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Abstract

Scholars and politicians of different political persuasions have tended to divide Africa into two distinct and somewhat unrelated parts: one, Arabic and Islamic, and second, Black Africa which includes various racial and ethnic groups embracing Christian, Islamic and traditional religions. Thus, two strands of Pan-Africanism (Trans-Saharan and Sub-Saharan) have been espoused. In this distinction which is ideological and historical-cultural, Afro-Arab cooperation in the 50s and 60s focused on mutual support by North (Arab) and Sub-Saharan (Black) Africa in the founding of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), struggles against apartheid, racism, colonialism, imperialism and neo-colonialism while the 70s witnessed Sub-Saharan support for Arab cause in the Arab-Israeli conflict leading to a rash of severance of diplomatic relations between several Sub-Saharan African countries with Israel and the first Afro-Arab Summit. That we have common issues and areas of cooperation that can provide a basis for sustained Afro-Arab cooperation and explain the role of North Africa in promoting these issues is not in doubt. North African countries not only played vital roles in the formation of the Organization of African Unity but also played leading and central roles in its restructuring culminating in the founding of the African Union. Some North African countries have supported the revival of Afro-Arab cooperation that would lead to the convening of the second Afro-Arab Summit to discuss matters of common interest between the two worlds while some North African have played vital roles in the formulation and implementation of African development plans as enunciated in the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), an economic arm of the AU. This study examines the raison d’etre not only for North African engagements in Africa but also the factors/forces enhancing/militating against Afro-Arab cooperation.
Introduction and Statement of the Problem

The pattern of interactions between Sub-Saharan (Black) Africa and the Arab World, particularly North (Arab) Africa, dating back many centuries, is full of contradictions. The Arabs have played three major roles in developments in Sub-Saharan Africa, indeed, Africa: first, as accomplices in African slave trade and African enslavement; second, as allies in African decolonization movements in the 50s and 60s and struggles against racism, neo-colonialism and apartheid; and third, as champions of Pan-Africanism and proponents of African development and economic integration, leading to the establishment of the Organisation of African Unity and the transformation of the OAU into the African Union. This study which examines the role of North Africa in Africa modes is basically historical and archival, content-analysing published materials on the links and cooperation between North (Arab) Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa.

Early Contacts Between Africa and the Arab World

Most writings on early Afro-Arab links have focused on the role of Islam with little attention being paid to contacts in the pre-Islamic and Christian period. Indeed, much has been written on the impact of slavery and African slave trade on Afro-Arab relations and cooperation. However, African presence in the Arab world has received scant attention with the result that Afro-Arab links are seen as a one-way traffic with the African being the recipient. This is not surprising if only because much of the literature on these contacts has been written by European and not African nor Arab scholars.

Contacts between Africa, especially the East African coast, and the Arab World predate Islam. The proximity between the two regions made such contacts inevitable long before the Christian period. Groups of Arabs filtered down and across the Red Sea, settled on the East African coast, Ethiopia, Somalia and the Sudan, partly, because of grave climatic conditions in their homelands, and, partly, as a result of political conflicts. Southern Arabia and the Yemen, because of their proximity and easy communication with the African coast, were the two main areas from where they came. Interactions between Ethiopia and Southern Arabia have been extensive and varied while there are records of immigration of Yemenis in the second century B.C before the destruction of Maarb Dam and Arbara, King of Hymar who conquered the Bejaland in the year 34BC. The world “Habbash” is said to refer to the tribe whose origin can be traced to Saudi Arabia. Linguists suggest that Geez (ancient Amharic language) and Arabic have semitic origins.¹ Archaeological remains in Masawa and Eithab on the Red
Sea coast confirm the widely-expressed views by historians that the relations between Africa and the Arab world were both of population and trade.

The Axumites from present Eritrea and Tigre ruled over Yemen for seventy years during the second and third centuries BC while Ethiopia traded with Arabia and the Persian Empire. The Axumite occupation of the Yemen in the 6th Century BC and the Cathedral built at Sana to rival the Kaaba in Mecca show that both Yemen and the Horn of Africa were close to each other culturally, economically and politically. In 570AD (Year of the Elephant and Year of the Birth of Prophet Muhammed), the Axumites’ attack against Mecca and the Cathedral in retaliation against the alleged insult made to the Cathedral in Sana was repelled. That the Axumites were defeated and Islam dominated the Arabian Peninsula including the Yemen and Saudi Arabia is not in doubt. But the long-established relations with the people of the Horn were intact.

These relations were strengthened during the Christian period. While the Bedouins (among the Arabs) resisted attempts at converting them, the settled agriculturalists in Yemen were more responsive, and a small Christian community, founded in Najran as early as the 4th Century BC, flourished until the rise of Islam, thanks to the protection of the Roman Empire and the Ethiopians. The Yemen was of strategic importance to the Romans whose presence in the Southern end of the Red Sea enabled the Imperial Fleet to control the land and sea routes to India. The other regions to which Christianity spread, thus, providing a cultural contact between Arabia and Africa were Egypt and Nubia. First, the Egyptian Church, to which the Ethiopian Church came to be linked, provided some of the first-rate African thinkers. Second, Nubia, where Christianity remained the dominant religion until the 15th century, developed its own Christian traditions. Third, the influence of the Christian Kingdoms of Nobata, Alwa and Maqqurah reached as far as Lake Chad. Christianity also spread to the Maghreb during the second century via Imperial Rome while the absence of indigenous Christian States was partly responsible for the lack of Christian communities in West Africa.²

With the exception of the Coptic Church of Egypt and Ethiopia, Christianity in Africa expanded with European colonialism. Hence, the domination of European Catholicism and Protestantism among African Christians compared with the Arab world where the Middle East Churches are dominant. Westernisation among the African and Arab Christians has been greater than among the Muslim Africans and Arabs. While Beshir has maintained that “Islamization in Africa did not necessarily mean Arabization,”³ Christianity and Arab cultures have remained interwoven in the Arab world without
distinction in radical Arab nationalism. Increased contacts in the post-colonial period have not only imbued several Christians with a new awareness of their shared heritage but also of the differences that divide them. The superiority with which the Muslims hold their own religion and Arab culture is not lost on non-Muslim Africans. The African Christian, a product of a Christianity different from that of Arab Christians, has become increasingly aware of the existence of Christians in the Arab world, and of Islam’s view that Christianity is not something alien. However, African Christians are afraid that the motive of Islam in Africa is to win new adherents while Muslim Arabs see the African Christians as a portage of Europe’s Christianity and the West.

Islam’s first contact with Africa was with Ethiopia. In the very early days of Islam, Prophet Mohammed advised his followers to immigrate to Ethiopia to avoid persecution in Mecca. There, they were well-received and protected by the Emperor in spite of strong representation by their adversaries. Thus, when the Emperor died, Prophet Mohammed called for a Special Prayer – the first and only one of its kind in Islam. This explains why the Muslims did not attempt either a conquest or a slow penetration of Ethiopia until 9th and 10th centuries when the indigenous Muslim Kingdoms of Shoa and Ofat emerged. Muslims have been enjoined to be tolerant of Christians and Jews – who were permitted to keep their churches, rites and beliefs in return for the Jizya (Head Tax). Their “protected” status was guaranteed by the Qur’an (Sura 9:29) and Hadith.

Christianity and Islam in the Horn of Africa co-existed for many centuries – Christianity in the Central Highland Plateaux and Islam in the lowlands to the East and North – while the spheres of both religions expanded rapidly in the 15th century. As Oliver and Atmore put it:

The centre of Christian population, by a combination of migration, conquest and cultural assimilation, have moved steadily southwards, through the Highland regions from Eritrea and Tigre, through Costa to Shoa. While Christian Kingdoms were dominant in the Rift Valley region and Muslim Kingdoms in the plains between the Highlands and the Red Coast, some facts need to be noted here. First, the Somalis, whose conversion to Islam started in the 10th and 11th centuries become dominant in the Shebele River region by the 14th century. In general, Christianity and Islam expanded in parallel with Christianity (being a religion of the nomads). However, friction between the two occurred over trade and trade routes. Nevertheless, the links between Ethiopian Christians and Jerusalem, and Muslims in the heartland of Islam remained intact, because in their mutual struggle, Christians and Muslims “were conscious of
Second, with respect to contacts with the East African coast Islam, several ships on the East African coast belonging to the Yemens and Hadarina provided networks for communication and trade (in gold, gum, honey and slaves) between East Africa and Arabia, Persia, Asia, Greece and Rome. There was no evidence of the spread of Christianity to these regions as in Ethiopia, Egypt and North Africa. Third, Islam arrived in East Africa during the 7th century AD, and by the 10th century BC, several thriving Muslim towns had emerged. Many indigenous Muslim States on the coast were inhabited by ethnically-mixed communities: Arab, African and Persian who speak Swahili. While the Portuguese were impressed by their cultural and economic influence, and although they imposed themselves over much of the East African coast in the 16th and 17th centuries, Islam remained the dominant religion. The replacement of the Portuguese by the Omani Arabs in mid-17th century led to increased Arab immigration and settlement on the coast and the spread of Islam linking the Gulf and Southern Arabia to the East African coast. This explains the presence of East African students in Mecca, Medina, Cairo and Istanbul (Hadhrami towns). Fourth, it was only in the 19th century that Islam spread into the interior of Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania and the Congo. Not only do Arab and Swahili traders settle in the trading posts in the interior, and inter-marry with the local (African) women; the Muslim communities in Kitato and Safie (Kenya), Tabora and Ujiji (Tanzania) were also reinforced by Asian Muslims coming from the coast and by the last quarter of the 19th century, much of East Africa has been transformed into a huge Muslim “sphere of influence,” with the centre in Zanzibar, with Muslims in the interior “as rulers, advisers, interpreters, scribes and dispensers of luxury goods.” Indeed, the new Muslim power was particularly noticeable in Uganda where after 1850, the Kabaka and the Royal Family embraced Islam, spreading a Bantu-Arab-Persian Islamic culture all over in the Eastern coast and African interior.

Arab conquest of Egypt in the 7th century did not lead to complete Islamisation and Arabisation. The Egyptian Copts, who welcomed the Arabs as a relief from persecution by Roman officials and tax collectors were recruited into the new Muslim regime as physicians, administrators, translators and craftsmen. The Coptic Church and the Mosque co-existed although the end of a proselytizing Christianity and the new immigrants from Arabia gave Egypt its dominant Muslim character at a very early stage. The founding of Al-Azhar in the 10th century and its growth into the power house of Islamic culture for Muslims in Africa served as an additional link between the Arab world and Africa.
Relations between the various city states and empires in the Middle East and their counterparts in Africa are ancient beyond reckoning. The collapse of the Roman Empire and its aftermath diminished these connections and destroyed most of the historical records of them. Ismael has noted:

Until the rise of Islam, the great barbarian invasions kept Egypt and Mediterranean Africa concerned with local affairs, and only a few Arab traders crossing the Red Sea and sailing the coastal waters of their small vessels, maintained the Middle Eastern-African contact.

And, in the centuries between the Hejira and imposition of European colonial rule, the Arabs held a virtual monopoly on economic and cultural exchange with Sub-Saharan Africa especially trade in slaves in the Eastern seaboard until it was officially outlawed by the British Government in the late 1800s, albeit, for altruistic reasons.

Indeed, historical contacts between Arabs and Africans predated the evangelizing activities of Prophet Muhammed and the advent of European colonialism. The advent and spread of Islam in West and East Africa merely accentuated the political, economic and cultural interactions between them. While the coming of European traders and imposition of European colonial rule effectively halted these activities, all that remained at the end of colonial rule were cultural contacts but unfortunate and the sour memories in Sub-Saharan Africa of aspects of their cultural contacts. Mazrui has put it succinctly:

The relationship between Arabs and Black Africans has always been asymmetrical – with the Middle East usually the giver, and the Black Africa usually the receiver. Throughout the history of their involvement in Black Africa, the Arabs have been conquerors and liberators, both traders in slaves and purveyors of new ideas. Trade and Islam have been companions throughout...

Because the spread of Islam in West Africa and the Nile Valley up to modern Ethiopia had not taken place without much misgivings, the African experience with the Arabs was an unhappy one. Because European colonialism prevented the Arabs from acquiring imperial possessions and because colonialism subjected the Arabs and Africans to similar colonial experiences, their (Arab and African) common colonial experiences provided them with objective and subjective bases for common action. The end of World War II, when the ‘wind of change’ started blowing across Africa, and, indeed, the two regions, saw the crystallization of a common front.
North Africa, the Organization of African Unity and Changing Relations Between North Africa and Sub-Saharan (Black) Africa

ROLE OF EGYPT IN AFRICA AND CONTRIBUTION OF NORTH AFRICA TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY

True, it is that the chief basis of Afro-Arab interaction is subjective and ideological. The Arab States in the Middle East were primarily interested in establishing their political identities and resolving their domestic problems while North (Arab) African States in the 1950s were engrossed in bitter and long struggles for colonial independence. However, the significance of the 1952 Revolution which brought Colonel Gamal Nasser to power should not be underestimated in assessing Egypt’s role in Africa, and the Pan African Movement, analysis of which will serve as a point of departure in this section of our study.

Two images of Nasser in Sub-Saharan Africa have been bandied by his detractors in the Western world. First, is that of a “rather evanescent, distant, and somewhat of an alien leader, who was essentially an Arab.” As Tandon puts it:

This image is tarnished by the memory of the slave trade in which the Arabs were the agents and Africans the slaved. Whatever Nasser did of pan-African nature therefore gets compromised by this image. His contribution to the African Liberation Movement is accordingly either simply dismissed as of little value or at best as suspect.

It was small wonder then that President Kamuzu Banda of Malawi was not only critical of the Arabs, denouncing Arab Sudanese policies towards their Southern compatriots; he also maintained that Arab participation in the heinous African trade excluded Arabs from being regarded as Africa’s genuine friends. Notwithstanding the fact that the present generation of Arabs cannot be held responsible for their ancestors’ actions, he contended that there is a continuity of Arab feelings of superiority to Africans and the inhuman indignities to which Southern Sudanese (of black extraction) have been subjected, to date, confirms his reservations about Afro-Arab fraternity/cooperation.

Whether President Banda’s perception of the Arabs is representative of what most Sub-Saharan Africans still feel about the Arabs; indeed, whether Sub-Saharan African perceptions of Arabs are a reflection more of the memory of the historical Arab role in African slave trade or of the positive Arab contributions of new ideas, Islam, liberation from colonialism, apartheid and racism, African development and commerce with the rest of the world is not our concern at least for now. Nasser’s
ideas about Egypt’s role in Africa and indeed, the Arab world, were clearly enunciated in The Philosophy of the Revolution. The role he envisaged for Egypt in Africa, it would appear to many of his critics, smacks of a later-day version of the ‘white man’s burden,’ complete with references to Egypt’s ‘manifest destiny’ and ‘civilising mission’ in the ‘interior of the Dark Continent.’

