. S. administrations in the post war era: are the accusations of being hawkish justified?

N. B.

What lessons can we draw from U. S. involvement in Central America. Does the US still believe in enforcing the 1823 Monroe doctrine of turning Latin America into a US backyard.

(ii) The Andropov Era

Are the speculations that he is likely to be more 'reasonable' in the context of East-West relations justified

- an intellectual and a former Head of the KGB - are these qualities favouring a more realistic and less militaristic posture

.../11

(N. B. It is important to stress that the USSR genuinely loathes war. It lost 20 million people during World War II)

(iii) The Post MAO-ERA

The priorities of Deng, Ho Yubang and Zhao Ziyang towards modernisation.

(iv) The Mitterand Era

A Socialist President in France: What difference does it make in terms of France's international role

(v) The "Iron Lady's" Times

What role for Britain. A more assertive role notwithstanding Britain's obvious limitations? What conclusions can we draw on the Falkland Islands/Malvinas crisis and war?

III. TANZANIA'S RELATIONS WITH THE GREAT POWERS

(a) General Principles

Tanzania's relations with the Great powers are based on certain general principles which form an indispensable part of our foreign policy principles and objectives. These include:

- ~~Safeguarding~~ Safeguarding of our independence and promoting the welfare of our people;
- Promoting the Freedom and Unity of our continent and thus our total support to the African liberation Movements against colonialism and racism;
- Practising genuine non-alignment and thus "refusing our friends to choose our enemies for us";
- Opposition to the policies and practices of injustice and great power domination of the weak at the Universal level thus our opposition for example to the US

intervention in Vietnam or USSR's intervention in Afghanistan.

It is our commitment and adherence to these principles which quite often has led us into conflictual positions with some of the Great powers. Our African policies; our genuine non-alignment and our internal policies of socialism and self reliance have on many occasions incurred the displeasure of some of the Western Powers. The price of principles has at times been heavy in terms of denial of much needed economic assistance. But as Mwalimu reminded us in his memorandum "Principles and Development," "Man does not live by bread alone."

(b) "Big Powers have no permanent Friends"

In our dealings with the Great powers we have always had to be circumspect conscious of the fact it would be foolhardy to totally ignore the somewhat cynical statement made by Lord Salisbury that "great powers have permanent interests and not permanent friends."

For, experience has demonstrated, that more often than not what Lord Salisbury has said sums up the philosophy of great powers - capitalists or Socialists. Few examples would help to elaborate the point.

The United States of America. The United States of America had been good friends of Haile Sellasie's Ethiopia. They had economic and military links. When the Emperor was overthrown, the progressive Government was courted by the Soviets who had been friendly to Somalia, Ethiopia's arch foe. Despite \$1 billion in weapons and technical assistance the Soviets abandoned the Berbera naval base for the greater prize (Ethiopia) while USA filled the

vacuum by befriending Somalia. In ~~EXXX~~ Egypt, Sadat in 1972 expelled 20,000 Soviet military and technical advisers and abrogated the friendship treaty. He then invited the Americans with whom Egypt has held joint military exercises under the RDF.

This concept of permanent interests is not confined to relations between great and small powers. As stated earlier, the USSR was an ally of the three great Western powers during WW2 to defeat Germany, Italy, and Japan. But after the war, the three Western Allied powers helped in the reconstruction of Germany, Italy and Japan.

(c) Relations with the UK, US and France

(i) The Historical setting

The UK was the colonial power ruling both Tanganyika and Zanzibar. The League Mandate gave administering power to Britain over Tanganyika and when the UN was formed Britain became the administering power under the trusteeship system.

Because of this colonial link, the British tended to expect ex-colonies to fall in her sphere of influence automatically. The same was the case with ex French territories. Thus when newly independent countries like Tanzania tried to assert their independence by moving from this Western sphere of influence to befriending the Eastern countries in order to be genuinely non aligned, the west misunderstood this and thought communism was creeping in.

And yet the truth is that Tanzania like most developing countries - former colonies - have not really extricated themselves from dependency on the West. They basically remain in many ways an extension of the



Western sphere influence. The Western powers nonetheless (particularly in the 1960s) have tended to view critically and at times with vehement opposition any trend tending to move to a more independent position.

(ii) The Western Changing Perception of Tanzania

In the period of the mid 1960s and particularly the period between 1964 - 1967 the Western major powers perception of Tanzania took a rather dramatic change. Instead of considering us as "moderate and responsible" they gave us all sort of names but in a nutshell amounty^{ing} to their disenchantment because in their perception we were going communist.

Three factors inter alia contributed to this, these were (a) Our Relations with CHINA; (b) the Arusha Declaration and (c) Our quarrels with three~~x~~ Western powers namely the Federal Republic of Germany, the UK and the USA. This last point merits a more detailed examination if only as a matter of historical interest.

