

*Abdur Rob Khan*  
*Golam Mostafa*

## **A SELF-SCRUTINY OF THE NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT : THE AFRICAN MEMBERS' PERSPECTIVE**

Non-alignment in recent years has been gaining increasing relevance to the Third World countries in their struggle for economic emancipation and foreign policy making. Concomitant to its increasing importance and its significant growth, the Movement is also facing profound internal challenges. Such internal challenges range from failure to adhere to the principles of Non-alignment on the part of some member countries to anomalous application of agreed principles and criteria and overall veering to one or the other power bloc by the Movement itself. Even though the recently held New Delhi Summit helped dispel much of the misgivings generated by the 1979 Havana Summit, the question of adherence to the principles and criteria of the Movement both by the individual member countries and the Movement itself remains a basic question. The popular clamour for self-scrutiny of the Movement raised in the post-Havana period, therefore, still retains its validity. But opinion differs as to the mode of self-scrutiny which range from restoration of pure and authentic Non-alignment to moderate and pragmatic view of accepting the shifts and changes as part of the very dynamics of the Movement. Without going into the debate as to which approach is realistic it may be observed that such macro-approaches to self-scrutiny of the Movement will lose sight of many more details essential for understanding of its dynamics. Under what circumstances do the Third World developing countries tend to violate the principles of Non-alignment ? To what extent are these violations unavoidable ? And to what extent do such violations affect the essence of the Movement ? These questions logically lead one to an objective and critical approach to Non-alignment from the member countries' perspective. Such an approach also

provides an alternative framework of analysis of the Movement of Non-alignment.

The present paper takes the African member countries as a case in point. The authors have been guided by a number of considerations. As a continent, Africa has the maximum representation in the Non-aligned Body. Out of 52 countries, 51 are members of the Movement. Many African countries like Algeria, Ivory Coast, Lesotho, Somalia, Sudan, Zimbabwe, Chad and Namibia became members of the Movement even before their independence. It may be mentioned that among the 25 founding members of the Movement in 1961, 11 were African. The Organization of the African Unity has, in its Charter, among other things, the policy of "unreserved adherence to the positive policy of non-alignment."<sup>1</sup> What, however, distinguishes the African countries from those in Asia and Latin America is that the process of decolonisation on the continent started much later and the vestiges of colonial past still haunt many of these countries. Apart from the rampant problems of famine, poverty, exploitation, racism and apartheid, the very political and economic independence of many an African countries is sometimes threatened.

## II. METHODOLOGY

The paper first constructs a profile of the African Non-aligned countries with the help of some indicators: (i) independence of the regime in power, (ii) foreign policy postures, (iii) adherence to the principles of the Non-alignment, (iv) military alliance or defence arrangements, (v) trade concentration and (vi) sources of aid. Scores have been given to each of the member countries on these indicators in ascending order of Non-alignment as reflected in the indicator. For example, with respect to independence of the regime in power, a regime backed by either Super power obtains zero, if backed by major or regional powers obtains.<sup>1</sup> The country obtains gradually higher scores if the regime in power just have only leaning toward

---

1. See *The Economist*, 5 March 1983, p. 49

external power. Full score of 5 is obtained by the country whose regime is nationalistic as well as independent.

The second indicator is foreign policy postures where we have considered two factors : whether the country concerned is guided by any external power in its foreign policy making on the one hand and whether the country concerned pursues 'Non-alignment' as a principle or cornerstone of its foreign policy on the other. For the purpose of the article, the third variable e. g. adherence to the principles of non-alignment bears special significance for, it assesses whether the country has so far violated any of the principles of Non-alignment. Though to some extent overlapping with the third, the fourth indicator specifically points out whether the country has alliance or military arrangements with external power. The fifth and the sixth indicators take care of trade direction and aid dependency respectively.- Trade direction looks into the trade concentration pattern on the assumption that trade concentration, particularly, imports trade in one country or few countries or one bloc necessarily puts economic constraints on Non-aligned behaviour. Similarly, the indicator of aid dependency considered whether the country concerned has high aid dependency and whether the aid flow originates from concentrated or diversified sources. Admitting that it is very difficult to follow a pre-coded structure to give scores to individual countries, we were always guided by the context and background of the facts that are known and visible at the surface. Extensive review of existing but scattered materials had to be made. Still, there might be scope of value judgements. It was often very difficult to keep up the scale of relative weight of indicators. But it is expected that the multi-variate framework would balance out over or under-weightage of a single indicator as happens with uni-dimensional approach. For example, the Non-aligned countries are often divided into radical, conservative and independent on their leaning toward Russia or China (radicals) tilt toward the West ( conservatives ) and adherence to the original purpose of the Movement ( independent ).<sup>2</sup> But such simplistic

2. See for detailed grouping of the member countries, *Newsweek*, 17 September 1979.

classification ignores other factors which determine the Non-aligned behaviour of a country.

The scores finally have been combined to obtain the total score of Non-alignment for the individual country. The details of the scores with the index have been given at Annex. 1. Once the profile of Non-aligned has been portrayed the factors behind political, economic and security constraints have been highlighted.

### III. PROFILE OF NON-ALIGNMENT OF THE AFRICAN COUNTRIES

This section briefly outlines the findings of the exercise as just indicated. It is upto the readers to make their own judgement as to which country is more or less Non-aligned than others. It may be seen from Table 1 that out of 51 African member countries, 41 countries accounting for 80 percent of the total scored above 15, of these 29 ( 56.9 percent ) scored between 16-20 and 12 (23.5 percent ) scored between 21-25 while no country scored above 25. Two countries, Algeria and Nigeria scored equal marks of 25. From this score pattern it may be inferred that bulk of the African countries tend to fulfil the principles or pre-requisites of the Non-alignment.

Table 1. Distribution of African Countries by Combined Score on Non-alignment.