He maintained:

...We cannot under any condition, even if we wanted to, stand aloof from the terrible and terrifying battle now raging in the heart of that continent between five million whites and two hundred million Africans. We cannot stand aloof for one important and obvious reason – we ourselves are in Africa. Surely the people of Africa will continue to look to us – we who are the guardians of the continent’s northern gate, we who constitute the connecting link between the continent and the outside world. We certainly cannot, under any condition, relinquish our responsibility to help to our utmost in spreading the light of knowledge and civilization up to the very dept of the virgin jungles of the continent.

To be sure, The Philosophy of the Revolution has often been compared by Nasser’s detractors with Hitler’s Mein Kampf and Nasser was seen as another Hitler. Indeed, the concept of the three circles – Arab, African and Islamic – outlined in The Philosophy of the Revolution – had done Nasser much propaganda damage because these came to be seen by other Arab leaders and Nasser’s detractors in the West as succeeding circles of his allegedly imperialistic ambitions in Africa and the Arab world.

The second image of Nasser, popular among the more radical leaders in Sub-Saharan Africa, was the image of Nasser as a Third World leader even if it meant interfering in the domestic affairs of Tunisia, Morocco, Libya, the Sudan, and making a political appeal to “Moslem Unity” in the Horn of Africa. Indeed, Nasser considered it Egypt’s duty not only to lead Africa but also to ‘safeguard the unity of the African march.’ As one Egyptian Government publication stated:

The UAR cannot leave its leading role as progressive, developed African State. It can participate in the liberation of the African continent... and help them in all fields of political, economic and social life.

It has become fashionable for academics and politicians of different political persuasions to divide Africa therefore into two distinct and somewhat unrelated parts: one, Arabic and Islamic, and second, Black Africa which includes various racial and ethnic groups embracing Christian, Islamic and traditional religions. Thus, two strands of Pan-Africanism have been espoused: Trans-Saharan and Sub-Saharan Pan-Africanism. While such African leaders as Kwame Nkrumah, Julius Nyerrre, Kenneth Kaunda
embraced Trans-Saharan Pan-Africanism others such as Kamuzu Banda embraced Sub-Saharan Pan-Africanism. In this distinction, which is ideological and historical-cultural, Afro-Arab relations and cooperation in the 1950s and 1960s and 1960s focused on mutual support, by North (Arab) Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa (otherwise loosely called Black Africa) in the formation of the OAU in May 1963 and in the struggles against colonialism, imperialism, neo-colonialism (in the Congo), racism and apartheid (in Southern Africa) while the 1970s witnessed Sub-Saharan support for the Arab cause in the Arab-Israeli conflict leading to a rash of severance of diplomatic relations between many Sub-Saharan African countries and Israel, Sub-Saharan Africa’s disenchant with the Arab world for not fulfilling their pledges to assist in Africa’s developmental efforts and the convening of the first Afro-Arab Summit.

Undoubtedly, Nasser not only championed Egyptian cause but also espoused the position of the non-aligned movement and the Third World in world politics. More than any Arab leader except perhaps Ben Bella, Boumedienne of Algeria and Muammar Ghaddafi in later years as well as Prime Minister Ahmed Mahoud of the Sudan after the June 1967 Arab-Israeli War, Nasser was a bridge builder between North (Arab) and Sub-Saharan (Black) Africa, indeed, between the Arab world and Africa, particularly Sub-Saharan Africa. True, it is that Nasser’s concern with the problems of African liberation in Southern Africa and the struggles against apartheid, racism and colonialism in Southern Africa paled in significance when compared with his concern with the problems of Palestine, Arab-Israeli conflict and imperialist designs in the Middle East. Compared, however, with several leaders of North (Arab) and Sub-Sahara African countries, Nasser’s contribution to the African liberation movements and struggles against apartheid, colonialism and racism in Southern and Central Africa, colonialism and neo-colonialism was unparalleled in the annals of world politics. As an Arab, it was rather odd that Nasser would be talking about the “African Personality” championed by Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana. At an inaugural session of the Political Committee of the Casablanca Bloc on June 15, 1962, Nasser had this much to say:

…it (the Casablanca Group) has indirectly contributed to the confirmation of the African Personality and to the consolidation of the Liberation Movement potential in Africa.

It was small wonder then that Cairo became a haven for African political exiles and African freedom fighters who were offered material, logistic and moral support by the Egyptian Government. Radio Cairo, (African Service) developed special programmes in thirty six languages including several African
languages such as Swahili, Hausa and Arabic (which were widely spoken in West, East, Central and Southern Africa) as well as English and French (widely spoken in West and Central Africa) to give listeners news of other peoples’ struggles and encourage the nationalist struggles while Islamic teaching was used to expand the African ‘circle.’ Cairo disseminated the publications of the Liberation Movements and encouraged in 1955 the formation of an African Association of the various Nationalist Liberation Bureaux and as the Headquarters of the Afro-Asian Peoples Solidarity Committee Cairo served as a bridge between Liberation and anti-imperialist movements in Africa and Asia.

Egypt launched various aid and technical assistance programmes consisting of training technicians and providing experts, doctors and teachers for African countries, ostensibly, to promote her policy of combating Israeli economic penetration in Sub-Saharan Africa. Egypt also signed bilateral, commercial, cultural and loan agreements with several African countries and thousands of Egyptian scholarships were given to African students to study in Cairo. After the creation of the Organization of African Unity, Egypt became one of the eleven member-Liberation Committee and the largest single contributor in terms of assessment to the OAU Liberation Fund, namely, £387,500 between 1964 and 1968 compared to Nigeria’s £325,500 (second largest) and Ghana’s £139,500 (third largest). True, it is that Egypt stopped direct contribution to the Liberation Fund since 1967, for reasons an explanation of which need not detain us here, Egypt continued to support the Liberation Movements outside of the OAU Fund. Nasser joined ‘militant’ African States in the Casablanca Bloc (including Algeria, Ghana, Guinea, Mali and Libya) in condemning Moise Tshombe’s secession bid in the Congo and in fact nationalized Belgian property in Egypt as a consequence and when civil war broke out in July 1960, Egypt contributed troops to the United Nations Peace Keeping Operations in the Congo and after Patrice Lumumba was captured and killed by his ‘enemies’ in September 1961, Egypt pulled out her contingent in protest. Egypt’s role could be compared with Israel which supported Moise Tshombe in many United Nations General Assembly votes on the issue. Commenting on the Israeli ambivalence, The Arab Observer noted:

If the Israeli Chiefs really supported the Africans, why did they not announce their support for the legal power in the Congo (Lumumba’s government then), the body on whom depends the victory of the Congo over her imperialist enemies. Instead, the Israeli Chiefs supported Moise Tshombe, Prime Minister of Katanga.
When Ian Smith of Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) unilaterally declared Rhodesia’s independence from the United Kingdom on October 11, 1965 and the OAU issued an ultimatum calling on the UK Government to crush the rebellion or risk severance of diplomatic relations by OAU member-States, Egypt became one of the first African countries to break diplomatic relations with the United Kingdom and offered to send armed troops to Rhodesia to fight the Ian Smith rebel regime, and following the Portuguese invasion of Guinea in November 1970, Egypt was one of the few countries to send armed troops to Guinea against Portuguese aggression.

Egypt’s formal political links with Africa started with the Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference held in Cairo in December 1957. Though the Conference deviated from the tradition of the Pan-African Movement and the canons of the 1955 Bandung Conference by inviting to full participation the former Soviet Union, one of the parties in the ‘Cold War,’ it represented Nasser’s first major attempt at organizing African liberation movements under his leadership, thus, justifying his dual involvement in African and Middle Eastern politics. Cairo became the home of many Pan-African and Afro-Asian organizations as well as a frequent venue for many meetings and conferences on Afro-Asian problems. Both the 1955 Bandung Conference and the 1956 ‘Tripartite Aggression’ (by Israel, Great Britain and France) gave a momentum to Afro-Arab cooperation and Egyptian-African relations. True, it is that the Bandung Conference was attended by delegates from twenty-nine Afro-Asian countries including the Sudan and Ghana as well as observers from African liberation movements and the Arab Organization for Palestine. The Conference, where no Pan-Africanists played a major role and Ethiopia was the only non-Arab independent African country attending, fired Egypt’s faith in the policy enunciated by Nasser in The Philosophy of the Revolution in eliminating colonialism in Africa. To be sure, the ‘Tripartite Aggression’ demonstrated to the Afro-Arab world that Israel was part of the imperialist club. To this end, the Arab League Council 1957 adopted a Resolution consolidating Afro-Arab relations, and in 1958, the Council urged member-States to support Cameroun’s independence. Apart from adopting a Resolution supporting freedom causes and calling for cooperation with African States most of which were on the road to independence in 1959, the Arab League Council in August 1960 adopted five Resolutions: (1) welcoming newly-independent African countries; (2) supporting efforts by African countries at consolidating their independence; (3) calling for Afro-Arab cooperation in economic, social and cultural fields; (4) granting scholarships and exchanging teachers and experts with African
countries; and (5) enjoining Arab Chambers of Commerce to send economic missions to African countries for the promotion and coordination of Afro-Arab cooperation in these fields.\(^4\)

Nasser’s policy with respect to Africa was challenged by Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana. Unlike Egypt which had declared a ‘state of belligerency’ with Israel, Ghana maintained friendly relations with Israel and the West, receiving substantial bilateral economic and technical assistance from the former.\(^5\) As the leader of the first Sub-Saharan (Black) African country to gain independence, Nkrumah was eager to organise a Pan-African movement which would undermine Egypt’s role and ambitions in Africa \textit{per se}. To be sure, while some African leaders, on historical-cultural grounds, contend that Pan-Africanism should be Sub-Saharan because their North African counterparts “will continue to have Arabic, Mediterranean and Muslim affiliations which will keep them from anything approaching total absorption into a conceivable Pan-African union,” others on ideological grounds, contend that the Sahara and Islam should not be a barrier between Arab and Black Africa, and therefore, Pan-Africanism should be Trans-Saharan.

Nevertheless, in April 1958, Nkrumah convened the First Conference of eight Independent African states in Accra, two (Ghana and Liberia) of which belonged to Black Africa while-five (Egypt, Tunisia, Libya, Morocco and the Sudan) were predominantly Arab with Ethiopia making its first official debut on the wider stage of African politics. The Accra Conference, if anything, indicated that neither Islam nor the Sahara constituted an insuperable barrier between Arab and Black Africa. Indeed, the view emerged at the Accra Summit and thereafter that some Sub-Sahara (Black) African countries had more in common politically with some Arab countries than with their immediate neighbours, a major sour point in Afro-Arab relations, particularly between Arab - and Black-Africa being the Arab-Israeli conflict.\(^6\)

While Nasser used the 1958 Accra Summit to improve his contacts with African leaders, the year 1958 saw a leadership rivalry between Nasser and Nkrumah which was clearly manifested in Radio Cairo propaganda against Nkrumah’s relations with the Israelis, Nkrumah’s statement warning against “direct Egyptian expansionism or indirect communist penetration of African areas through a willing Egypt” later led to a \textit{rapprochment} between Nasser and Nkrumah during the latter’s (Nkrumah) visit to Cairo in June 1958. However Ghana’s decision in November 1958 to form a Union with Guinea and later Mali that would serve as a ‘nucleus for a Union of African States’ was seen as a challenge to Nasser’s leadership while the All-African People’s Conference in Accra in December 1958 was seen as an attempt to check
Egypt's participation in Africa by differentiating between Arab – and Black-Africa. Addressing the Opening Session of the Conference, Nkrumah, in a somewhat enigmatic statement, warned:

Do not let us also forget that colonialism and imperialism may come to us yet in a different guise, not necessarily from Europe. We must alert ourselves to be able to recognise this when it rears its head and prepare ourselves to fight against it.²⁹

A member of the Egyptian delegation to the Conference, Ahmed Bahai el Din has observed:

A great effort was made to isolate the UAR at the conference ... These attempts were concentrated in a poisoned propaganda campaign ... which asserted that the UAR is an Arab, not an African state.³⁰

Certainly, many Black Africans were suspicious of Egypt’s intentions in Africa. Chief Obafemi Awolowo, a Pan-Africanist and one-time Leader of the Opposition in the Nigerian Parliament observed that there had never been any cultural affinity between Egypt and the Black race in Africa although Egypt is physically located in Africa. As he put it:

The United Arab Republic, the pet creature of Nasser, which has one foot in Africa and another in the Middle East, is the very antithesis of a workable African community.³¹

Thus, although Nkrumah expressed his belief in ‘Afro-Arab nationalism’ during his visit to Cairo in January 1959, his unification attempts were confined to Black Africa. In July 1959, Ghana formed the Community of Independent African States with Liberia and Guinea, and following Nkrumah’s little ‘Summit’ with Modibo Keita and Sekou Toure in December 1960, the Charter establishing a Ghana-Guinea-Mali Union was signed in January 1961. President Nasser was not invited to any of these unification talks, and his role in African affairs was virtually ignored by Kwame Nkrumah in his Africa Must Unite.³² In effect, while some African leaders and observers of the under-developed world have seen Pan-Africanism as the cornerstone of African Unity, there are other Pan-Africanists who believe, consciously or unconsciously, that the search for African Unity should be limited to Black Africans, and indeed, should be Sub-Saharan. However, a Sub-Saharan Pan-Africanist ideology has never been accepted by a majority of Pan-Africanists including Julius Nyerere and Kenneth Kaunda who contend that colour and the Sahara should be a bridge rather than a barrier between Arab and Black Africa.