(iii) Quarrel with West Germany

- (a) In the aftermath of the Zanzibar Revolution the GDR established an Embassy in Zanzibar - the first GDR Embassy in Africa.
- (b) Subsequent to the Union, the Government of the URTZ decided with effect from February 1965 to close the GDR Embassy in Zanzibar but allowed the GDR to open a consulate General in Dar es Salaam. Since this was a Union of sovereign states the Union Government showed greater sensitivity to the FRG (for other wise having inherited the Embassy in Zanzibar it should have allowed it to operate in the capital of the Union Government)

(c) The GDR was unhappy but made no noise. They accepted a diminished and yet a new status (as far^{as} the mainland was concerned where they had no representation);

(d) But the FRG₁ reaction was both negative and unduly melodramatic.

- They took a Unilateral action of breaking a Five Year training and aid agreement with our Air Wing and threatened to terminate all aid unless our Government rescinded its decision;
- They tried to insist on the scrupulous application of the so called Hallstein doctrine even if such application meant jeopardising Tanzania's own unity; (By this doctrine, FRG would have no diplomatic relations with any country which maintains relations with the GDR. The only exception was the USSR with whom the FRG had established diplomatic relations. Hallstein was in the 1950s first Secretary of State in Chancellour Adenauer's office and later Secretary of State in the Foreign office).

(e) Tanzania's response to all this was swift and unequivocal. Mwalimu asked Bonn to terminate all its remaining aid in the country.

- This was an important assertion of our country's sovereignty.

(iv) Turbulent Phase of our Relations with the United States

(a) The US negative attitude towards the Zanzibar Revolution;

- Zanzibar was so concerned about U. S. designs and intentions and at about the possibility of U. S. intervention that its Foreign Minister instructed Zanzibar's Permanent Representative to the UN to call for an emergency meeting of the Security Council to the fact that it was later decided not to do so does not alter the depth of Zanzibar's suspicious at that time.;



- 16 -

- (b) The Union Government accusation that the US was plotting to subvert the Union Government: Re: statement made by the Foreign Minister of the URTZ in November, 1964;
- (c) The US/Belgian Intervention in Staneteyville
Mwalimu in condemning this act compared it to the Treachery at Pearl Harbour "In an action reminiscent of Pearl~~X~~ Harbour, Foreign troops were flown to the Congo at the very moment that negotiations were taking place to secure the safety of all" (Here Mwalimu was referring to the negotiations then under way in Nairobi between US Ambassador William A~~F~~wood and the Governor of Gizenga's Foreign Minister Thomas Kanza).
- (d) The carlucci/Gordon Affair
Carlucci was US Charge d'Affairs in Zanzibar while Gordon was Counsellor in the US Embassy in Dar es Salaam.
- In January 1965 the Union Government declared them Person⁵ Non Grata for being implicated in attempting to subvert the Zanzibar Government;
 - Despite Tanzania's efforts to explain to the US that we regarded the action of the two as being personal, Washington retaliated by expelling Counsellor Herbert Katua of our Embassy in Washington and recalling their Ambassador Mr. William Leonhart
 - Tanzania in turn recalled US Ambassador (the late) Othman Sharif.
- (e) Tanzania's constant opposition and condemnation of "US aggression" in Vietnam.

V. DIPLOMATIC BREAK ~~XXX~~ WITH BRITAIN

- In October 1965 Tanzania severed diplomatic relations with the UK because of the latter's handling of the Rhodesian rebellion.
- The decision was in conformity with the OAU decision. This was our decision for the 'honour of AFRICA. (But only Eight other countries complied with the OAU decision, these were Egypt, Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Congo (Brazzaville), Algeria and Sudan).
- This was not an easy decision for Tanzania to take. At the material time the UK had given more economic aid to Tanzania than any other country. In retaliation, the UK froze an interest free loan of £7.5 million. This loan was never restored even when diplomatic relations were re-established. A new and different aid package had to be negotiated with the British.

The Rhodesian question surfaced again in Tanzania's relations with the UK when the Tory Government of Mrs. Thatcher came into power in 1979. Our efforts to ensure the nationalists who had fought a protracted armed struggle were not robbed of their rights led to more misunderstanding.

v. Relations with France

(a) Background

Because of historical events, Tanzania did not have close relations with France because the latter had more interest in Francophone Africa. But because of the role of de Gaulle and Giscard d'Estaing in African affairs, there have been quarrels with France. France tried to create the French community in Africa. But Sekou Toure rejected it and opted for independence. Subsequent activities of France were not helpful. The Algerian war which lasted till 1962 was seen as a harbinger of sinister French designs in Africa. The Congo events and the neo-colonial situation France maintained in Francophone Africa did not provide room for close relations.