Score Class	No. of Countries	Percentage of Total
0-5	0	—
6-10	2	3.9
10-15	8	15.7
16-20	29	56.9
21-25	12	23.5
26+	0	—
Total :	51	100.0

Source: Annex. 1

While no member country in Africa obtained less than 5, 2 countries obtained scores between 6-10 ( actual score 8 and 10 ) and 8

between 11-15. In one sense it may be said that about 10 countries (about one-fifth) fall below the modal class of 16-20.

It should be borne in mind that this is just a static picture and conceals the temporal developments which might have been more helpful to pass judgement about trends. In particular, attention should be drawn to the fact that many of the African countries entered into defence agreements or military arrangements on independence to ensure political existence or to meet the exigencies of the particular circumstances. However, as time passed, many such agreements are known to have fallen into abeyance or have lost their teeth.<sup>3</sup> By any standard it may be said that the degree of independent behaviour and Non-aligned postures have increased over time. Also there have been attempts on the part of many African countries, particularly the nine African countries<sup>4</sup> close to the apartheid regime to attain collective self-reliance in the form of regional co-operation.<sup>5</sup>

#### IV. CONSTRAINTS TO NON-ALIGNMENT

##### 4. 1. Political Constraints

In identifying political constraints, our focus would be the independence of the regime in power. In one sense, it may be considered as a primary variable determining Non-aligned behaviour. From Annex 1, it may be seen that there is a direct correlation between total scores obtained by a country and score obtained on count of "independence of the regime in power." In all 12 countries obtained 2 or less on account of this indicator, which may be considered below the mark from our point of view. It may be observed that the dependency of the regimes of these countries fall into different categories, some are installed directly by foreign troops, some installed as well as sustained

---

3. For details, See Talukder Maniruzzaman, *Security of Small States in the Third World* (Canberra : Strategic and Defense Studies Centre, 1982).

4. Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

5. See Enver Cavim (ed.) *Africa Guide 1982* (Essex : World of Information, 1982) P. 7.

by external powers, while others have the backing and support—moral and material—from outside sources. Such support or blessing has to be distinguished from leaning or orientation of the regime itself toward external powers. In Africa as in other parts of the world, there are countries, whose governments might have leaning toward the East, or any other external powers. But at the same time they are independent and nationalistic for their existence and action. Yet in other cases, there are African countries where the regimes in power are fairly nationalistic, independent and feel reluctant to identify themselves with any external powers.

Much of this dependency results from domestic sources having their origin to the colonial legacy. The colonial rule, even the decolonisation process itself, did not allow growth of political institutions. What is more, in many cases, true independence was achieved at a much later date. Ethiopia, for example was independent, but part of the country was occupied by Italy during the World War II. Egypt got independence in 1922 but British troops were occupying the country until 1954. Libya's independence in 1951 was similarly considered to be nominal until the change-over of government in 1969. Because of this prolonged rule, political development remained highly rudimentary. Most of the countries consequently come to be ruled either by military dictatorship or by one party system. Out of 51 member countries in Africa, only 14 have multi-party system. For one, the military rulers have only very narrow domestic political constituency and therefore, they have to resort to violent repressive politics. And fully aware of the narrow domestic support base the regimes, in turn, looked toward external sources for support and sustenance. A very related obstacle is the tribal nature of the social structure of most of the African countries. The sharp tribal and ethnic cleavages make the people self-centred. Struggle for and conflicts over, power is a common phenomenon in Africa. The civil war in Nigeria, Chad, Zaire and other countries are cases in point. For lack of tolerance and the spirit of accommodation, the dominant power groups sought helping hands from external sources to maintain their position. And thanks to the

***Please  
send me  
biiss  
journal***

[ *block letters Please* ]

I am willing to subscribe to **biiss journal**

For  1 Year  2 Years  3 Years.

Name .....

Address .....

Country .....

Enclosed my Cheque/Money Order/Draft/  
Unesco Coupons for :

.....  
Date..... Signature.....



**BISS**  
**BY AIR MAIL**  
PAR AVION

**STAMP**  
**HERE**

**TO**

**PUBLICATION OFFICER**  
**BANGLADESH INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL**  
**AND STRATEGIC STUDIES**  
**1/46, ELEPHANT ROAD (FORMER AIR HOUSE),**  
**DHAKA, BANGLADESH**



# NATIONS OF AFRICA



LOOK FOR THE COMING ISSUES OF

**biiss journal**

Enquire :

PUBLICATION OFFICER

BANGLADESH INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL

AND STRATEGIC STUDIES

1/46 ELEPHANT ROAD (FORMER AIR HOUSE)

DHAKA, BANGLADESH

TEL : 406234

four times

The **biiss journal** brings out twice a year articles dealing with issues both of national and international importance.

The Institute welcomes contributions and comments.

benign and benevolent attitude of the former colonial powers to the regimes in power, they got it stand-by.

The political orientation of many of the African countries also bears the mark of colonial past. Even after independence, many of the African political parties and leaders carried nostalgic legacy of the political parties of the colonizing countries like France, Spain and Portugal. The French Socialist Party, for example, still commands loyalty and formal relationship from amongst some African leaders.

For all practical purposes, what matters is the perceptions of the regimes in power : perception of themselves and perception of national interests. But it is very difficult to distinguish between the two. Seeking and obtaining external support for the long term interest of the nation is always justified and is not necessarily a negative point from the point of view of Non-alignment. But when such external inputs just sustain a minority group at the expense of national interests, there is no reason why such behaviour should not be called contrary to the principles of Non-alignment.

Thus it is the slow progress in the growth of political institutions and in national integration that contributed to widen the gap between the regimes and the general mass. Consequently, the regimes in power always looked outward for support and sustenance.