In 1960, two informal groupings of independent African states emerged because African leaders could not agree on the form of intra-African cooperation. This cleavage, based on policy orientations
and the colonial experiences of African leaders, was apparent at the Addis Ababa Conference of Independent African States of June 1960. The two groups could be categorized broadly as ‘moderate’ and ‘radical,’ with the disparity between them intensified during the fifteenth Session of the United Nations General Assembly. While such ‘moderate’ African states as the Sudan, Nigeria, Ethiopia, Togo, Liberia and the Cameroun supported UN Peace-Keeping Operations in the Congo, the ‘radical’ states (Ghana, Guinea, Mali and the UAR) supported Patrice Lumumba and called for the withdrawal of their troops from the UN Command in Congo after Premier Lumumba’s assassination.33

The first formal grouping of independent African states was formed at a meeting held on December 15-19, 1960 at Brazzaville by a coalition of French speaking African states (excluding Guinea and Mali) which shared a common language, similar colonial experience, and economic and political interests, favoured closer links with France rather than African Unity, and which wanted to establish principles of economic cooperation and non-alignment in foreign policy.34 The second formal grouping mooted by King Mohammed of Morocco and Kwame Nkrumah was formed following a meeting on January 4-7, 1961 at Casablanca by states that are generally considered more radical in their approach to decolonization and African Unity than those which attended the Brazzaville Conference and subsequently became the Union of African and Malagasy States.35 Although the Casablanca Conference issued a comprehensive programme in the form of an African Charter which provided for a joint African High Command to protect African countries from aggression and take action independently, if necessary, of the United Nations, and the establishment of political, economic and cultural institutions “to coordinate the policies of African nation in these fields,” there is little doubt that agreement on the broad aspects of the African Charter was attained through compromises. Thus, King Mohammed V of Morocco was commended for any action taken for the restitution of Mauritania as an integral part of the old ‘Great Moroccan Kingdom,’ while Nasser was able to have Israel denounced “as an instrument ... for imperialism and non-colonialism not only in the Middle East but also in Africa and Asia” in spite of Israeli relationships with Ghana, Guinea and Mali.36

Obviously, the Casablanca Conference gave Nasser an opportunity to keep Egypt associated with African issues, and make more contacts with Sub-Saharan African governments. However, because of the Conference’s narrow representation,37 it failed to serve as a rallying point for all African states and signalled the polarization of differences between the two African blocs. Efforts made to resolve these differences culminated in the Monrovia Conference attended by twenty African (including Libya
and Tunisia) states on May 8-12, 1961. Although the Monrovia Summit was the largest gathering of African states, bringing together nearly all the French-speaking and a majority of English-speaking states, and although it spoke with the same sharp voice as the All-African Peoples’ Organization and other militant Pan-African groupings on questions relating to decolonization,\(^3\) it failed to secure the adherence of the Casablanca powers which boycotted the Summit (Monrovia) as well as the Lagos Summit of January 1962, called to discuss the machinery of intra-African cooperation.\(^3\)

The boycott of the Monrovia Summit by the Casablanca Bloc, and the decisions of the Tunisians, Libyans and the Sudanese to withdraw from the Lagos Summit had deeper political repercussions. Foreign Ministers of the Casablanca Bloc meeting in Accra on January 29, 1962 had decided that the Lagos Summit be boycotted by the Group. The boycott not only increased anti-Ghana feelings among some African leaders who held Nkrumah chiefly responsible for the last minute decision of the Casablanca Bloc to do so, but also fanned latent opposition among a number of African leaders to Arab participation in the Pan-African movement, a feeling which was strong especially among members of the Union of African and Malagasy States (UAM), the official title of the Brazzaville Bloc.\(^4\) Indeed, Black African leaders like President Senghor and Chief Awolowo had long argued that the first step in the Pan-African Movement should be to unify Black African states, while others argued that Arab internecine quarrels would only produce unnecessary divisions in the Pan-African movement. In an editorial entitled “Arab First, Arab Last,” a Nigerian newspaper,\(^4\) noted that the Arabs have always put Arab interests before those of Africa’s, ostensibly referring to the way that some Arab states, notably the UAR, had always used Pan-African or Afro-Asian Solidarity Conferences to brand Israel as an ‘imperialist base’ in Africa.

A word on the boycott by the Casablanca Bloc of the Monrovia Summit. Whilst not all the Arab-African states joined the Casablanca bloc, with the exception of Ghana and Guinea, it was predominantly a Muslim organization, primarily of North Africa but including Mali. The Sudan, Tunisia and Libya had initially supported the Lagos initiative but boycotted the Lagos Summit because the Algerian Provisional Government then fighting the War of Independence with France was not invited because of the opposition of the Francophone African countries. Mauritania, which was closely associated with the UAM, attended the Monrovia and Lagos Summits. Finally, Nasser appeared to be sympathetic to the functional approach to African Unity largely because of his experience of the Egypt – Syria Union.\(^4\) In effect, although Nasser’s view was not at variance with the Monrovia Group’s
contention that economic cooperation must be the foundation of African Unity, he had to respect the Accra decision of the Foreign Ministers of the Casablanca bloc to boycott the Lagos Summit. Nevertheless, the isolation of the Casablanca bloc reflected the failure of Nasser’s African policy. Many factors contributed to the exclusion of Nasser from the mainstream of intra-African cooperation. First, his policy in the Congo had not appreciably influenced the course of events, and was in opposition to that of the majority of African states (the Monrovia bloc) which supported UN Operations in the Congo despite ‘past weaknesses and mistakes.’ Second, Nkrumah’s struggle with Nasser for African leadership dissipated the latter’s influence on the continent. Third, Nasser’s radical anti-Western stance, and willing cooperation with the Soviet bloc nations alarmed the more conservative African states. Fourth, the injection of Arab issues into African politics, especially the Arab-Israeli conflict, was a frequent source of irritation between Arab and Black Africa while racism in African politics had the latent effect of isolating North (Arab) Africa from Sub-Saharan (Black) Africa.

These factors and other problems that Nasser faced internally within the Egypt-Syria Union and the Middle East, largely influenced a re-evaluation of Egypt-African relations. A National Charter drawn up in May 1962 treated Arab Unity as an internal matter and identified Egypt’s interest in Africa in association with the Israeli issue. The Charter not only marked the beginning of a new phase of Egyptian-African relations but also represented Nasser’s attempt to cope with the changing scene in a newly-independent Africa. Since Egypt could no longer make an outright bid for African leadership, an effective role in Africa’s international relations required the country to reconsider its policies and bring them into line with those of the Monrovia Bloc.

Arab commitment to Pan-Africanism was put to a test at the Addis Ababa meeting of African Foreign Ministers in May 1963 which preceded the Summit of African Heads of States and Governments. Although President Nasser joined in advocating economic cooperation as a prelude to African Unity, a move obviously in opposition to Nkrumah’s plan for political unification, in form of an African Continental Government, Sierra Leone’s Foreign Minister, Dr. John Karafa Smart, challenged his Egyptian counterpart, Dr. Mahmud Fawzy, to give assurances that Egypt’s priority commitments in the Middle East and Africa were not in conflict. Although Dr. Fawzy pointed out that “the UAR was truly an Afro-Asian country in that she was geographically located on both continents and racially involved in both,” he failed to squash “forever the imperialist-propagated idea that there is some contradiction in being an Arab and an African state at the same time.” At the Addis Ababa Summit on May 24, 1963,
Present Nasser has this much to say: “...this conference is itself proof of the existence of a free and African will. This is confirmed by the fact that all traditional divisions which imperialism tried to impose on the continent to render it apart to North of the Sahara and South of the Sahara, to white, black and coloured Africa, to East and West, to French-speaking and English-speaking Africa, have collapsed and were swept away by the genuine African reality. There remain but one language on African land: the language of ...one destiny, no matter what the method of expression.”

By pushing the Israeli issue at every Conference, albeit unsuccessfully, Egypt alienated many Black African states. At the Accra Conference of Independent African states in April 1958, the Egyptian delegation tried to obtain an anti-Israeli Resolution that would have tended to drive a wedge between Ghana and other African states on the one hand, and Israel on the other. The Egyptian Foreign Minister sustained a double rebuff, first, in his failure to have the Israel issue placed on the agenda as a separate item, and second, in the non-committal Resolution calling for a just resolution of the Arab-Israeli dispute. Nasser was obviously aware of this, because he decided to keep the Arab-Israeli conflict out of African politics, at least for some time. Nevertheless, Egypt’s interest in the Middle East and Africa continued to pose a dilemma in its relations with Africa. Asked at the Addis Ababa Summit if the Egypt/UAR was working for Arab or African Unity, Nasser retorted:

I can see no contradiction between Arab Unity and African Unity ... Unity covers a wide scope ranging from unity of aims to constitutional unity. I cannot imagine that constitutional unity will be established today since African countries have to know each other in first place and in the mean-time, unity of aim will come about and an African League will be formed as is in the proposal made by the Addis Ababa summit ... We consider this as a step towards unity. I speak as an African and as the President of the UAR.

But a large part of Egypt’s Arab aspirations were manifested in Africa. As an observer noted:

The Arab question in general cannot be separated from the African problem especially if we realize that 73 percent of the Arab land is situated in the African continent and two thirds of the Arab states live in Africa.

Reactions to the announcement by the Arab League that it intended to open information offices in West Africa were an indication that Black Africans did not want to be entangled in the Arab-Israeli dispute. As one West African noted: “the decision of the League must be resisted because it is a subtle device to involve us more directly with the frenetic politics of the Middle East,” and the Sierra Leonean Foreign Minister went further in stating that “African members of the League will have to decide soon
where they stand. Are they in the Middle East or in Africa?" The isolation of the Casablanca Bloc at the
Monrovia Summit therefore forced Nasser to reconsider his African policies and bring them in
conformity with the Monrovia Bloc. That he was able to resolve the contradiction between his Arab and
African policies was made clear from the deliberations of three Conferences held in Cairo during 1964.49
Because the 1964 African (OAU) Summit was held in Cairo, it was expected that the Israeli issue (which
had played a minor role at the 1963 Addis Ababa Summit) would figure more prominently. The Arab
League members of the OAU agreed not to press for a formal Resolution. It was small wonder then
President Julius Nyerere of Tanzania considered the Cairo Summit to have been a “proof of the unity of
the African continent and (a refutation of) ... false propaganda which divided it into black Africa and
Arab Africa.”50 Furthermore, because the UAR felt that its best interests are better served by working
within the framework of the larger African community, Nasser established friendly relations with the
rather ‘conservative’ French-speaking African states during 1963-64, and by 1965, the UAR had
exchanged Ambassadorsial representations with Algeria, Benin Republic, Peoples’ Republic of the
Congo, (Congo-Bra), Ethiopia, Ghana, Republic of Cameroun, Kenya, Cote D’voire (Ivory Coast), Liberia,
Libya, Mali, Morocco, Nigeria, Senegal, Togo, Guinea, Tanzania, Sudan, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Tunisia,
Uganda and Zambia. The fact that Egypt’s earlier start in industrialization compared with other
independent African states (except the Republic of South Africa) offered it the possibility of becoming a
major supplier of manufactured goods to the continent made this decision even more significant.51

In effect, Egypt’s efforts at the OAU indicated an intention not only to remain within the
mainstream of African politics but also become a moderating rather than radical influence. When the
OAU was threatened by internal dissensions, Nasser attempted to mediate in order to preserve its
solidarity. After the 1963 Addis Ababa Summit, Nasser preferred a back-seat position on disruptive
issues, although the 1965 Accra Summit appeared to be separating Africa along the lines of the formal
groupings (Brazzaville, Casablanca and Monrovia) over the issue of support for the Congo rebels.52
Unlike Presidents Ben Bella and Bourguiba, (who passionately appealed to other African Heads of
States and Governments, reminding them that they could not continue to advocate continental unity if
they ignored the problem facing North African states), he (Nasser) did not push the Israeli issue at the
1964 Cairo Summit. That the post-1962 African policy of the UAR appeared to be paying dividends may
be seen from the reactions of the Black African states to the June 1967 Arab-Israeli war. At a Cairo
meeting on 1 July 1967, forty-five Afro-Asian nations expressed their support for the Arab cause. At the
United Nations General Assembly, however, Sub-Sahara African voting was mixed on a UNGA Resolution condemning Israel as the aggressor nation: while twelve nations voted for the Resolution, eight voted consistently in opposition. Although Nasser did not have the solid support of Sub-Saharan Africa, the voting perse indicated that his active African policy had produced mixed reactions and that Arab affairs were of some concerns to some Black African states.

It has been said that because of the perennial Arab-Israeli conflict, North (Arab) African states can not but pay lip service to Pan-Africanism when their “Arabic, Mediterranean, and Muslim affiliations ... will continue to keep them from approaching total absorption into a conceivable Pan-African union.” The low degree of Arab commitment to Pan-Africanism has been attributed to the extent to which Black Africa supported Arab struggles against Zionism and Western imperialism. The injection of Arab issues during successive African Summits not only alienated many Sub-Sahara African States but has been a frequent source of apprehension and disenchantment between North (Arab) and Sub-Saharan (Black) African states. At the 1960 Addis Ababa Summit of Independent African states, the UAR tried very hard to get the Summit impose sanctions against Israel. This not only caused a delay in the final Plenary Session but also annoyed some of the Sub-Sahara African delegates. It appeared that Nasser realized this and decided not to raise the Arab-Israeli issue at the Addis Ababa Summit in May 1963. Again, at the Cairo Summit in July 1964, the Arab League members of the OAU decided not to press for a formal Resolution against Israel, but made comparisons between Israel and South Africa, and also between the role of the Palestine Liberation Army and that of African Liberation Movements, ostensibly to evoke the African ‘conscience.’ No word of support came from Black Africa.

Apart from normal trade relations between African peoples and the Arab world, there was not much interaction between Arab and Black African states at the governmental level, as compared with the relations between Israel and some Black African states. Indeed, while many Black African states used Israel as a model for development, there was a considerable Israeli presence in many Black African states. Because many newly independent Black African states espoused a policy of non-alignment, they preferred to steer a middle course in the Arab-Israeli dispute, and because many of them are poor economically, they readily welcomed Israeli proffered assistance. In any case, there was not much that Black Africa could do to influence the course of Middle East international relations; to many Black African states, only the two former Super Powers, especially the Unites States, could bring about an Arab-Israeli détente. Many Black African states were absentee members of the United Nations under
whose auspices the State of Israel was created in 1948 and was accorded diplomatic recognition almost immediately.

CHANGING RELATIONS BETWEEN NORTH AFRICA AND BLACK AFRICA

Events, however, changed at the Addis Ababa Summit in May 1973 which opened an era of Afro-Arab cooperation and solidarity. Indeed, the essence of the Summit was that the North (Arab) African states managed to convince Sub-Saharan (Black) African states that they not only shared common enemies, but also that Israel was a real threat to ‘the security, territorial integrity and unity’ of the African continent. In effect, Egypt’s struggle against Zionism was equated with the liberation of Southern Africa which topped the list of OAU priorities. If the most significant outcome of the 1973 Summit was the emergence of a new phase of Afro-Arab cooperation, the 1972 Rabat African Summit was a landmark in the shift of the OAU policy in respect to the Middle East crisis.60

In 1967, a majority of the OAU member-States rejected a Somali request for an Emergency meeting of the Council of Ministers to take a stand on the June 1967 War, arguing that only the United Nations could deal with the situation. The Kinshasa Summit in September 1967 adopted a ‘Declaration’ rather than a ‘Resolution’ on the June 1967 War. African leaders carefully abstained from denouncing Israel as an ‘aggressor’ nation, but expressed their concern with “the grave situation that prevails in the United Arab Republic, an African country whose territory is partially occupied by a foreign power.” In effect, they sympathized with Egypt and promised to work within the United Nations in order to secure the evacuation of the United Arab Republic territory by Israeli forces. The Algiers Summit in September 1968, however, passed a Resolution on the Aggression Against the United Arab Republic. It reaffirmed OAU’s support for the UAR; called for a rigorous implementation of the United Nations Security Council Resolution 242 for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied territories; and appealed to all OAU member-States to use their influence to ensure compliance with the United Nations Resolution. In May 1969, President Leopold Senghor of Senegal proposed a complete arms embargo on all countries in the Middle East. More disturbing to Israel were the visits to Cairo and Moscow by President Bokassa of the Central African Republic, whose country was an important source for Israel’s diamond trade. During his Cairo visit in April 1970, President Bokassa assured President Nasser “of his country’s support for the Arabs and the necessity of a complete Israeli withdrawal from occupied Arab lands.”
expressing reservations, and two years later, the Rabat Summit, in a Resolution entitled, *Resolution on the Continued Aggression Against the Arab Republic of Egypt*, pledged the UAR “its effective support in its legitimate struggle to recover totally and by every means its territorial integrity.” Here, the Summit was fully endorsing Egypt’s stand, and its right to resort to war to free the occupied territories.