(b) The Mitterand Era

It was the coming into power of the Socialists and Mitterand that created the right atmosphere for good relations with Tanzania. Currently the French are involved in several projects in Tanzania including the Dar airport expansion project. It must however be pointed out that towards the end of the term of office of President Giscard D'Estang relations between Tanzania and France had began to warm up. The French Head of State had invited Mwalimu to pay a state visit. Because of circumstances beyond control Mwalimu was only able to do so after the last of Presidential elections in France. The elections which saw Mitterand emerging victorious. It should also be stated that the Dar es Salaam airport project was a legacy of the Giscard de Estang's era.

- One clear factor which has helped improve relations with Mitterand's France is that administration greater sensitivity to African problems and aspirations though this point should not be overstretched considering that performance has in many ways frustrate general expectations.

(vi) An overview of our Present Relations with the three Western Great powers

Notwithstanding the past conflicts and in some case perhaps because of the experiences of some of them, our present relations with the three ranges from satisfactory (in the case of the US) to very good in respect to both the UK and France.

The issues of African freedom and dignity still have the potential of creating problems in our relations with the three but particularly with the United States.

Current events of USA linkage of the Cuban withdrawal from Angola and the independence of Namibia can be a source of further misunderstanding. The US so called "constructive engagement" with South Africa is meant to take apartheid S. A. as an "ally" against communism. This mistaken approach does not augur well for relations with Tanzania and Africa.

(VII) TANZANIA'S RELATIONS WITH THE USSR AND CHINA

(a) Background

- Because of the traditional relations with the west it was not possible for colonial Tanganyika or Zanzibar to have relations with the Socialist countries. It was after independence that Tanzania established relations with Socialist countries.

- Thus relations with these countries represented a new era. For us it was part of our efforts to break away from being a mere extension of the Western sphere of Influence.

- These relations have been of mutual interest and by and large very productive. They have served to ^estrengthen our independence.

(b) Relations with the USSR

These have been fairly good though there is great scope for improvement and expansion.

On the positive side

- Thus far our relations have been more political and cultural than economic;

- The USSR has played an important and at times crucial

role in support of African Liberation Movements

- The USSR has helped train many of our people;

Problem areas

- (i) The USSR has not really been reconciled to our brand of Socialism. Thus we are not close to them as say the Angolans, Mozambicans and Ethiopians are;
- (ii) In the past and to a ^Rcertain extent even now they have allowed our close relations with China to influence~~d~~ their attitude and position towards us;
- (iii) We have rejected the concept of the Socialist countries with the USSR as the leader being "Our natural allies." This has increased Moscow's suspicions and uneasiness towards us;
- (iv) We have always called for an end of Super Power Rivalry in the Indian Ocean. The Soviets do not like to be equated with the U. S. in this connection;
- (v) We have also -
 - condemned Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia in 1968;
 - opposed (through our votes at the UN) their intervention in Afghanistan (They consider the position as an unfriendly act)
 - refused to accord recognition and support to the Heng Samria regime in Kampuchea.

(c) Relations with China

Of all the Great Powers, it is an inconstestable fact that we have maintained very close relations with the Peoples Republic of China.

Following are some of the highlights of our ties:

(i) Mwalimu's state visit to China in February 1965 marked a turning point;

Arising from this visit three important decisions were taken which have been the hall mark of our relations and cooperative interactions these were:

1. The 100 million sterling pounds TAZARA - Freedom Railways - China's biggest project in Africa.
2. Assistance in the military field which had grown over the years;
3. The Sino-Tanzania Friendship Treaty signed on 20th February 1965 (Treaty based on the Five principles of Peaceful Coexistence)
 - (i) Mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity;
 - (ii) Mutual Non-aggression
 - (iii) Non-Interference in each other's affairs
 - (iv) Equality and Mutual benefit
 - (v) Peaceful co-existence

(ii) Relations encompass economic, trade and other fields. Regular consultations and exchange of visits. Premier Chou Enlai visited Tanzania in 1965 while Premier Zhao Ziyang is ~~expected to visit~~ Tanzania from January 11 - 15, 1983. Mwalimu has made two more

state visits - the last one being in March 1981.

Areas of differences

Though we maintain close relations we have our differences. For example at the political level we have differed sharply on:

- (i) China's position on Angola in the immediate aftermath of the MPLA's proclamation of independence;
- (ii) China's position on the Shaba affairs
- (iii) China's position on the Ogaden conflict.

BUT THE HIGHEST TRIBUTE THAT CAN BE PAID TO CHINA AND THIS IS WHAT HAS SUSTAINED AND NOURISHED OUR FRIENDSHIP IS THAT WITH THEM WE HAVE AGREED TO DISAGREE. AT NO POINT HAVE THEY ATTEMPTED OVERTLY OR COVERTLY TO INFLUENCE OUR POLICIES. THEY HAVE RESPECTED OUR POSITION. AND THAT IS A GREAT ASSET FOR A GREAT POWER WITH A POPULATION OF OVER ONE BILLION PEOPLE AND WITH ALL THE POTENTIALS OF A SUPER POWER.