#### 4. 2. Security Constraints

Military vulnerability of the African states have multi-faceted features. The primary source of threat comes from the hostile neighbours not reconciled to the regime because of territorial, ethnic or other disputes. The second source of threats is the external powers seeking primarily their own economic and political gains. But in the final analysis the two sets of threats to security are related and interacting. There is hardly any country which is not affected by inter-country, bilateral and multi-lateral conflicts. The conflicts range

from dislike toward a regime in power, provision of sanctuary to insurgents to territorial disputes. The Somalia-Ethiopian conflict in the Horn of Africa, the Chadian civil war, the Egypt-Libya and Sudan-Libya conflicts and the Western Sahara issue, in North Africa, Uganda crisis in East Africa are examples where the conflicts did not confine to the initial contending parties but spread to other countries threatening stability of the region as a whole.

Another common source of the threats to security of the South African countries is the apartheid regime of South Africa. Apart from heavy physical and economic dependence on South Africa, the bordering countries suffer from security threats from the Pretoria regime. Persistent attack on Zambia, Mozambique, Angola, Zimbabwe by South Africa on this or that pretext is well known. The objective of Pretoria's military offensives included, among other, removal of the potential and perennial threat to her security and change of regimes. The aborted attempt of South Africa to change the Government in Seychelles in 1979 is an example of the latter motive. Such continued conflicts and regional sources of threats to security of the African member countries results in not only instability but also violation of the principles of Non-alignment. For one, such threat perception often compels the country concerned to invite external powers or regional countries for aiding in self-defence which again contains the potential seed of violation of the Non-aligned principles. This is a unique situation where external intervention is sought in the face of bilateral conflicts and sometimes in domestic crises. Such gestures provide ground for external intervention in African internal affairs. Secondly, existence of such threats to national security prompted the African countries to enter into bilateral and multilateral defence arrangements. Whether such defence arrangements can really bolster their security needs is always a question mark. But such arrangements certainly contain the seed of potential destabilisation. Thirdly, the external threats to African security is not promoted by internal causes above. In a bid to perpetuate economic

and political interests, the ex-colonial powers as well as other external powers, post military mites in different countries.

The number of troops in many African countries increased very rapidly in late sixties and early seventies as a result of growing influence of Western powers and the Soviet Union in the region. In 1980 the world armed forces was about 26 millions, of these about 1.5 million were in African countries, i.e. the armed forces populaion ratio was about 1;300.

In 1963 there were 17 air bases and naval bases of Western powers in the region. France had the target in tropical Africa in Senegal, Mauritania, Chad, Madagascar and other places. France had also special verbal arrangements with many African countries by which she could intervene in the internal affairs of those countries. Thus French troops intervened in internal affairs of Mali in 1960, in Togo and Ghana in 1962 and in Congo in 1963. Later on, France signed defence or military co-operation agreements, with Benin, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Gabon, Ivory Coast, Madagascar, Mali (now terminated) Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, Togo, Upper Volta and Zaire. According to an agreement signed between France and Djibouti in 1977, the former has been permitted to station a number of troops there. On the basis of these agreements French troops participated in conflicts in vaious African states such as in Central African Republic, Zaire, Chad and in Western Sahara. Other European powers had also significant influence in Africa, Britain had bases in Al-Addam and Tabreek in Libya until 1970. She had also bases in Freetown ( Sierra-Leone ), Kano ( Nigeria ), South Rodesia and South Africa. Britain still maintains overflying training and defence agreement with Kenya, though she has withdrawn troops from Tanzania.

USA also did not lag behind to exert her influence in the region. As an outcome of the Camp David Accords and the Peace Treaty between Israel and Egypt, USA exerted her influence in the region by stationing her troops in Sinai under the banner of the Multi-national Peace-keeping Forces. An agreement with Egypt signed in

1981 also enables USA to use the Egyptian bases. With the growing tensions in the North Africa over the crisis of Western Sahara, US increased its military position there giving continuous military assistance to Morocco and other states of the region. In 1982 the US signed a defence agreement with Morocco under which arms supply to the latter has been stepped up. US has also mutual defence and assistance agreements with Ethiopia (1975), Ghana (1972) Mali (1912), Niger (1962), Senegal (1962), Zaire (1972) and Liberia (1972). However, most of them now may have fallen in abeyance. In 1980 US signed defence agreement with Kenya and similar agreement was signed with Somalia in 1982. Under these agreements US is allowed to use the base facilities in Mombasa and Mogadishu.

The Soviets and the Chinese are rather new comers in this region. Until 1970 Soviet Union had no military bases in Africa and had no formal defence agreements with the countries of the region. The Soviets first signed the Friendship and Co-operation Treaty with Egypt in 1971 which was denounced by Egypt in 1976. Later on the signed similar agreements with Angola, Mozambique (1977) and Ethiopia (1978). Military aid has also been provided to Congo, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, Nigeria, Uganda and Zambia by USSR and her other allies, Cuba and GDR in particular. The Soviet Navy also uses the base facilities on Dahlak Island, Ethiopia. Very recently with the deterioration of US-Libyan relations the Soviets are trying to sign another defence pact with Libya. From 1974 to 1978 the USSR was the main arms supplier to the African states (55% of total). Among the Soviet bloc countries East Germany has military advisers posted in many African countries. Hungary signed Friendship Treaties with Ethiopia and Mozambique in 1980. North Korea has a Treaty of Friendship with Togo signed in 1981.

China has military assistance agreements with Cameroon, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea, Mali and Tanzania and supplies arms to Mozambique and Zaire. According to a defence agreement with Egypt, China supplied arms and spare parts to Egypt in 1978-1979.

Belgium has a military co-operation agreement with Zaire and Spain maintains close links with Equatorial Guinea.