While no one reason can be given for the dramatic shift in OAU policy with respect to the Middle East crisis, some observers have attributed it to Black Africa’s disillusionment with the Western powers on many sensitive issues including the continued sale of arms to South Africa, UDI in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe), Portuguese colonialism, Namibian independence and the Congo crises 1960 – 1965. It is against this background that Black Africa, indeed, Sub-Saharan Africa began to look for new allies.

At the Addis Ababa Summit in 1971, African Heads of States and Governments appointed a ten-member Committee suggested by President Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia to assist in the implementation of UNSC Resolution 242, resumption of the Jarring Mission and seek ways of achieving “a peaceful, equitable and just solution to the Middle East Crisis.” Egypt accepted the mission of the Committee if only because it was not variance with her interests. Israel also welcomed the move since there was no insistence that it would implement the June 1971 Resolution of the African Summit. In any event, Israel did not want to jeopardize its good bilateral relations with many Black African countries. The Committee chaired by President Moktar Ould Daddah of Mauritania included Heads of States and Governments of countries having good relations with Egypt and Israel or at best, are neutral. The then two Super Powers also accepted the OAU Mission. As a result of its deliberations, a four member Sub-Committee chaired by President Senghor was mandated to visit Cairo and Tel-Aviv to discuss “concrete proposals” worked out by the OAU while President Daddah, then OAU Chairman was authorized to present the OAU peace proposals to the UN Secretary General, U Thant and Dr. Gunnar Jarring, UN Middle East Mediator. Because of his position and personality, President Senghor played the most prominent role. The peace mission had discussions with Egyptian and Israeli leaders in November 1971. While he showed a real concern for their mandate and believed that

> We Black Africans understand both the Arabs and the Israelis, because, together with us, they form a triad of suffering peoples,

reports indicated that the four African leaders were more sympathetic to the Israeli cause and demonstrated greater objectivity than was contained in the African Summit Resolution of June 1971.
Specifically, they recommended the resumption of “indirect negotiations” mediated by Dr. Jarring, an interim agreement for opening the Suez Canal and free navigation in the Straits of Tiran:

They were also concerned that: ‘secure and recognized boundaries’ be determined in the peace agreements; security be achieved through UN guarantees, demilitarized zones and international forces, including troops to be stationed at strategic points and withdrawal terms be embodied in the peace agreements.65

The Peace Mission could not reach a compromise between Egyptian demand for immediate Israeli troop withdrawal and Israeli insistence that negotiations should commence forthwith. True, it is that they agreed on the desirability of resuming the Jarring Mission. They were unable to agree on the terms of its continuation. It was the disagreement among the ten-member Committee over the Report of the Peace Mission that delivered the coup de grace – because the report of the Peace Mission was not endorsed at the UNGA meeting in December 1971. Rather, Nigeria, Cameroun and Senegal (three of the ‘Four Wise Men’) along with Ethiopia, Mauritania and Tanzania sponsored a 21-nation Afro-Asian Resolution (General Assembly Resolution 2799 (XXVI), December 13, 1971) calling for the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict, as well as the

Termination of all claims or state of belligerency and respect for an acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every state in the area and its rights to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force.

The Resolution which was passed with a vote of 79-7 with 36 abstentions expressed “full support for all the efforts of the Special Representative to implement Security Council Resolution 242(1967).” ‘The lack of unanimity among the majority of OAU member-States at the UNGA with respect to the proposals by the ‘Four Wise Men’ was made manifest in the vote on two amendments (16-65-42) proposed by Barbados and Ghana to the original draft (General Assembly Resolutions Draft Amendment A/L 651, December 10, 1971 and A/L 655, December 13, 1971). Another Resolution (General Assembly Draft A/L656. December 13, 1971) amending the original draft and sponsored by Senegal, indicating that the General Assembly “notes with satisfaction the replies given by Egypt and Israel to the Memorandum of the Committee of African Heads of State and considers the replies sufficiently
positive to make possible a resumption of the Special Representative's mission” failed to pass, partly, because it was submitted so late in the Session.66

What reasons can be advanced for the changing positions among the OAU member-States at the UN with respect to the peace proposals by the “Four Wise Men”?67 According to an observer:

In the UN, Egypt could use leverage unavailable within the Middle East regional system itself. It could call upon the solidarity of the African states with a fellow member of the OAU and the ‘Third World’ who tend to vote together on North-South issues such as decolonization and economic development. The approximately 14:1 ratio of Arab to Israeli votes in the UN could also be important on votes of particular concern to Africans, such as the liberation of Southern Africa. More particularly, the Arab votes could be important in elections for major positions and committees within the UN system.68

There appears to be a coalescence of issues among Sub-Saharan African countries and the Arab world including North Africa, and the latter (North Africa) exploited the opportunity to the fullest advantage. It was small wonder then that President Daddah noted that the ‘Peace Plan for the Middle East’ foundered because Israel

strongly rejected any peace settlement and was even more strongly opposed to anything that might lead to the withdrawal of its forces from occupied territories.69

At the African Summit in June 1972 in Rabat, Morocco (an Arab country) and chaired by an Arab leader, King Hassan of Morocco, a Resolution, drafted by a Committee of Twelve Foreign Ministers from the ten-member Committee plus Morocco and Algeria (which has also been a leading anti-imperialist state and perhaps more prepared than Egypt to support armed struggles in Africa)70 and moved by Cote D’Ivoire, perhaps the most pro-Israeli African state was approved by “consensus,” meaning that it did not secure the support of all delegations. The OAU Resolution of June 14, 1972, essentially pro-Egyptian, strongly condemned Israel, though two-thirds of OAU member-States then maintained diplomatic and economic relations with Israel.

The Arab diplomatic victory at the Addis Ababa Summit in May 1973 was remarkable in spite of the serious blow to the Arab cause which was inadvertently inflicted by Colonel Ghaddafi of Libya. A few weeks before the Addis Ababa Summit, Colonel Ghaddafi sent cables to all African Heads of States and Governments urging them to boycott the Summit unless the venue were changed to Cairo or unless
Ethiopia agreed immediately to sever diplomatic relations with Israel and close the Israeli Embassy in Addis Ababa. He also demanded that the OAU headquarters be moved to Cairo. He accused Ethiopia of supporting Israel, the ‘Zionist enemy,’ and called on all African countries to “define their attitudes to the Zionist enemy and coordinate them with the Libyan views.” No one heeded Libya’s call for a boycott of the 1973 Addis Ababa Summit and every OAU member-State (including Libya) sent a delegation. At the Summit, President Boumediene of Algeria won wide admiration among many Black African leaders compared with Ghaddafi’s reckless attack on Ethiopia which infuriated many Black African leaders, and certainly embarrassed his Arab compatriots. President Boumediene compared the occupation of Egyptian territory with that of Southern Africa by white settlers, and contended that this was an insult to the entire African continent. Making a passionate plea to African Heads of States and Governments to sever diplomatic relations with Israel as a “concrete act of African Unity,” President Boumediene declared: “Africa cannot adopt one attitude towards colonialism in Southern Africa and a completely different one towards Zionist colonialization in Northern Africa.” In effect, the Middle East problem, the Algerian leader contended, was, and should be part of the African struggle against colonialism, imperialism and Zionism in different parts of the continent. That President Boumedienne turned a likely Arab diplomatic defeat into a significant victory could be seen in the Resolution unanimously adopted by the African Heads of States and Governments on 29 May 1973. This Resolution reaffirmed previous OAU policy on the Middle East crisis. It stated that “respect for inalienable rights of the Palestine people is an essential element of any just and equitable solution” of the Middle East problem, but watered down the guarantee “of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of every state in the area,” embodied in UNSC Resolution 242. It warned Israel that her refusal to withdraw from occupied territories constituted an act of aggression, threatening the “security, territorial integrity and unity” of our continent; and that it “might lead OAU members to take at the African level, individually or collectively, political and economic measures against it in conformity with the principles contained in the OAU and UN Charters.”

It was small wonder then that when the Yom Kippur War broke out in October 1973, twenty-seven Sub-Saharan African states reacted strongly by breaking diplomatic relations with Israel. And, when the Arab oil producing states began their ‘oil’ offensive against the Western powers supporting and encouraging Israeli ‘aggression’ and intransigence, the OAU Council of Ministers, meeting at Addis Ababa from 19 – 21 November 1973, seized the opportunity of calling upon the Arab oil producing states
(who are members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) and the Organization of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries (OAPEC)) to extend their oil embargo to Portugal and the racist regimes in Southern Africa. In a Report to the Council on the Algerian proposals entitled, Consideration of Current Middle East Situation with Particular Reference to its Effects in Africa, the former Secretary General of OAU, Mr. Ekangaki noted that

The countries which are our worst enemies depend considerably on us for their energy supplies. In the circumstances, it would be reasonable to think that the time has come for our Arab brothers to use the oil embargo as a weapon against these countries.  

Hence, the Algiers Summit of Arab Heads of State of 26 – 28 November 1973 not only responded positively to the request made by the OAU Council of Ministers to impose an oil embargo on South Africa and Rhodesia, but also proposed an Arab-African Summit to broaden the base of Afro-Arab cooperation/relations. In its Resolution on Africa, the Arab Heads of State decided that all diplomatic, consular, economic, cultural and other relations with South Africa, Rhodesia and Portugal should be broken off by those Arab states which had not yet done so, and that a strict oil embargo should be imposed on these three countries. They welcomed the OAU decision to set up a seven-nation Committee to seek ways of bringing about closer Arab-African cooperation, and pledged to give diplomatic and material support to African Liberation Movements. They announced the establishment of an Arab Bank for Industrial and Agricultural Development in Africa with an initial capital of $231 million and an Arab Economic Organization with a total capital of $446 million to provide loans and technical assistance to African states. In his Address to the Arab Summit, the Algerian leader called the emerging Afro-Arab solidarity (after the 1973 Addis Ababa Summit) a landmark in Africa’s international relations. He noted that the

Time has come to consolidate the Arab-African solidarity in other spheres of mutual cooperation between the political, economic and technical institutions of the OAU and the Arab League. Such cooperation representing human and material resources of the Arab and African countries will constitute a formidable force in international relations capable of playing a decisive role in the service of justice and freedom in the whole world.

Afro-Arab cooperation in the 50s, 60s and early 70s focused on mutual support in the struggles against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, Zionism, racism and apartheid. Mutual support between Sub-Saharan Africa and the Arab world particularly North (Arab) Africa took many forms
including Arab economic boycott of South Africa, Rhodesia and Portugal (before decolonization of African territories) though this support was not equally shared by all the Arab states. For example, Lebanon maintained its consular relations with South Africa until 1973 while South African manufactured goods unofficially littered some Arab markets much of the time. Following the Arab Summit in Algiers in November 1973, Arab Heads of State not only supported Africa, terminated oil supplies to South Africa, Rhodesia and Portugal; they also practical steps towards consolidating Afro-Arab cooperation. The Second Summit of the Islamic Conference in Lahore between February 22 and 24, 1974 called on member-States to continue their support of African struggles against colonialism, racism and apartheid in Southern Africa especially in South Africa, Rhodesia and Portuguese colonies in Africa and to sever all dealings with these regimes, and in particular stop all shipments of oil and prevent any derogation to the rule.

Events following the Algiers Summit of the Arab League and Lahore Summit of the Islamic Conference created some uneasiness and anti-Arab murmurings among some African leaders who raised serious questions about the propriety of the rupturing of diplomatic relations with Israel which was compelled to upgrade her diplomatic representation with apartheid South Africa.74 To be sure, while several African leaders including President Siad Barre of Somalia (regarded as part of the Arab bloc) bemoaned Arab indifference to serious economic difficulties including balance of payments deficits faced by many poor African countries as a consequence of huge increases in the prices of oil and oil-related products caused by the Arab oil embargo, many Black African leaders were not only incensed by Arab attempts to dominate the OAU and its institutions especially the Secretariat (the election of whose new head-Secretary General – nearly marred the Modagishu Summit of African Heads of States and Governments) and the African Development Bank; they were also agitated that the much-publicised Arab pledge of $500 million loan to the ADB remained unfulfilled, and in anticipation of the Arab pledge, and under pressure, the ADB had overcommitted its resources and given loans to some North (Arab) states including Tunisia (which received $8.46 million though its paid-up share stood at $4.162 million), thus, exposing the multilateral development bank to liquidity crisis.75
New Phase of Afro-Arab Relations and Role of North Africa in the Transformation of the OAU to African Union and African Development

DEVELOPMENTS LEADING TO THE FIRST AFRO-ARAB SUMMIT

The 8th Extra Ordinary Session of the OAU Council of Ministers in November 1973 decided to establish economic cooperation between the Arab League of States and the OAU as well as the machinery for such cooperation. This was followed by a Summit of ALS in Algiers with a “Declaration Concerning Africa Adopted by the Arab Kings and Heads of State” reaffirming Arab-African solidarity in all spheres. As we noted above, the Arab Summit resolved in late November 1973 establish an Arab Bank for Industrial and Agricultural Development in Africa with an initial Share Capital of $231 million and also an Arab Economic Organisation with a total capital of $446 million to provide loans (to cushion the effects of balance of payments deficits) and technical assistance to African States. However, questions were raised about the propriety of establishing other financial institutions given the existence of the African Development Bank which then had 39 OAU member-States, and is not only the Pan-African financing institution for socio-economic development in Africa, but already has solid institutional framework, competent professional manpower and a wide range of experience to enable it play a key role in the channeling of financial and technical assistance to African States under the best possible terms and conditions. Serious misgivings were expressed about the effects of Arab oil embargo imposed by the OAPEC with two categories of African States adversely affected by the embargo. The first category comprises eleven African countries with their own oil refineries but must import crude oil for those refineries. If their crude oil imports in 1974 remained at 1973 level, their total oil import bill would rise by 242 percent over the 1973 import bill, namely, from $185 million in 1973 to $634 million in 1974. The second category consists of twenty-two African countries which import refined oil. Their combined oil import bill in 1974 would be 157 percent over their 1973 import bill if the 1973 consumption level remained the same. This meant an increase in oil import bill from $166 million in 1973 to $427 million in 1974. Thus, thirty-three OAU member-States which were not oil importers would have to pay more than $1 billion for their oil imports in 1974 as compared with about $400 million in 1973.