Table 2 Presence of Foreign Troops in Africa

Country	French Troops	Cuban Troops
Algeria	98	—
Angola	—	21,000
Burundi	30	—
Cameroon	90	—
Chad	1,800	—
Congo	10	300
Djibouti	4,500	—
Equatorial Guinea	—	20-30
Ethiopia	—	12,000
Europa*	10	—
Gabon	300	—
Gloriose Islands*	10	—
Guinea	—	200-300
Guinea Bissau	—	70
Ivory Coast	500	—
Libya	25	100-125
Madagascar	50	30
Mauritania	100	—
Moyotte	2,000	—
Morocco	200	—
Mozambique	—	300
Niger	60	—
Reunion*	2,000	—
Senegal	1,300	—
Sierra-Leone	—	100-125
Tanzania	—	20-30
Togo	80	—
Tunisia	40	—
Uganda	—	20-30
Upper Volta	20	—
Zaire	70	—
	13,595	34,160-34,340

Source : Le Noavel Observateur, May 1978.

\*Islands in the Indian Ocean near Madagascar.



So it is seen that most of the African countries either have direct military pacts/agreements or indirectly have military links with the major and Super Powers. Out of 51 countries only 8 have no formal military pacts/agreements with any power while 12 countries have either direct pact or allow base facilities to the Super Powers (Annex-1) which is obviously a source of threat to the security of the African states and tend to violate the principles of Non-alignment.

Most of the African countries have very weak and vulnerable defence systems. After independence, many of the countries, including those who are otherwise Non-aligned in foreign policy making, had to maintain political independence and territorial integrity with stationing foreign troops on their soil because of small and weak defence forces.

Thus from above it turns out that it is the very weak defence force, rather fragile domestic base of many of the regimes compounded by threat perception that led the African countries to be militarily dependent on external sources.

#### 4.3. Economic Constraints

Africa includes more than two-thirds of the least developed countries of the world, whose per capita income is less than \$ 370. Only 9 countries have the GNP per capita more than \$ 1000 (Annex-2). The economic backwardness of the African countries was not a new phenomenon and created in a day or two, rather is a legacy of colonial rule and exploitation. The colonial powers exploited the natural resources of the continent for their own economic interests and it is still continuing under various forms. The Multi-national Corporations are the real owners of the resources of the continent and the African states get only a very minor share of their own resources. In general Africa is very rich continent with a huge reserve of oil, gas, diamonds, copper, zinc, bauxite, phosphates, potash and iron. For example, Congo has the world's richest deposit of potash, Guinea possesses more than

50 percent of world's bauxite. Morocco is the third depositor of phosphates in the world. Namibia is the largest producer of diamond and gemstones and Zaire has more than 60 percent of world's cobalt reserve. Africa is also very rich in livestock, fisheries, timber and other commodities. Among the agricultural crops Africa is very rich in producing cotton, coffee, cocoa, tea, tobacco and groundnuts (Annex-2).

In spite of having the rich natural resources, Africa still remains the poorest continent with heavy dependency on foreign aid. Except the traditional sectors of economy the African states were not able to develop other sectors of their economies. Most of these economies are not diversified. For example, 90 percent of total export earnings of Burundi comes from agriculture, while in Malawi agriculture accounts for over 94 percent of export earnings.<sup>6</sup> While the main economic source of Djibouti is trade and income from the port.

Similarly many countries have to depend on only a few items for export earnings. For example, more than 60 percent of export earnings of five African countries come from oil while Libya's and Niger's dependence on oil is more than 90 percent. Raw cotton accounts for more than 50 percent of export earnings for Egypt, Chad and Sudan. By exporting coffee, Rwanda and Burundi receive 55 percent and 90 percent respectively of their total export earnings. Sao-Tome and Principe gets 80-90 percent of her export earnings from cocoa, while coffee and cocoa constitute more than 50 percent of Cameroon's external earnings. Zambia earns 83 percent of her external revenue by exporting copper, while groundnuts constitutes 70 percent of Gambia's total export earnings (Annex-2).

This sort of economic structure and export pattern will, in no way, help the African countries to achieve their economic independence and will always remain as a source of threat to their economic security. Because if for natural calamities or for any other reasons

---

6. Gus Liejbenow; Malawi's Search for Food Self-Sufficiency; Part-1 *UFSI Reports*, 1982, No. 30 p. 3.

the production of one particular item would be reduced or the price of it in international market would fall in then the economy of the producing country would be severely affected. For example, for the fall of price of cocoa and coffee in international market, the economies of Cameroon, Ivory Coast, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe and Uganda were seriously affected.

The trade concentration is also observed to be quite high for the African countries. For example, more than 40 percent of trade of 12 African countries are carried out with France. Trade of landlocked countries like Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Swaziland and Zimbabwe is dominated by South Africa to a significant extent. Trade dependence, specially for import of Ethiopia and Angola on Soviet Union and other COMECON countries with when the former have special political relation, is quite high. Guinea Bissau has 50 percent trade with Portugal, while Spain is the main trade partner of Equatorial Guinea. Sao Tome and Principe has about 70 percent of its total volume of trade with Portugal and Holland. On the whole, the EEC countries are the main trade partners of the African states.

In case of aid, the dependency is quite high and the donors in return expect economic and political dividend. France is giving aid to the African states and getting trade facilities, military facilities from them and also exerting significant influence on them. US aid is given to only those countries who can serve the US interests in the region. The Soviets and others have the same objective in offering aid to the people of this continent. South Africa is also giving aid maintaining trade linkage with the neighbouring countries for the same purpose. As a result, even if the African states strongly criticise South Africa's sinister policy toward Namibia, they are not always able to take any serious steps against her for their overwhelmingly economic dependency on South Africa. For example, in 1981, Robert Mugabe at the eve of his departure to Nairobi to attend the 18th Assembly of Heads of States and Governments of the African states, said that his country would not

be in a position to participate in any sanctions against South Africa because more than 90 percent of Zimbabwe's trade passed in transit through South Africa and she is also a major trade partner of Zimbabwe.<sup>7</sup>

So the primitive structure of economy, dependency on particular items for trade, concentration of trade with particular countries and high aid dependency are considered to be the main economic constraints of the African countries in conducting their foreign policy in the real sense of Non-alignment.

In the face of these economic constraints the African states are trying to strengthen economic co-operation among themselves in various sectors by signing bilateral and multi-lateral agreements. Thus in 1976, 14 African states signed an agreement with France formally establishing an African Solidarity Fund to finance various development projects in Africa. In 1979, Zaire, Zambia and Angola signed a Trilateral Non-aggression Pact which also included a declaration on economic co-operation, particularly in the field of transport.<sup>8</sup>

At the same time the African states are fighting against the South African economic expansion and domination in the region. In 1979, nine African states closest to the apartheid regime of South Africa, met in Arusha ( Tanzania ) and formed the South African Development Co-operation Conference ( SADCC ) to work out the details of reduction of their economic dependence on South Africa. The main objective of (SADCC) was to co-ordinate policy of the member countries to increase trade within the region among the member states and build up network of roads and railways to meet the real needs of the people of the region.

The Zimbabwean Government also trying to reduce her dependence on South Africa. For example in 1981, Zimbabwe declared that she would transfer her oil dependence from South Africa

---

7. *Kessing's Contemporary Archives*, 1981, p. 31054

8. *Ibid*, 1980, p. 30427

to Mozambique and for this purpose 180-mile pipe line was established, which would carry all refined diesel fuel and gasoline required by Zimbabwe and that aviation fuel, paraffin and other petroleum products would be brought by rail from Mozambique.

From what has been described above, it is evident that the African countries are overwhelmingly dependent on external sources not only for their political and military viability but also for economic sustenance despite the fact that many of the countries are rich in valuable mineral resources. Attempts to attain collective self-reliance have been undertaken. But tangible returns are yet to be obtained. Thus economic dependence put a serious hurdle to Non-aligned behaviour of the African countries.

## V CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Non-alignment as a foreign policy posture has much of its origin and strength in the domestic sources of the countries concerned—their people, their political institutions, stage of economic development and economic policy stand, above all, own strength in term of self defence. One country may be more Non-aligned on one count than another. To what extent, however, each of the indicators would interact and affect one another, would depend on either or both of in what politico-economic milieu the country is located or/and how the country concerned can manipulate one against the other to produce the over all image the country commands in Non-alignment. The second factor should take and normally takes precedence over the former. Take the case of Djibouti which is militarily quite vulnerable and as such had to take help of French troops bolster her security in the face of Somali-Ethiopian conflict. But this did not bar her from taking a Non-aligned posture and playing an active role in mediating the Somali-Ethiopian conflict. On the other hand, there are countries which are just victims of circumstances and are trying to overcome those by playing a balancing game even if the outcomes may be intangible and invisible at the initial stage.

Having said this the question that arises is what would be the implications of the type of Non-aligned behaviour as we have seen on the Non-aligned Movement itself ? The answer is always compounded by subjectivity and value judgements. More so in the case of Non-alignment which has been, since its inception a very loose organization comprising diverse systems and forms of government and diverse peoples. But a little pondering would reveal that this very diversity and flexibility in organisation and course in fact adds to the strength of the Movement rather than weakening it. If the founding fathers of the Movement could conceive of the Non-alignment to be a flexible one in the dynamic sense of the term, there is no need for prescribing a path for it. The Movement itself will go its own path in the changing world context; the member countries while adhering to the overall goals and principles of the Movement will pursue their perceived national interest. Neither should infringe on self-development of each other.

## ANNEXURE 1 : PROFILE OF NON-ALIGNMENT OF THE AFRICAN COUNTRIES

Sl. No.	Name of Country	Regime in Power	Score	Foreign Policy Postures	Score	Adherence to Nonaligned Principles	Score
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	ALGERIA	—Independent —Liberal democratic	5	—Non-alignment —Non-interference —Supports liberation struggles.	5	—No violation —Dispute with Morocco over Western Sahara issue	4
2.	ANGOLA	—Pro-Moscow and Cuban backed	1	—Guided by Moscow and Cuba —Anti-apartheid —Supports liberation struggles	2	—Permitted Cuban troops	2
3.	BENIN	—Marxist —Independent	4	—Independent but China leaning	4	—No violation	4
4.	BOTSWANA	—Nationalist	4	—Independent but soft heart for South Africa	2	—Passive support to apartheid and racism	1
5.	BURUNDI	—Independent —Left leaning	4	—Left-leaning	4	—No violation	4
6.	CAMEROON	—Independent	5	—Independent —Anti-South African —Anti-intervention in Chad	5	—No violation	4
7.	CAPE VERDE ISLAND	—Pro-West —Nationalist	3	—Independent	5	—No violation —Refused to sign ECOWAS sponsored defence pact	4
8.	CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC	—Backed by France	2	—Pro-West —Extreme depen- dence on France	2	—French troops welcomed	2

## Annexure 1 contd.

Military Alliance	Score	Trade Direction	Score	Aid Dependence	Score	Total Score
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
—None	5	—Mainly West (EEC) but diversified.	4	—50% of GDP (1980)	2	25
—Opposes military alliance				—Mainly West		—
—Friendship and Co-operation Treaty with USSR 1976	1	—Concentrated	2	—High	3	11
—18000-21000 cuban troops stationed		—Cuba and USSR		—Cuba, USSR and also US & South Africa		—
—Military Co-operation Agreement with France 1974	2	—France (30-40%)	3	—High France & Libya	2	19
—No alliance	5	—South Africa	3	—High	1	16
		—Regional countries		—France		—
—Training assistance from Belgium	3	—E EC	2	—High	1	18
		—Regional countries		France (100%)		—
—Military Assistance Agreement with China and France 1974	3	—France (40%)	2	—High	2	21
		—EEC (70%)		—EEC (70%)		—
—Friendship and Co-operation Treaty with Portugal 1975	3	—Ecowas	4	—High	2	21
		—France other EEC countries		—Diversified		—
—French base at Bouar	1	—EEC	3	—High	2	12
—1100 French troops		—France		—France		—