Given the huge increases in prices of oil, a commodity which is not produced by most of Black Africa, Sub-Saharan African problems are more likely to be compounded. First, the Arab (North) African countries, because of their special affinity to the Arab world and the benefits derived therefrom, are unlikely to face similar problems as their Sub-Saharan (Black) African counterparts. Second, the duality
of the position of Arab (North) African counties must be seen as a factor tending to influence the
relationship between Black Africa and the Arab world as a whole.\textsuperscript{27} As Eze put succinctly:

\begin{quote}
The North African Arabs are Africans not only because these countries are
geographically located on the African continent but because they have
participated actively in shaping intra-African economic and political
relations.\textsuperscript{78}
\end{quote}

It has been argued that the causes of underdevelopment of Black African countries are much more
fundamental than the huge oil price increases caused by the Arab oil embargo.\textsuperscript{79} Nzo Ekangaki former
OAU Secretary-General has grouped African countries into four categories:

1. Six North African (Arab) countries unaffected by the embargo;
2. Three countries: Peoples Republic of the Congo, Gabon and Nigeria which
   are crude oil producers;
3. Eleven countries which have refineries but must import crude oil; and
4. Twenty-two countries which import refined oil and are the most affected
   by the oil embargo and huge increases in oil prices.\textsuperscript{80}

The question being frequently asked was whether the Arabs owed any obligation to Black Africa for the
diplomatic support given by the latter to the former following the October 1973 Yom Kippur War. It has
been argued by certain Black African countries that the Arabs should compensate Black Africa for the
extra huge oil import bill increase occasioned by the embargo as well as the loss of Israeli assistance
caused by rupturing of diplomatic relations with Israel.

Arab States had rejected entreaties of offer of concessionary/differential oil prices to African oil
producing countries. Mr. Sayed Hisham Nassir, Saudi Minister of State and Acting Petroleum Minister
noted: “We are willing to help our African brothers but by no means shall we give them special oil
purchase rates which are different from the rest of the world.”\textsuperscript{81} They argue, though not quite
convincingly, that oil prices were fixed by OPEC and that Arab oil producers want to avoid being
accused of double price concessions to African countries by other oil consumers though they gave
guarantees of adequate oil supply to African oil importing countries on two conditions which, as
Ekangaki put it, “the OAU considered completely acceptable.” These are:

1. that oil provided should not be re-exported from African countries; and
2. that African countries getting supplies from non-Arab sources (USSR, Iran
   and Venezuela) should continue to do so to prevent the diversion of
   supplies to countries (South Africa and Portugal) facing Arab oil
   embargo.\textsuperscript{82}
Mr. Ekangaki added that Arab oil Ministers accepted OAU request that ships carrying oil to South Africa and Portugal be blacklisted and refused entry to Arab ports. Arab oil Ministers also agreed with the OAU Committee of Seven that a Special Assistance Fund would be set up to assist African countries facing balance of payments deficits as a result of the oil embargo, and that the Fund would be administered by the OAU to ensure that it would not be used for other considerations beyond the real needs of the countries concerned. However, if Arab oil States are unwilling to give concessionary oil prices to African oil importing countries for the reasons so advanced, why did the Organization of Arab Petroleum Producing Countries offer North (Arab) African countries oil on concessionary terms? As we noted above, the increases in oil prices did not affect North (Arab) African countries to the same extent as their Black African countries. The point to emphasize here is two-fold. First, the North (Arab) African countries are OAU member-States and in varying degrees, have supported liberation movements in Africa, particularly in Southern Africa. Nasser (Egypt) and Ben Bella (Algeria) were among the most ardent supporters of liberation movements in Southern Africa. Egypt, after Nasser, still supported liberation struggles in Southern Africa though her contribution was limited by her preoccupation with the Arab-Israeli conflict (Middle East Crisis). Boumedienne (Algeria) was certainly less enthusiastic about liberation struggles in Southern Africa than Ben Bella was but he had become involved in the fenetic Middle East politics. As Eze put it:

For the rest of the North African Arabs, like many Black African countries, their support for African Liberation Movements has varied from lukewarm to down right indifference. The Arab countries from the Gulf, in view of the dominance of Western interests over their economies at least before the 1973 October War, have not been able to make a positive contribution to the African liberation struggle.

Second, and perhaps more important, apart from Algeria, Libya and to some extent, Egypt, which produces some oil, the rest (of North (Arab) Africa does not produce any oil, and therefore, unlikely to be in any position to assist Black Africa. In essence, since the Middle East crisis is the concern of the Arab world which, by definition, embraces the North (Arab) African Arabs, the latter North (Arab) Africans could have used and could use their good offices and influence in the Arab League to persuade the non-African members of the League to make some concessions to Black Africa.
True, it is that some Black African countries contemplated resuming diplomatic relations with Israel, not without threats of sanctions from some Arab States including Libya. True, it is that certain African countries considered imposing certain economic sanctions against North (Arab) countries, particularly Egypt and the Sudan, indicating the extent of disenchantment and disillusionment of Black Africa with the Arab world. By 1975, there was some indication that African countries were more willing to forge greater political cooperation with the Arab world. First, the OAU enunciated a policy of providing support to the Palestine Liberation Organization. The OAU Liberation Committee provided token assistance to the PLO in the same manner as all African liberation movements while the OAU explored all ways to increase the isolation of Israel. Second, the Palestinian question formed a separate item on the agenda at the African Summit in Kampala in June 1975.

Meanwhile, the years 1974 through 1976 started with a flurry of activities culminating in the first Afro-Arab Summit in Cairo in March 1977. First, Arab-African Oil Ministers met in Cairo on January 22, 1974 on guaranteed Arab oil supplies to Africa. Arab oil Ministers had met in Kuwait in December 1973 where they expressed eagerness to satisfy Africa’s oil needs. Meanwhile, the Statute of the Arab Bank for African Development with on initial capital of $195 million, later raised to $500 million to finance industrial, agricultural and economic development programmes in Africa excluding exchange of technical assistance between Arab and African countries with a seed money of $15 million, passed the drafting stage. Second, a Federation of Arab Republics consisting of Egypt, Syria and Libya announced during a visit by a delegation to Nigeria, Togo, Liberia and Sierra Leone and Cote D’Ivoire on January 29, 1974 additional $42 million for the Arab agricultural bank proposed for Africa, followed by a Kuwaiti Government announcement giving $200 million to be channelled through the Arab Bank to finance industrial and agricultural development programmes in Africa. Third, addressing the first Conference on Afro-Arab Cooperation in Cairo on January 22-23, 1974, Mr. Mahmoud Riad, Secretary-General of the ALS had this much to say:

Our historic relations are close. The Arab League with all its members endorsed and respected the resolutions of the Organisation of African Unity since its inception. We all are developing countries suffering from the hard impact of economic backwardness in spite of the huge resources and potentialities owned by the African and Arab peoples... we should overcome all obstacles impeding our advance... with a common action based on concerted and integrated foundations... so as to increase our production and raise its value (and) make up for what was unjustly and oppressively imposed
on us by the colonialist powers and... go along with the great achievements of the world today.  

In his own address, Mr. Nzo Ekangaki noted:

We truly believe that peace in the Middle East is not only in the interest of the Arabs but also in the interest of Africans as well as in that of the world community at large. The real and long-term solution to the economic problems of African countries lies in increasing and rationalizing trade exchange amongst them and with the Arab countries. This conference can achieve a great leap forward in the path of African-Arab unity and African-Arab solidarity.

Fourth, the first instalment of about 70 million Naira loan from Arab oil producers was released to less fortunate and needy African countries including Ethiopia and Tanzania (which had the highest – about 7 million Naira each – to alleviate the effects of drought and balance of payments deficits caused by the huge increases in oil prices). Fifth, a Somali proposal for an Afro-Arab Summit was referred by Arab Foreign Ministers meeting in Cairo in early September 1974 to an Arab Summit slated for Rabat, Morocco in October 1974. The Foreign Ministers at their Cairo meeting agreed on an accelerated disbursement of loans to African countries from the $200 million Arab Development Fund established early 1974 “in appreciation of African support to the Arabs during last October war.” And, at the Rabat Summit, a Somali Memorandum was discussed and at the end of the deliberation, it was agreed: (1) that an Arab delegation be sent to African countries to discuss the convening of an Afro-Arab Summit which might lead to increased Arab aid to Africa; (2) that an Arab-African Fund at $200 million be capitalized for 1975 with the possibility of further increase after consultations/discussions between Arab governments; (3) that the capitalization of Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa, based in Khartoum, at $231 million be increased by $140 million; (4) that a meeting of the Bank’s Governors be convened by December 11, 1974 to implement the decisions of the Summit; (5) that the capital of the Arab Technical Fund for Africa be increased from $76 million to $80 million. True, it is that African countries were disenchanted with the quantum of aid and investment in Africa by Arab oil producers which prefer to invest their petrol-dollars in developed market economies. Following the Rabat Summit, the Arab League informed six African countries (Uganda, Mali, Tanzania, Liberia, Rwanda and Gambia) which had received loans that the loan repayment period had been extended from three to ten years.

Addressing a five-day (January 7-11, 1976) Symposium on Afro-Arab Liberation and Development in
Khartoum, Sudan, the Head of the Nigerian delegation, Major General Ibrahim Haruna, Federal Commissioner for Information called on African and Arab leaders and intellectuals to cooperate and launch nationalist programmes that would ensure a just recycling of national wealth and resources that would embrace the yearnings of the masses. While stressing the need for recognition to be given to the needs of African and Arab peasants who formed the major parts of these population groups if cooperative efforts were to be meaningful and rural-urban drift reversed, Major General Haruna warned that African and Arab liberation would remain a mirage if we did not recognize and concentrate efforts on addressing the imbalance between available food and population together with the attendant problem of food preservation and marketing. While noting the establishment of the Afro-Arab Cooperation Fund and Afro-Arab Development in respect of financing agricultural development projects and infrastructural investments, Major-General Haruna advocated a program of action and measures which would include armed struggle, economic measures such as boycotts, financial aid, training, education and other material goods necessary “to create the realization and achievement of the revolution any goals as conceived by nationalist organizations or governments.”

Meanwhile, preparatory meetings of Afro-Arab leaders were held in Cairo and Dakar in March and April 1976 on matters affecting the two blocs. At the Cairo Summit attended by delegations from fifty-nine countries and Mr. Yasser Arafat, a Charter of economic and political cooperation was signed with the delegations declaring Palestinian and Southern African guerrilla movements “Afro-Arab causes,” promising renewed support including arms and logistics to national liberation groups. A Declaration promised Afro-Arab cooperation in finance, mining, trade, industry, agriculture, energy, transport, communications and telecommunications. Two other documents covered the mechanics of cooperation including the need for the establishment of preferential trade agreements and an increase in the capital of the ADB and the Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa and to this end, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates boosted the capital of the ADB by $35 million to $1 billion while that of the Khartoum-based Arab Bank was raised by $180 million to $544.5 million, though the aid came to two-thirds of an original African demand as tabled by Tanzania which was the subject of heated discussions at a Foreign Ministers’ Conference preceding the Summit. Various speakers at the closing session such as Presidents Sadat, Kaunda, Baire, Nimieiri and Ahidjo described the Cairo Summit as a milestone in the history of the Third World. In his welcome Address at a Summit of over seventy African and Arab Foreign Ministers convened in Dakar in April 1916 to examine Afro-Arab cooperation in
the light of a Programme of Action and Statement prepared by the OAU Secretary General, Mr. William Eteki Mboumoua, the Senegalese President, Leopold Senghor appealed to all Arab countries to eschew bitterness and solve their problem while cooperating with other African countries in decolonizing Southern Africa, urging a union of the Arab League and the OAU. While Arab countries expressed serious reservations about the OAU document, the Dakar Summit endorsed in eight point Charter of cooperation between the OAU and the Arab League.

Then came the March 1977 Cairo Meeting of Foreign Ministers of over sixty Afro-Arab countries to prepare a programme of economic and political cooperation between Black Africa and the Arab world, with the Togolese Foreign Minister, Edem Kodjo appealing to Arab oil States to be more generous with their oil wealth:

The Arabs should look beyond the concept of profit and loss and make a political decision to help Africa develop its mineral and agricultural resources and harness the energy of its rivers and lakes. He raised two issues before the meeting namely, the growing gap between the rich and poor countries of the region and Africa’s political support of the Arabs against Israel and Arab support for liberation movements in Southern Africa.