1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9. CHAD		—Backed alternately by France and Libya	1	—Guided by France	1	—Invited French and Libyan troops	1
10. COMOROS ISLAND		—Mercenary backing for installation of the regime	1	—Islamic Solidarity —Economic and political dependence on France	2	—French troops and base facilities	3
11. CONGO		—Marxist Leninist but independent	4	—Balanced relation with West, USSR and China. —Non-alignment and neutrality	4	—Permitted cuban forces	3
12. DJIBOUTI		—Independent and nationalistic	5	—Independent and active non-aligned —Balancing between the regional conflicting groups.	5	—Peace making role recognized	4
13. EGYPT		—Pro-West —Independent	4	—Influenced by USA	4	—Base and training facilities to RDF.	1
14. ETHIOPIA		—Pro-Moscow —Military regime	2	—Guided by Moscow and Cuba	2	—Permitted cuban troops and Soviet advisory to fight Somalia —Supports the Eritrians.	1

	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
—Military Co-operation Agreement with France		2	—France and regional countries of UDEAC	2	—France and Libya —Libya paid civil servant salary	3	10 —
—French base in Mayotte and 400 Legion troops		2	—Concentrated with regional UDEAC countries	2	—High —France;	1	11 —
—Friendship and Co-operation Treaty with USSR —Military aid agreement with France —3000 cuban troops in 1978		1	—France (50%) —Regional UDEAC countries	2	—Balanced Frnce, EEC and East European countries	2	16 —
—Because of tense situation in the Horns, 3600 French troops for security and training		2	—France UK and Japan	3	—EEC, USA and Japan	1	20 —
—US basefacilities and defence assistance from USA		2	—West Europe and USA (18%)	3	—Mainly USA	2	16 —
—Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation with USSR 1978 —Base facilities to USSR(Dahlak Island) —Tripartite Allianace with Libya and South Yemen 1981.		1	—Observer in Comecon —50% oil from USSR —Concentrated in East bloc	1	—Mainly from USSR and Cuba	1	8 —

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
15. EQUATORIAL GUINEA	—Backed by USSR(base extent) —Spain and France oriented	1	—Dictated by survival of the regime in power	2	—	During fighting in Angola Farnado port was used by USSR Navy as base and rudder station.	1
16. GABON	—Backed by France	2	—Guided by France	2	—	Sent troops to Benin	1
17. GAMBIA	—Backed by Senegal	2	—Independent —Confederation with Senegal	3	—	Installed troops in Senegal	3
18. GHANA	—Independent	5	—Independent	5	—	Not violated	4
19. GUINEA	—Independent	4	—Balanced and non-aligned	5	—	Not violated	4
20. GUINEA BISSAU	—Independent	4	—Independent	4	—	Not violated —Refused to sign the West African defence pact 1981	4
21. IVORY COAST	—Leaning towards West	3	—Influenced by France	4	—	Not violated	4
22. KENYA	—Pro-West	2	—Influenced by USA	3	—	Was involved in Ogaden war and signed pact with Ethiopia in 1978	2

	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
—No pact but dependent on Moscow and Spain for survival of the regime		4	—Spain	2	—High —Spain	2	12 —
—Military Co-operation Agreement with France, 1974		2	—France (40-50%)	3	—Moderate —France	4	14 —
—Mutual defence agreement with Senegal.		3	—25% with UK —German, France, Italy	3	—IMF/EEC	4	18 —
—Presence of cuban troops							
—Military Co-operation Agreement with USA 1972		1	—EEC and regional countries	3	—Less —Diversified	4	22 —
—Military Assistance Agreement with China		2	—90% of foreign exchange earning comes from bauxite	1	—French, USA, EEC, Nigeria	4	20 —
—Limited cuban troops			—34% goes to EEC				
—None		5	—Member of Lome Convention and ECOWAS	3	—Diversified between East and West	3	23 —
			—More than 50% trade with Portugal				
—Military Co-operation Agreement with France		2	—More than 35% trade with France	3	—France, USA —Oil revenue high	4	20 —
—Presence of limited French troops			—USA, German, Holland, Italy				
—US Naval and Air facilities and base at Mombasa		0	—About 40% trade with EEC	3	—USA —Britain	3	13 —
—Defence Agreements with USA and Britain			—UK about 20%				

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
23. LESOTHO	—Pro-West		2	—Land locked and influenced by South Africa		3	—Not violated	4
24. LIBERIA	—Pro-West		2	—Influenced by US		3	—Not violated	4
25. LIBYA	—Nationalist independent		5	—Radical independent		3	—Interference in Chad and Uganda	1
26. MADAGASCAR	—Pro-East —Independent		3	—Independent		4	Not violated	4
27. MALAWI	—Pro-West		3	—Influenced by South Africa		2	—Good relations with racist regime of South Africa	2
28. MALI	—Independent		5	—Pro-West —Independent		4	—Not violated —Refrained from signing ECOWAS sponsoring defence pact in 1981	4
29. MAURITANIA	—Pro-West —Independent		4	—Pro-West —Independent		4	—Not violated	4
30. MAURITIUS	—Independent		5	—Independent		5	—Not violated	4
31. MOROCCO	—Pro-West		3	—Influenced by USA and France		3	—Involved in the crisis of Western Sahara, —Sent troops to Zaire —Attempts to change power in Mauritania in 1979	1

	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
—None		5	—South Africa main trading partner	3	—USA, UK	3	20 —
—Mutual Defence Agreement with US 1972		2	—24% of imports from USA —Germany, Japan	3	—USA & EEC	4	18 —
—Friendship Treaty with USSR		1	—Diversified USA, Italy, Britain, France and other EEC countries.	4	—None	5	19 —
—Arms supply from USSR							
—Military Co-opera- tion Agreement with France		3	40% imports from France —USA Germany Japan, Italy	3	—Tied with France and USA	3	20 —
—None		5	—Import 41% with South Africa —Export 42% with UK, Japan, Germany	3	—High —Tied with South Africa and UK	3	18 —
—Military Assis- tance Agreement with US		3	—France 30-40% —German, Ivory Coast, Senegal Japan, UK	3	—World's 6th poorest country, —France USA.	2	21 —
—Military Assis- tance Agreement with China (Recently denounced).							
—Military Assis- tance Agreement with France		3	—Diversified, mainly EEC countries	4	—Debt 150% of GNP —France, Libya and other Arab coun- tries	2	21 —
—UK responsible for defence		1	—Diversified but leaning to West	3	—UK	2	20 —
—Has no defence force							
—US base facilities		1	—France 26-27% —USA and other EEC countries	3	—High —USA, France and Saudi Arabia	2	13 —
—Defence Treaty with US in 1982							
—Permitted limited presence of French troops							

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
32. MOZAMBIQUE	—Marxist-Leninist party —Pro-USSR and China	3	—Influenced by both China and USSR	3	—Presence of limited Cuban troops	4	
33. NIGER	—Left bias but Independent	5	—Independent	5	—Not violated —Signatory of ECOWAS	3	
34. NIGERIA	—Pro-West —Independent	4	—Independent	5	—Dispute with Ghana	3	
35. RWANDA	—Pro-West	3	—Influenced by West	3	—Disputes with Zaire and Burundi	3	
36. SAOTOME AND PRINCIPIE	—Marxist —Independent	4	—Independent	5	—Not violated	3	
37. SENEGAL	—Moderate Islamic —Independent	4	—Pro-West —Influenced by France	4	—Supports Morocco in Saharan dispute —Anti Libyan —Sent troops to Gambia	4	
38. SEYCHELES	—Socialist —Independent	4	—Independent	5	—Not violated	3	

9	10	11	12	13	14	15
—Friendship Treaty with Angola and Ethiopia	3	—Diversified	4	—High	2	11
—Treaty with USSR		—South Africa, USA German, Portugal, Iraq, Italy, Japan		—Tied with major powers		—
—Military assistance from France	3	—ECOWAS countries	3	—High	2	21
—Involved in the conflict of Chad		—France (35-40%)		—Diversified		—
—None	5	—Italy, Nigeria USA, UK, German	2	—Nil	5	25
—None	5	—Imports 22% with UK —Exports 42% with US —German, Japan	4	—High	1	20
—None	5	—Diversified	4	—Tied with West		—
—None	5	—USA, UK, Japan EEC.		—One of the poorest countries		—
—None	5	—Portugal and Holland ( 70% )	2	—High	1	21
—Military Co-operation Agreement with France 1979	1	—France (40—50%)	3	—Portugal	2	17
—Mutual Defence Agreement with Gambia		—EEC		—France		—
—1300 French troops						
—US satellite tracing base	1	—Diversified	3	—EEC	3	19
—Joins military exercise with US				—USA		—



1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
39. SIERRA-LEONE	—Pro-West —Independent		4	—Influenced by France	3	—Not violated	3
40. SOMALIA	—Pro-West		4	—Influenced by US	3	—Involved in war with Ethiopia in Ogaden	4
41. SUDAN	—Pro-West		4	—Influenced by US	3	—Involved in Iraq-Iran War —Participant of Joint exercise with US RDF	3
42. NAMIBIA	—Nationalist —Independent		5	—Leaning towards East	4	—Not violated	4
43. SWAZILAND	—Dependent on South Africa		3	—Influenced by South Africa	3	—Not violated	4
44. TANZANIA	—Socialist —Independent		5	—Pro-China —Independent	4	—Has military con- tingents in Zambia, Mozambique, Seychelles and Comoro Islands —Conflict with Uganda	2
45. TOGO	—Pro-France —Independent		4	—Influenced by France	3	—Plays significant role in African affairs —Prime mover of ECOWAS	4
46. TUNISIA	—Pro-West —Independent		4	—Independent	5	—Not violated	4
47. UGANDA	—Supported by Tanzania		3	—Independent	5	—Involved in regional conflicts	2

9	10	11	12	13	14	15
—None	3	—UK, France USA	3	—High —Diversified	2	19 —
—Permitted cuban military experts						
—US base facilities in Mogadishu	1	—Italy, EEC USA	4	—High —USA and Saudi Arabia	2	17 —
—Defence agree- ment with US 1982						
—Military Co-operation Agreement with China 1982	2	—Diversified —40% export with EEC countries	4	—High —USA and Saudi Arabia	2	18 —
—Arms assistance from USA		—Italy, Japan, Saudi Arabia, UK France, German				
—The national li- beration move- ment is going on with the active help of Angola and USSR	3	—More than 50% controlled by South Africa	2	—High —USSR and other African States	2	20 —
—None	5	—Tied with South Africa	2	—Less and balanced	4	19 —
—Military Assis- tance Agree- ment with China	2	—Diversified —German, UK, India, China, Japan, USA, Italy	4	—70% of budget —West and China	2	19 —
—Military Co-operation Agreement with France	2	—France 34% —UK, USA, Japan Holland, African states	3	—France and Arab States	3	19 —
—Strategic Co-operation Agreement with US (1981)	2	—More than 60% with EEC, —Arab States	3	—High —USA and Arab States	2	20 —
—Defence and training arrange- ment with UK	3	—EEC and African states —Diversified	3	—High —UK	2	18 —

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
48. UPPER VOLTA			—Pro-West —Independent	4	—Influenced by France	3	—Not violated	4
49. ZAMBIA			—Independent	5	—Independent	5	—Not violated	4
50. ZAIRE			—Backed by France —Pro-West —Anti-Soviet	1	—Influenced by France and Belgium	3	—Disputed with Angola —Permitted foreign troops —Conflict in Shaba province	2
51. ZIMBABWE			—Leaning toward East —Independent	4	—Independent	5	—Not violated	4