Addressing an Inaugural Session of the three-day First Afro-Arab Summit on March 7, 1977, first mooted by Somalia in October 1973, the Egyptian leader, President Answar el Sadat said that Afro-Arab solidarity which was manifested before and after the Yom Kippur War opened a new vista in the movement of solidarity among peace-leaving and freedom-loving peoples in the face of dangers and challenges. He announced the donation of $1 million in cash and kind to African liberation movements by Egypt which had always supported liberation efforts in Africa since the July 23, 1952 Revolution, emphasizing several points:

1. The Arab nation strongly believes that supporting African issues is a national duty which is as important as the duty of liberating occupied Arab territories.
2. An international economic system should be established to enable Arab and African countries to develop their resources to serve the aims of overall development and remove the traces of exploitation and injustice from which Arab and African countries suffered for long
3. While the eyes of the world were riveted on the Afro-Arab Summit in order to take the common struggles of African and Arab countries to new horizons, Afro-Arab countries should direct the course of events between
the East and West and ensure that the détente between the two blocs should not threaten or undermine Afro-Arab interests and rights.99

After much deliberation, the Summit which ended on March 9, 1977 adopted four documents:

1. Political Declaration
2. Declaration and Programme of Afro-Arab Action
3. Declaration on Afro-Arab Economic Financial cooperation

On (1), the Summit affirmed that the Programme of Action was a historical turning point to reinforce the links between African and Arab countries, strengthen their political independence and sovereignty over their natural resources.100 The Summit:

1. decided to mobilize all potentialities for strengthening Afro-Arab relations in various fields;
2. affirmed its full support for all liberation movements in Palestine and Southern Africa in their struggles to regain their legitimate rights including rights to self determination;
3. condemned Israeli occupation of Arab territories as well as measures to change their geographical and demographic features; and,
4. reaffirmed all efforts to enhance the political and economic isolation of Israel, South Africa and Rhodesia and called on Israel to create a conducive atmosphere for resolving the Middle East conflict.101

On (2), the Summit stressed the determination of Afro-Arab countries to develop and expand the areas of cooperation between African and Arab countries, and on (3), the Summit adopted a Plan of cooperation designed to strengthen African development, organize technical and financial assistance, encourage investments, strengthen trade relations between Africa and the Arab world and use Arab funds for development in Africa. Finally, the Summit agreed to establish a number of joint bodies to ensure Afro-Arab cooperation in various fields.102

Experiences of many African countries since the diplomatic ruptures with Israel and events since the first Afro-Arab Summit in Cairo in March 1977 have not borne out the high hopes and aspirations of several Black African countries. First, wealthy Arab countries have not been so generous with financial and economic assistance while those Arab countries like Libya which have provided overseas development assistance have concentrated on military assistance rather than economic sectors and even shown selectivity, backing Muslim countries and factions against non-Muslims. Indeed, Libya lured several African leaders with promises of huge ODA subject to opposing Israel and converting to Islam. More significant, one has witnessed continued investment of Arab oil money in Europe and United
States which maintain economic links with apartheid South Africa, thus, indirectly/directly endorsing South African economy in spite of basic exploitation of Black labour.\textsuperscript{103} Second, development assistance from the three bodies established by the Arab League had proved insufficient to offset the awful financial plights of African oil consuming countries. Saudi Arabia which produces $33\frac{1}{3}$ percent of the world’s oil loaned Pakistan $1.7$ billion to buy United States arms as against $124$ million given to African nations hit by economic recession caused by Arab oil embargo. Third, was the lack of zeal, commitment and support by Arab states to the political problems in Southern Africa. Of particular note was the Jordanian sale of 31 military Jets to the Ian Smith regime in Rhodesia.\textsuperscript{104} Fourth, several Black African leaders noted:

1. that no Arab Head of State from Africa attended the Second World Black and African Festival of Arts and Culture in Lagos, Nigeria;
2. that no Arab Foreign Ministers from Africa attended the First Extra Ordinary Meeting of OAU Council of Ministers in Kinshasa;
3. That Arab countries have been getting too much from Black Africa for nothing and that Arabs, regard at best, Black African nations as pawns for the satisfaction of African needs and interests;
4. that religious chauvinism and skin colour can contribute to creating a superiority complex in the Arabs towards Black Africans. Hence, Major General Joe Garba, Nigeria’s Foreign Minister in the mid 70s stressed the need for attitudinal change by Arab nations in the interests of continental peace, understanding and progress, condemning, in no uncertain terms, “occasional patronizing attitudes of certain Arab countries towards their African neighbours.”\textsuperscript{105}

Additionally, it has been argued, not without much justification, that Arabs lack technical expertise as Black Africans, and where Arabs have constituted themselves in large numbers such as Lebanese and Syrians, they have tended to be exploitative, deriving much from the economy and offering not much except corrupting influences.

**NORTH AFRICA AND TRANSFORMATION OF THE ORGANISATION OF AFRICAN UNITY TO AFRICAN UNION**

It will be recalled that some North (Arab) African countries, notably, Egypt, Libya, Morocco, and Algeria played central roles not only in the founding of the Organisation of African Unity. They have joined other African countries in establishing the African Economic Community following the adoption
of the Abuja Treaty. They have also played leading roles in restructuring the OAU and founding the African Union in addition to the design and implementation of African development plans especially the launching of New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), an economic arm of the AU.\textsuperscript{106}

Following a series of in-depth consideration of Africa’s economic problems by African Ministers and various groups of experts, the 1979 Monrovia Summit of African Heads of States and Governments adopted a Declaration of commitment on the guidelines and measures for national and collective self-reliance in socio-economic development within the framework of the North-South dialogue for a New International Economic Order. In October 1980, Nigeria hosted the first OAU Economic Summit which adopted the Lagos Plan of Action,\textsuperscript{107} which was a Blue print to regional approach to socio-economic development based primarily on collective self-reliance. Adebayo noted that the Lagos Plan of Action, which was adopted at the Summit, recognized, \textit{inter-alia}, the need to take urgent action to facilitate the achievement of the goals of rapid self-reliance, self-sustained development and economic growth, thus, laying the foundation of regional socio-economic integration of Africa.\textsuperscript{108} Consequently, African leaders, in the Final Act of Lagos, affirmed their commitment, to set up, by the year 2000, on the basis of a Treaty to be concluded, an African Economic Community (AEC), with the aim of ensuring rapid socio-economic and cultural integration of the African continent and promoting collective, accelerated, self-reliant and self-sustaining development of member-States, as well as cooperation among these states and their integration in the economic, social and cultural fields. And, at their Fourth Extra-Ordinary Summit held in Sirte, Libya on September 9, 1999, African Heads of States and Governments deliberated extensively on the ways and means of strengthening the continental organization with a view to making it more effective, thus keeping the organization at the same level with best international practices, not only in Africa, but also with the outside world. Thus, following frank and extensive discussions on how to strengthen African Unity, the Summit decided to establish the African Union in conformity with the OAU Charter and the provisions of the Treaty establishing the African Economic Community (Abuja Treaty).\textsuperscript{109}

In essence, it can be argued that the primary goal of African leaders is to accelerate the process of implementing the Abuja Treaty by shortening its implementation periods and ensuring the speedy establishment of all institutions provided for in the Treaty. The Heads of States and Government therefore mandated the Council of Ministers to prepare the constitutive legal text of the Union to be adopted in 2001 at the Extra-Ordinary Summit convened specifically for that purpose in Sirte, Libya. At
the time that the draft Constitutive Act was submitted to the Heads of States and Government at the Extra-Ordinary Summit in Sirte, the exact nature of the African Union remained largely unsettled. Thus, a few of the member-States believed that the Union should be a Federal or at least a Confederal Continental Government. This position was based on the notion that Africa is one entity and that there is no difference between its component parts, hence, the “United States of Africa.” There is also the view that Africa is a continent characterized by deeply divided political and economic levels of development and as such, an immediate political union was not feasible, principally, because Africa is made up of independent States that desire to retain their political independence and sovereignties. What is significant is that the sharply divided opinions took the political statesmanship of President Obasanjo of Nigeria to strike a delicate balance between the two extreme opposing views to be able to adopt the Constitutive Act in Sirte in 2001. According to President Obasanjo and guided by the provisions of the Sirte Declaration of September 9, 1999, the nature of African Union should be understood to mean the pursuit of socio-economic integration of the continent as a first and necessary step towards the achievement of political union. Furthermore, while political union is desirable and should be the ultimate objective of the AU, the socio-economic conditions for its immediate implementation were not and are still not in place. It was noted however that closer socio-economic integration would, of necessity, require some degree of political cooperation. This arrangement may necessarily not be in form of a federation or even a confederation at this stage but could be the ultimate goal in the future. Ultimately, this was the argument that persuaded the adoption of the Constitutive Act of the AU in its present form. The majority of member-States thus agreed that the Union should be an arrangement that will accelerate the process of integration of the continent in all its ramifications.

The rapid nature of the creation of the AU is of particular interest to scholars of international politics given the clash and accommodation of interests of the major actors (Mbeki, Obasanjo and Ghaddafi) who serve as arrow heads with respect to its creation. First, was Thabo Mbeki’s enlightened self-interests, while the AU was conceived by the African National Congress and the need to place South Africa as a safe haven for direct foreign investments given South Africa’s level of industrialization in Africa. How the assumption of office by President Nelson Mandela of South Africa not only brought to the fore the instability created on the South African economy by the ‘Cold War’ saga, but also that his neo-liberal position rendered the populist and socialist ideology of ANC unattractive. His first major
attempt to carve out a world view for South Africa was to move the ANC away from its traditional populist and socialist ideas through a series of in-house discussions. While the internal re-orientation was going on, President Mandela usually signalled through public speeches and policy documents that the new South Africa would be guided by liberal tradition. For instance, in 1996, the government made public that its policies would be informed by “Growth Employment and Redistribution,” a neo-liberal strategy designed to make South Africa a destination for direct foreign investments in Africa and competitive global trade. This position was further reiterated by Thabo Mbeki and hence, given priority to the development of a coherent foreign policy that revolved around liberal internationalism initiated by his predecessor. Thus, Mbeki’s prioritization of foreign policy in the early days of his leadership was intended to cow the opposition to the liberal doctrine within the ANC, and also signal to the business community that he was committed to making South Africa a destination for direct foreign investments and international commerce in Africa.

According to Tieku:

It was within this context that Mbeki decided to reform the OAU which had been referred to in the international media as a ‘dictator’s club; on his first appearance as President of South Africa at the OAU Summit in Algiers, in July, 1999... which Mbeki felt was not reflective of the democratic wave in Africa, he considered that the OAU could be strengthened, so that in its work, it focuses on the strategic objective of the realization of the African Renaissance. However, since South Africa is located in a continent whose international image as a protector of human rights, including property rights leaves much to be desired, the immediate challenge faced by ANC in its attempt to pursue these twin objectives was devising appropriate means to improve Africa’s image. Not surprisingly, South Africa’s first major foreign policy document showed that foreign policy perspectives in a democratic South Africa indicated that human rights and promotion of democracy would be at the core of its foreign policy.

Alred Nzo as the first Foreign Minister of the New South Africa said “human rights are the cornerstone of our government policy and we shall not hesitate to carry the message to the far corners of the world. We have suffered too much ourselves not to do so.” However, the neo-liberal position of the South African Government created division within the ANC and undermined Mandela’s efforts to chart a coherent foreign policy. Thus, three broad changes with respect to South Africa’s world view could be discerned at the time Thabo Mbeki took over in 1999. First, are the populist remnants of the
ANC who wanted South Africa to maintain its ties even with ‘rogue’ States. Second, are the liberal internationalists, who believed in the reinvention of South Africa as a global trading state with strong regional and continental interests. And, third, are the pragmatists, who held the view that foreign policy should be driven by national interests rather than ethical values or ideological principles. The inability of President Mandela to assert his view over and above these three groups prompted some analysts to suggest that the new South Africa has “no foreign policy at all under him.”

Aside from opening up the business space of South Africa to the international community, Mbeki’s rigorous defense of liberal norms and his open condemnation of undemocratic governments in Africa angered some African leaders many of whom had supported the ANC and given it sanctuary during the days of liberation struggles including Ghaddafi. The anger that President Mbeki’s position generated, and the resulting accusation that South Africa was “little more than the West’s lackey on the Southern tip of Africa,” compelled his government to adopt a new approach to the promotion of neoliberalism in Africa. Mbeki’s new strategy entailed placing the neo-liberal message within a broader transformationalist agenda. Instead of open condemnation of illiberal governments in Africa, President Mbeki called for the restructuring of the African identity. It was therefore within the purview of his ‘African Renaissance’ that Mbeki demanded the reorganization of the OAU to diffuse dictatorial tendencies of the African elite class. First, was to reorient the OAU towards the promotion of strong and democratic institutions. Second, was to exclude seizure of power through unconstitutional means, particularly through coup d’états. And, the third was to assist military regimes that may exist on the African continent to think about democratic options as an acceptable form of government.

Now, to an examination of Obasanjo’s vision on the reform of the OAU. As part of his reform package to put the OAU on the path of progress and development, issues bordering on security, stability, development and cooperation in Africa were articulated in the Memorandum of Understanding on the “Conference on Security, Stability, Development and Cooperation in Africa” (CSSDCA). Obasanjo noted that the principles enunciated at the Conference demand certain standards of behaviour from every government (in Africa) in the interest of common humanity. Similarly, the reform agenda urged African leaders to treat security as both a human security issue and an interdependent phenomenon. A security concern at human level includes transcending, among others, economic, political and social aspects of individuals and the society at large. The reform also laid greater emphasis on effective participation of civil society in cooperation and development programmes,
thereby bringing or re-invigorating Pan-Africanism as an essential missing link among sovereign states in Africa. It is interesting, however, to note that the reform encourages African leaders to develop common African Agenda based on unity of purpose in order to confront headlong continental challenges. These lofty ideas of Chief Obasanjo, no doubt, manifest themselves clearly in both the institutional design and legal underpinnings of the AU. For instance, the Peace and Security Council and its Protocol as well as Article 4 (h) give the AU the duty to intervene in the domestic affairs of African nations on humanitarian grounds.

On security, the Obasanjo reform package in line with the Kampala Declaration aimed at influencing African leaders to look at security concerns from a holistic perspective noted that the concept of security must embrace all aspects of society, and that the security of a nation must be based on the security of the life of individual citizens to live in peace, and to satisfy basic needs. As an interdependent phenomenon, the reform package urged African leaders to see the security of their States as inseparably linked to other African countries. This implies that the maintenance of security anywhere in Africa is a collective responsibility of all African States, and that sovereignty no longer offers the protection behind which African leaders can hide to violate the fundamental rights of their citizens. On stability, the reform Plan suggested that the criteria for judging the stability of African States should be grounded in liberal principles such as respect for the rule of law, human rights, good governance and the participation of African citizens in public affairs. On cooperation and development, the reform Plan did not contain anything distinctly different from previous proposals submitted to the OAU. A majority of issues discussed under cooperation and development essentially reiterated the traditional rhetorical ideals, such as African resolution of African problems and the importance of integration for Africa’s development, among others. Since the OAU did not have the institutional mechanism necessary to provide a common African agenda, it was imperative to demand a restructuring of the Pan-African organization. Nonetheless, the glaring opposition by the ‘Old Guards’ who included Libya’s Muammar Ghaddafi, Sudan’s el-Bashir and Kenya’s Arap Moi practically militated against the implementation and realization of the Kampala Declaration on CSSDCA. Subsequent efforts by Chief Obasanjo to persuade African leaders to adopt the Declaration not only failed. Obasanjo’s imprisonment in 1995 also led to the disappearance of the document from the agenda of the OAU all together. According to Obasanjo, his attempt failed because “it threatened the status quo and especially the power positions of a few African governments whose domestic hold on unscrupulous
power rendered them vulnerable and insecure.” Therefore, the election of General Obasanjo as Nigeria’s President in May 1999 provided him with an opportunity to revive the CSSDCA process from where he left it in 1995. As a prelude to the revival of the CSSDCA process, President Obasanjo established a Ministry of Cooperation and Integration in Africa whose primary role is to foster African peace, security, and stability. Meanwhile, Muammar Ghaddafi began to show interest in strengthening the OAU in spite of his opposition to the Kampala Declaration. First, he invited African leaders to an Extra-Ordinary Summit in Sirte, Libya on September 9, 1999 primarily to discuss ways and means of making the OAU an effective organization. Presidents Obasanjo and Mbeki saw this invitation as a huge opportunity to achieve their interests. Abegunrin has noted that Ghaddafis has his own reasons. As he put it:

Apart from the obvious fact that he wanted to take credit for relaunching of continental integration initiatives in Africa, his decision to host the Summit was also influenced by much broader strategic and geopolitical imperatives... (and) use the platform... to cement his full return to the geopolitics of black Africa and... demonstrate his renewed commitment to the Pan Africanism project.¹¹⁵

It was within this context that Ghaddafi’s announcement to the media after the Summit that he had invited African leaders to an Extra-Ordinary Summit in Sirte in order to create a ‘United States of Africa’ acquires an analytical meaning. Since Ghaddafi’s had not, until this announcement, mentioned any ‘United States of Africa’ project, which entailed the creation of a continental presidency with a five year term, a single African military force and currency,¹¹⁶ and more importantly, to the extent that his invitation did not create any impression that the Extra-Ordinary Summit had been planned before the Algier’s Summit, many observers and African leaders interpreted the media announcement as the usual Ghaddafi’s ‘public display.’¹¹⁷

Thus, Ghaddafi’s announcement of the ‘United States of Africa’ proposal meant that the African leaders had three main competing requests by three African arrow-heads. In order to accommodate the three rival demands and interests, the decision to replace OAU with a new nomenclature became clear and hence, the emergence of the new-born African Union. It is interesting to note that a majority of African leaders adopted this position because they saw it as the best possible way, and indeed, an opportunity of avoiding division among them. However, Ghaddafi and his supporters presented the Sirte decision to the media as a victory for them. A careful reading of the Sirte Declaration shows that
the positions adopted by the Summit favoured Nigeria and South Africa tactically more than Libya or any other countries. As subsequent events showed, the victory declared by Ghaddafi and his sympathizers was somewhat premature. Although many of the leaders who spoke during the Sirte Summit cautiously welcomed Ghaddafi’s proposals, it was clear from their speeches that most of them saw it as too radical and excessively ambitious. It therefore did not take too long for those who disagreed with the whole idea to voice their opposition publicly. South Africa, for instance, had a firm hand in the drafting of the Constitutive Act of the AU, and indicated that it will not be part of any ‘United States of Africa,’ and consequently opposed the inclusion of Ghaddafi’s plan in the recommendation of the Council of Ministers. Thus, the constitutive legal text which was approved at the Lome Summit in June 2000 contained none of the ideas of the ‘United States of Africa’ as proposed by Muammar Ghaddafi. South Africa’s dominance in the drafting of the Constitutive Act shed light on the AU’s strong focus on the advancement of human rights, democracy and good governance as well as African Renaissance.

Though loosely based on the European Union (EU), the AU model adopted in Durban in 2002 had the footprints of Nigeria and South Africa. Many of Africa’s big men were not impressed. In fact, they resented the manner in which Nigeria and South Africa had usurped control of the organization. Muammar Ghaddafi, President Daniel Arap Moi, and Zimbabwean President Robert Mugabe were the chief opponents of AU. For Ghaddafi, Arab leaders in Africa had fallen out with him in 1998, when they refused to endorse an OAU Resolution rejecting UN sanctions against Libya for refusing to hand over two Libyan suspects in the 1988 bombing of PANAM 103 aircraft over Lockerbie, Scotland. Having failed to unite the Arab world behind him, Ghaddafi turned to Africa as his new support base. Inaction by the continent’s major players such as Nigeria, South Africa and Egypt left Ghaddafi with a free hand to try to dominate the politics of the AU. Ghaddafi had never hesitated to use his country’s vast oil and gas riches to promote his foreign policy objectives in Africa and the Arab world. His most willing supporters have been countries that benefitted from Libya’s bilateral assistance. For example, at the Sirte Summit in 1999, he paid the arrears of the membership fees of Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, the Gambia, Lesotho, Madagasy Republic, Malawi, Mali and Niger to enable them to meet the OAU requirements for participation in the pre-AU proceedings and voting. Although Ghaddafi had been at the forefront of the formation of the AU, President Obasanjo and Mbeki soon eclipsed him. In his reinvention of himself as a man of peace, Ghaddafi has emerged as Presidents’
Obasanjo and Mbeki rivals in Africa, and internationally, in both the economic and political spheres. Western leaders, previously Libya's harshest critics, not only accepted to work with Ghaddafi since he had handed over to the British government the two Libyan suspects but were also charmed by the oil and gas largesse that Ghaddafi had offered them. European leaders and especially, their oil and gas (multinational corporations) business executives are now frequent visitors to Ghaddafi “sipping tea with him in the former Pariah’s desert tent, surrounded by throngs of Ghaddafi’s trademark women guards.” For example, in May 2004, Ghaddafi was enthusiastically received by the President of the European Commission, Romani Prodi in Brussels, when he proclaimed that Libya will be the new bridge between Europe and Africa. As part of the Western leaders’ dramatic diplomatic moves to Muammar Ghaddafi, the French President, Jacques Chirac visited Libya in November 2004 after Libya agreed in January 2004 to pay compensation over the downing of a French airliner in 1989 over Niger even though Libya, which signed a compensation agreement for victims of the 1988 PANAM 103 aircraft bombing over Lockerbie, Scotland, never publicly admitted responsibility for either incident.

Nevertheless, Ghaddafi had convinced many African leaders that he genuinely had the continent’s best interests at heart. For instance, former Zambian President Kenneth Kaunda warmly acknowledged this, and the former U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Anan told the African Summit in Lusaka in 2001 that “I would like to pay tribute to leader Ghaddafi for spear-heading this development of formation of the African Union.” It should however be noted that Libya was one of the supporters of controversial resolution by African Foreign Ministers on the eve of the AU’s Lusaka Summit of 2001 that expressed support for President Mugabe’s controversial land policies without a whimper about the ZANU-PF inspired violence in Zimbabwe. Both Presidents Obasanjo and Mbeki had to work hard to block that Resolution and finally got it watered down to a fairly innocuous statement supporting continued talks on the issue between Great Britain and Zimbabwe.

The ultimate battle for control of the AU pitted Africa’s ‘Old Guards,’ personified by Colonel Ghaddafi, against the ‘Young Turks,’ led by Presidents Obasanjo and Mbeki. While the ‘Old Guards’ were still bitter against colonialism and the need for Africa to carve out a future independent of the West, the ‘Young Turks’ maintained that the development discourse had undergone a fundamental shift, and that Africa needed to be integrated into the global economic system and engage the West more directly. But Colonel Ghaddafi wanted a new organization to be called the ‘United States of Africa,’ headquartered in Tripoli, Libya. He offered a plush palace in the Libyan capital for this purpose and even hinted that
Nkosazana Olamini-Zuma, South Africa’s Foreign Minister could be the AU’s first Foreign Minister, with himself as the leader of the new organization. Unfortunately, Ghadafi’s effort failed dismally. The Young Turks saw the new organization as something more like the EU, with member-States retaining their own identities and the AU working closely with the West. The battle for leadership of AU extended to which countries would have seats in the proposed Peace and Security Council, modelled on the United Nations Security Council. This would be one of the AU’s most powerful organs, with the authority to intervene in the affairs of member-States and deploy a combined African military force to troubled spots or on peace-keeping missions. Ghaddafi saw the main purpose of the force as protecting the continent from external aggression, but President Mbeki’s allies won the day. Muammar Ghaddafi and the ‘Old Guards’ were vehemently opposed to the inclusion of a prescription for good governance in the AU Charter. However, last minute intervention by South Africa ensured that the draft Charter made good governance and a culture of human rights prerequisites for accrual of benefit from the New Economic Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD). South Africa also proposed that the AU would have to act when human rights were trampled. The proposed Charter made provisions for the AU to “intervene in a member-State pursuant to the decision of the Assembly in respect of grave circumstances, namely, war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity. Any member-State failing to comply with the decisions and policies of the Union may be subjected to sanctions.

Thus, the total rejection of the “United States of Africa” proposal and the strong emphasis placed by the constitute legal text on liberal norms were a big blow to the Plan by the Libyan leader. Ghaddafi’s disappointment with the whole process was evident in his pronouncements. In response to a question posed by a journalist trying to solicit his opinion on the Assembly’s approval of the Constitutive Act during the Lome Summit in June, 2000, Ghaddafi remarked: “it is a victory for Africa. I am proud because I still have a grand ambition for the African continent and I have a fixed date with the Heads of State in March 2001.”

Ghaddafi’s dissatisfaction with the turn of events explains why he came to the inauguration ceremony of the AU in Durban in 2002 with a range of proposed amendments to the Constitutive Act. His proposed amendments included a single military force for Africa, an AU Chairman with presidential status and greater powers of intervention in member-States. However, the Chairperson of the Summit, who incidentally happened to be President Mbeki, exploited Rule Eight of the new rules of procedure stipulating that any item proposed by a member-State must be presented sixty days before a meeting with supporting documents and draft decisions sent to the Chairperson of
the Commission thirty days ahead of the Session to prevent Libya from tabling the amendments. Therefore, the launching of the AU went ahead on July 9, 2002 without any consideration of Libya’s proposal. Immediately after the inaugural ceremony, Ghaddafì tabled a motion requesting African Heads of State and Governments (AHSG) to convene another Extraordinary Summit as soon as possible to amend the Constitutive Act. The Assembly accepted Libya’s invitation, and referred the proposal for the consideration of the Executive Council, pursuant to the rules of the procedure of the AHSG. While the Assembly’s acceptance of Libya’s invitation seems to indicate Ghaddafì’s influence over the African leaders, the support for the Extraordinary Summit from the great majority of them had nothing to do with Ghaddafì’s proposal. There were certainly few African leaders who genuinely felt that Libya had a case, and these were those who caved into Libya’s request to keep “a potential troublesome member (State)” as Ghaddafì within the African Union. 

Conclusion and Recommendations

We have examined the role of North (Arab) Africa in Africa particularly their contributions to African struggles against colonislim, imperialism, neo-colonialism, racism and apartheid. We have also examined African support for Arab causes culminating in a flurry of rupturing of diplomatic relations between Israel and several Black African countries following the 1967 and 1973 Arab-Israeli wars. We have also examined the role of North (Arab) Africa in the transformation of the OAU into the AU. It will be recalled that the Arab Summit in Rabat in October 1974 supported a joint Afro-Arab Summit, the first Summit of which was actually held in Cairo in March 1977.

As we noted above, the experiences of several Black African countries and events since the first Afro-Arab Summit have not borne out the high hopes and aspirations of African countries. True, it is that African peoples and the Arab world will continue to have cultural, religious and economic contacts, an Afro-Arab cooperation is unlikely to stand the test of times. First, the years 1963 – 1974 were great moments of coalescence of issues between Africa and the Arab world. With decolonization in Portuguese Africa, majority rule in Zimbabwe and South Africa (since 1994), independence of Namibia, Camp David Agreement between Israel and Egypt and some form of rapprochement between Israel and the Palestine National Authority, those issues that brought Sub-Saharan (Black) Africa and North (Arab) Africa including the Arab world together would fizzle out and recede into the background. That several Black African countries severed diplomatic relations with Israel because of Arab pressure and promises
of money rather than conviction is not in doubt. While only a few Black African countries received Arab assistance, there was a feeling, albeit misplaced, among some Black African countries that their solidarity with the Arab world before, during and after the Yom Kippur War has been met with little evidence of reciprocal Arab largesse. Although, General Idi Amin toppled President Milton Obote of Uganda in January 1971 with the assistance of Israeli military advisers because of President Obote’s pro-Arab orientation in his last year in office, however, Amin soon developed a morbid fear of the Israelis: “Those who helped to make me can help to break me.”

But he could not expel the Israelis while the Sudanese civil war in the early 70s was being fought because Amin had relations and allies among the Anyanya fighting the Sudanese Central Government with Israeli support. With peace settlement in February 1972, to the chagrin of the Israelis, Amin had no need for the Israelis though it was suggested that Amin became hostile following his visit to Libya. Amin visited Libya because he had decided to expel the Israelis, and in any event, it made good diplomatic and economic sense to extract some concessions from Israel’s enemies if he planned to expel them. The Israelis were expelled not because Amin owed them considerable amounts of money. Their expulsion can be explained by Idi Amin’s personality, the fear that the Israelis might assist in removing him from power and the civil war in Southern Sudan had come to an end.

Chad broke diplomatic relations with Israel on November 28, 1972, partly, to reduce Arab involvement in Chad’s civil war involving President Tombalbaye (a Christian) killed in a coup d’etat against a Muslim secessionist group. Guinea and the Congo broke off relations for ideological reasons and Tanzania believed in the Arab cause on its own merit while Zaire was forced to choose between a friend, Israel and a brother, Egypt, accusing the former of “territorial expansionism.” Niger Republic broke off relations partly because of religion while other African countries before October 1973 had become disenchanted with Israel for several reasons ranging from an increasing feeling that Israel had become a mini-bully in the region to strained relations between Israeli experts in individual countries and the people/ authorities in those countries. Kenya, Nigeria, Cote D’Ivoire and Ethiopia (under Selassie) broke with Israel, partly, because they did not want to be isolated from African diplomatic trends or break ranks with other OAU member-states. Needless saying that the Camp David Agreement, which led to the suspension of Egypt’s membership of the Arab League in May 1979, led to a flurry of resumption of diplomatic relations between some Black African countries and Israel, albeit not without threats of economic and diplomatic sanctions by some Arab countries (including Saudi
Arabia, Algeria, Kuwait, Tunisia and United Arab Emirates) and the Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa (BADEA). Because none of the richest Arab nations is in Africa, most of them are unlikely to be particularly sensitive to their international obligations to Black Africa or Sub-Saharan Africa. Thus, when the OPEC decided (to increase fuel prices because of the dynamics of the international oil industry)\textsuperscript{124} and OAPEC (to use Arab oil as a weapon) to ‘alter some major powers’ policies towards Israel,'\textsuperscript{125} African states especially the oil importing countries, had hoped that they would be spared the adverse effects of the oil embargo and by extension, price increase through some concrete and positive action. Black African oil consuming countries wanted their oil supplies guaranteed and had hoped that they would not have to pay high prices for oil which would drain their meagre foreign exchange earnings, advocating a two-tier pricing system which could easily be accommodated by the oil-rich Arab States, and was in fact mooted by Nigeria.\textsuperscript{126} But these hopes were misplaced: they did not receive regular oil supplies in spite of assurances from Arab oil producers. In fact, Arab oil producers made it abundantly clear that oil prices were fixed as a consequence of negotiations between the oil companies and OPEC member-States though North (Arab) African countries were given oil on concessionary terms.\textsuperscript{127} Thus, Arab oil producers were not prepared to make any sacrifices and risk their vital interests by selling oil to the poor Black African oil-importing countries at reduced/negotiated prices with some of them (East African countries) threatening to sell water to the Arabs in exchange for Arab oil.\textsuperscript{128} Obviously, the oil price increase created an economic recession in the developed market economies which reduced their demands for primary products, the main foreign exchange earners for poor Black African states which were then forced to spend their meagre foreign exchange earnings not only to finance huge oil price increases but also to purchase manufactured goods from the DMEs, the ostensible targets of OPEC and/or OAPEC. Gitelson has put the issue more bluntly that “the Arabs apparently tried to step into a patron-client relationship, for which they had always criticized the Western countries. They would be glad to charge high prices for their goods and then offer financial assistance on their own terms to the Africans.”\textsuperscript{129}

Many African leaders were incensed that the much-publicised Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa and the Arab Fund for Africa as well as other financial institutions set up by Arab oil-rich States foot dragged, partly, because of lack of executive capacity, and inexperience at undertaking evaluation of projects submitted for financing, and partly, because of lack of commitment
to the goals of Afro-Arab cooperation by the staff members of BADEA and other financial institutions compared with the ADB. Mazrui has noted:

Much of the diplomatic discussion between Africa and the Arab world in 1974 was on multilateral aid and -- money from Arab sources, channeled through special banking institutions, for development projects in Africa (and) performance at this... level has been slow and haphazard. There is a residual deadlock as to whether Arab aid should come through a new Arab Bank for African development or should be channeled through the existing African Development Bank.

In anticipation of Arab funds, the African Development Bank (ADB) overcommitted its resources, thus facing liquidity crisis which led to the suspension of work on the vital Trans-African Highway it was then financing. It has been alleged that the Arab oil-rich States have only offered assistance to predominantly African Muslim States and/or African States with Muslim minorities; that the Arabs (as we noted above and shall demonstrate below) have attempted to dominate the OAU and ADB, and that the ADB under Arab pressure has given loans to some North African (Arab) States far in excess of their subscriptions. Tunisia, for example, obtained a loan of $8.46m from ADB though its Paid-Up Share was only $4.162m.

The major aid donors among the OPEC member-states have been Iran, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, United Arab Emirates and Venezuela. While 80 percent of OPEC aid has gone to Muslim countries, this can be explained, partly, by the fact that OPEC is Islamic in composition, and partly, because the poorest countries, tagged the ‘Fourth World,’ are disproportionately Muslim. Muslim recipients of Arab aid in Africa included Mali, Somalia, Senegal, Guinea and Sudan. While Uganda is not a Muslim country, it had a Muslim Head of State by 1971 and until the end of 1974, Uganda got $20 million in official OPEC aid though double that amount was promised. There has been unofficial aid to Muslim minorities in non-Muslim countries (Sierra Leone, Kenya, Ghana, Chad, Ethiopia, Benin Republic and Burkina Faso), ostensibly to promote the donors’ foreign policy objectives. Libya, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia probably spent more on Muslim Black Africa than the published official figures though there is a strong temptation among oil-rich Muslim/Arab countries to invest in DMEs, such as Daimler-Benz in Germany, black Muslim countries and estates in the United Kingdom and the United States rather than Black Africa.

That the OAU almost became an instrument through which the Arabs had hoped to influence Sub-Saharan Africa came to the fore at the 1974 African Summit in Mogadishu. Though the Somali President was then the OAU Chairman, the Somali Foreign Minister was encouraged by the North
Africans (Arabs) and friends to contest for the post of the OAU Secretary-General with the Zambian Foreign Minister as a rival candidate. All the North African (Arab) states voted for the Somali (Muslim) candidate while the Anglophone states voted for the Zambian candidate with the Franco-phone states divided on the candidate to support, and because the voting raised the potentials of splitting the OAU along Sub-Saharan (Black) Africa and North Africa (Arab) lines, a third candidate was elected to break the deadlock. The election of the ADB President in the 1990s suffered the same fate, raising serious questions about the genuiness of North African (Arab) intentions in Africa.

True, it is that Black Africa and the Arab World are linked by territory and in spite of the common ties established through Islam and culture, they remain separated by many historical and psychological factors. So what perceptions do Africans and Arabs have of each other since perceptions shape attitudes and attitudes in turn influence opinions and decisions. Memories of Arab participation in African slave trade and propagation of Islam, are a painful reminder of erstwhile relationships. The civil war which ravaged the Sudan for more than a decade until Peace Agreement in 1982 was between the Arab and the Black (the Anyanya guerrillas) – when the Sudanese Central Government agreed to regional autonomy for the provinces of Equatoria, Bahr El Ghazal and Upper Nile and the Sudan is yet to know peace with the Sudanese President wanted for war crimes by the ICC. The precipitate dispatch of Libyan troops to Uganda under Amin demonstrated the possibility of Arab political and military intervention in purely Black Africa affairs while the support given by Muslim Arab States (Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Libya and Pakistan) to the predominantly-Muslim Eritrean Liberation Front against conservative Orthodox Christian Government in Addis Ababa brought to the fore Arab intentions in Africa because an independent Eritrea under Arab control over the Red Sea could become absolute. On Arab and African perceptions of each other, Dunstan Wai has noted:

Africans perceive Arabs as cunning, crafty, dishonest, untrustworthy, and racially as well as culturally arrogant. Many Africans do not feel at ease in dealing with Arabs; for educated and Westernized Africans, Arab culture is unattractive, and for the masses of Africans, they are mystified in general by foreigners…. Not a few Africans also perceive Arabs as religious fanatics, and the public pronouncements and conduct of some Arab leaders such as Colonel Gaddafi… tend to reinforce the feeling in Sub-Saharan Africa of a resurgence of the Islamic’ jihad’ financed by the newly-accumulated oil money. In addition, Africans tend to view Arabs as colonialists and imperialists.
On the other hand,

The Arabs are often paternalistic and condescending towards Africans. They generally view Africans as ‘infidels’ and... politically naïve... (and) susceptible to international manipulation. Arab technocrats... view African elites as corrupt, incompetent, and lazy. They are contemptuous of African financial institutions which they consider bloated and inefficient. Most Arab businessmen do not have confidence in doing business in Africa. Africans... feel that Arab banks and funds are excessively slow in finalizing project contract, and that a condescending attitude toward them in business discussions produces unease and stifles effective communication. 138

Although African Muslims feel a sense of religious solidarity with Arabs many of them feel uneasy with non-African Muslims, principally, because Islam does not seem to provide the religious bond that would cement relations between African Muslims and Arabs. What is being said here in essence is that African elites who suffer from Arabophobia consider the Sahara as a legitimate political divide and “are grateful to the great desert for providing protection to tropical Africa from massive Arab invasion from the north.” 139

More important were the precipitate moves by Colonel Ghaddafi which created suspicious about Arab intentions in Sub-Saharan Africa. In September 1972, he ordered Libyan troops to assist President Idi Amin against an alleged “Zionist” invasion of Uganda from Tanzania. But Amin was disenchanted with the Israelis for not providing Uganda sufficient military hardware and assist Uganda in an armed attack against Tanzania to take over Tanga in order to have an access to the Sea. 140 Colonel Ghaddafi relentlessly forced President Tombalbaye of Chad to bow to Arab wishes even in matters of internal security. Because of France’s inability to provide Chad with additional financial and military resources during a severe drought, 141 as well continued military campaigns against the Chadian National Liberation Front (FROLINAT) which received much support from Libya and Algeria, President Tombalbaye was forced to come to terms with Ghaddafi to extricate the Chad Republic from financial ruins. 142 The price for the Libya loan of 23,000 million CFA Francs was that Chad severed diplomatic relations with Israel. Similarly, President Diori of the Niger Republic, who was under increasing pressure to find alternative sources of revenue to the French during the devastating drought period, was compelled to sever diplomatic relations with Israel in January 1973 in return for “better” relations with the Arab world, but particularly with Libya which has shown its readiness to reward Israelis’ enemies. 143
Although Diori secured a Libyan loan of 800 million CFA Francs, this did not deter the Nigerien military from moving him from office in a coup d’etat.\textsuperscript{144}

With the death of Nasser, who acted as a link between the Arab world and Africa, and Sadat who concluded a peace agreement with Israel and was shunned by his Arab compatriots, it is unlikely that any Arab-African leader would be able to play that role effectively. Regardless of Libyan oil wealth, Ghaddafi (who was derided by some Arab-African leaders such as President Nemeiry, Sadat and Mubarak at a point in time in the 70s) is in no position to play that role. President Moukhtar Daddah was unable to build up an image of Mauritania as the ‘hypen’ between the Arab world and Africa, partly, because Mauritania is not rich enough to browbeat any Sub-Sahara African state as Libya has tried, albeit vainly, to do and partly, because he had always preferred to be identified with the Arab world perhaps because of the colour of his skin than with Sub-Saharan Africa. Additionally the rift between Morocco and Mauritania on the one hand, and Algeria on the other over Sawahari Arab Democratic Republic places a strain on Arab-African relations. The Sudan which is “ideally suited to act as a unifying force between Black and Arab-Africa” because of Nemeiry’s success in bringing together Arabs and Blacks, after thirteen years of a costly civil war, is currently engrossed in another round of civil war between the Central Government in Khartoum and Darfur. The fact that the Sudan was unable to persuade the Eritrean secessionists who were propped up with huge Arab oil wealth to seek a negotiated settlement in their war with the Ethiopian Government shows the limit of its influence in the Arab world.

Racism is obviously an issue that would tear Africans and Arab apart. Indeed, racism in African politics has had the latent effect of isolating North (Arab) Africa from Sub-Saharan (Black) Africa. The fact that the Arabs feel that they are racially superior to Blacks Africans or that they consider “infra-dig to be regarded as having any social and cultural affinity with the black races of Africa” is irritating to many politically-conscious Africans and could not be ignored by many Sub-Sahara African leaders. In Egypt, Tunisia, Morocco, Algeria, Libya, Sudan, Somalia, Eritrea, Mauritania and the Arab world, Blacks are not only treated as the scum of the earth and discriminated against; they are also regarded in their own countries as second class citizens who cannot aspire to positions in these countries. All the Black African civil servants in these countries were sacked without a whimper from the African Union. Frantz Fanon who contributed in no small measure to the success of the Algerian liberation movement in the 60s was discriminated against and was even considered a security risk.\textsuperscript{145}
We have noted that North (Arab) African countries have played central roles in restructuring the OAU and designing rules (such as principles relating to democracy and good governance) governing Pan African institutions and initiatives. Egypt and Algeria are two of the five members of NEPAD and its mechanism for reviewing good governance and the African Peer Review Mechanism. While the Constitutive Act of the AU emphasises the centrality of the principles of democracy and good governance, Libya sees these principles as Western values, emphasizing the peculiarity of the continent in their application. The African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) encouraging change and good government was launched in 2003 by the AU to deepen the rule of law and other attributes of good governance through National Governing Councils that can independently monitor and assess the activities of their leaders. While over thirty member-States have acceded to the APRM, few countries (including Ghana, Kenya, Rwanda and Nigeria) have gone through the entire cycle of implementation of APRM. While the ‘old guards’ and Ghaddafi are not favourably disposed to the prescription of good governance in the Constitution Act of the AU, and while Ghaddafi’s ‘United States of Africa’ project was rejected by the AU, one is inclined to raise questions about Ghaddafi’s real motives in putting $90 billion at Africa’s disposal during summit talks of the Community of Sahel-Saharan States (CEN-SAD), a trade bloc with Headquarters in Tripoli Libya since 1998. While Morocco has reservations about the revival of Afro-Arab cooperation mooted by Egypt and Libya as well as convening a second Afro-Arab Summit given AU’s position on the independence of the Sawahari Arab Democratic Republic (admitted in 1984 into the OAU), Mauritania has witnessed several coupdetats in violation of the AU principle rejecting extra-constitutional change of government.

Both Arab Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa are connected by economic, political and military links with extra-Africa (foreign powers). North-Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa are linked with the European-Mediterranean partnership. It is doubtful if these arrangements with Lome Convention and Special Agreements between the EU and the Mediterranean States and North Africa’s link with United States Africans Command (in the war against terror/terrorism) can enhance Afro-Arab cooperation.

Undoubtedly, Afro-Arab relations, in the words of Mazrui:

"cannot reduce themselves to inter-Muslim relations. Nor should economic interaction between Africa and the Middle East be limited to bilateral aid. The related questions of multilateral aid, bilateral investment and inter-regional trade need to be explored, strengthened and ... institutionalized in the years ahead."
Since the October 1973 Yom Kippur War, Africa and the Arab world are fast becoming a single international sub-system while oil as a new form of black energy has posed serious questions about future relations between the Arabs, Africans and the Western world. For the sake of both their past (as accomplices in Africa’s enslavement and allies in African liberation and struggles against colonialism, imperialism, neo-colonialism, apartheid and racism), the Arabs must genuinely become partners in Third World development.\textsuperscript{49}

We have noted factors that militate against Afro-Arab cooperation. It is in order to make some general recommendations. First, the issue of Libya’s over aggressiveness in its religious propaganda in Black African countries needs to be addressed, and vigorously too. Second, the current crop of African leaders should endeavour to lay to rest the ghost of Arab slave trade and African enslavement by the Arabs. Third, there should be attitudinal change by the North (Arab) African countries in the interest of continental peace, understanding and progress while occasional patronizing attitudes of certain Arab countries towards their African neighbours must stop. Fourth, Afro-Arab relations should not be reduced to what the Arabs can give the Africans in terms of petrol dollars and what Africans must do in gratitude for the Arab largesse.\textsuperscript{50} Fifth, Area Studies Programmes must be established in Arab Universities to specialise in African Studies and in African Universities to specialise in Arab Studies. Efforts must be made to translate the works of African playwrights (Soyinka, Achebe, among others) into Arabic while Arabic masterpieces should be translated by products of Departments of Arabic and Islamic Studies. Sixth, for Africans to make any meaningful contribution to Afro-Arab cooperation, the obscurantist and self-righteous activities of Muslim missionaries must be curtailed and the impressions associating Islam with backwardness have to stop. Seventh, the Arab League and AU must make structural changes in their Charters to accommodate new trends of Afro-Arab cooperation. Finally, rich Arab oil producing countries could embark on joint industrial ventures in Black Africa by recycling their surpluses invested in Europe and North America in some development projects in Black Africa.\textsuperscript{151} While some North (Arab) African countries have made remarkable progress in the areas of governance and development, there are areas of improvement. Libya which views respect for the rule of law and human rights with disdain was recently criticized for executing ten Nigerians without giving them fair hearing. As Malcom Smart, Amnesty International’s Director for the Middle East and North Africa put it:

\begin{quote}
In the case of Libya, we fear that death sentences are handed down after proceedings which fail to satisfy international standards for fair trial.\textsuperscript{152}
\end{quote}
Additionally, rapid strides made by some North (Arab) African countries (Tunisia and Libya) in the areas of development and women empowerment are worthy of emulation by Sub-Saharan African countries in spite of the authoritarian nature of some of the regimes in North Africa.
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