### Index

#### (a) Regime in Power

- 0 — Backed by either Super Powers
- 1 — Backed by major powers/regional powers
- 2 — Pro-Super Powers
- 3 — Pro-major powers/regional powers
- 4 — Leaning to external powers but nationalistic in policies/action
- 5 — Independent

#### (b) Foreign Policy

- 0 — Guided/dictated by Super Powers
- 1 — Guided/dictated by major powers/regional powers
- 2 = Dictated by geo-political factors/aid dependence
- 3 = Pro-Super Powers
- 4 = Leaning to external powers but more or less independent
- 5 = Truly Non-aligned

#### (c) Adherence to Non-aligned Principles

- 0 = Involved in violation of Non-aligned Principles
- 1 = Permit/support in military intervention/support apartheid and racism
- 2 = Interferences in internal affairs of others
- 3 = Acquiescence to violation
- 4 = Strictly Non-aligned and no violation

9	10	11	12	13	14	15
—Military Co-operation Treaty with France	3	—Diversified —EEC, USA and African States	4	—High but balanced	3	21 —
—Arms supply from USSR	4	Mainly UK and South Africa —USA, Japan and EEC	3	—High —West	2	22 —
—Military Co-operation Agreement with Belgium and France	2	—France, UK, USA Japan, Ivory Coast, German, Belgium	3	—High —Belgium US, France	3	14 —
—Presence of French troops						
—Overflying, training and defence agreement with UK	3	—Main trade partner South Africa (about 30%)	2	—High and balanced	3	21 —

## (d) Military Alliance

- 0 = Belong to blocs/alliance with Super Powers
- 1 = Foreign military base/presence of foreign troops or bilateral defence agreement with Super Powers
- 2 = Defence agreement with major powers/limited base facilities for Super Powers
- 3 = Defence Pact with regional powers/countries
- 4 = Defence assistance from external powers
- 5 = No alliance/base/troops

## (e) Trade Direction

- 0 = Trade concentration with either Super Powers
- 1 = Trade concentration above 75% with one bloc
- 2 = Trade concentration between 50-75%
- 3 = Trade concentration between 30-50%
- 4 = Trade concentration between 25-30%
- 5 = Trade diversified and balanced

## (f) Aid Dependence

- 0 = High and tied with either Super Powers
- 1 = High and tied to major powers
- 2 = High but balanced between major powers
- 3 = High and tied to regional powers
- 4 = Less and tied to major powers
- 5 = Nil

**Annexure-2**  
**Basic Facts**

Sl. No.	Name of the country	Area Sq. km.	Population million (1980)	Year of independence	Year of joining NAM	GNP per capita (1980)	Political regime	Resources	Leading items of export
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.	Algeria	2,381,741	18.9	1962	1961	1,870	-One party	-Oil, gas, metal	-Oil and gas(58%)
2.	Angola	1,246,700	7.1	1976	1976	470	-Multiparty	-Oil diamonds	-Oil (80%)
3.	Benin	112,622	3.2	1960	1964	310	-Military dictatorship	-Palm oil, cotton, cement	-Palm oil and cotton (75%)
4.	Botswana	582,000	0.8	1966	1970	620	-Multiparty	-Diamonds, meat and meat products	-Diamonds (60%)
5.	Burundi	27,834	4.1	1962	1964	200	-One party	-Coffee, cotton -Poor minerals	-Coffee (90%)
6.	Cameroon	474,000	8.4	1960	1964	670	-One party	-Oil, gas, bauxite	-Coffee, cocoa (More than 50%)
7.	Cape Verde Islands	4,033	0.4	1975	1976	350	-One party	-Fishing, small cargo fleet, mineral products	-Agricultural; Fish and fish products (54%)
8.	Central African Republic	622,984	2.3	1960	1964	300	-One party	-Diamonds, coffee, timber	-Diamond, coffee and timber (more than 90%)
9.	Chad	1,284,000	4.5	1960	1964	120	-One party	-Oil, uranium -Other minerals expected	-Raw cotton (65%)
10.	Comoros Island	1,795	4.4	1975	1976	150	-One party	-No known mineral resources; Economy entirely based on agriculture	-Vanilla and perfume oils(more than 75%)

\*NAM : Non-aligned Movement.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11.	Congo	342,000	1.6	1960	1964	900	-One party	-Worlds, richest deposit of potash -Agriculture is also developed 35% to GDP	-Crude oil (58%)
12.	Djibouti	23,000	0.4	1977	1979	450	-Multiparty	-Fishing and livestock	-Economy is totally based on trade and income from the port.
13.	Egypt	1,001,449	39.8	1922	1955	580	-One party	-Phosphate, Iron ore, coal, manganese	-Cotton (66%)
14.	Equatorial Guinea	28,051	0.25	1968	1976	—	-One party	-Iron, copper -Uranium may be present	-Cocoa, coffee wood,
15.	Ethiopia	1,221,900	31.1	*	1955	140	-Multiparty	-Gold, rock salt, copper	-Food and animals.
16.	Gabon	267,667	1.3	1960	1973	3,590	-One party	-Oil, manganese, uranium	-Crude oil (70%)
17.	Gambia	11,570	5.8	1965	1973	230	-Multiparty	-Deposit of gasoline and oil are expected	-Groundnuts (70%)
18.	Ghana	238,305	11.7	1957	1961	420	-One party	-Gold, bauxite, manganese, diamond oil and gas	-Cocoa, gold, manganese.
19.	Guinea	245,857	5.4	1958	—	290	-One party	-Bauxite (50% of world's deposit), Uranium, gold, iron	-Alumina and bauxite (90%)

\* Was never under colonial rule. But from 1935 to 1941 was occupied by Italy.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
20.	Guinea-Bissau	36,125	3.2	1975	1976	160	-Military dictatorship	-Poor	-Fish, mineral products
21.	Ivory Coast	322,463	8.3	1960	1955	1,150	-One party	-Bauxite, salt -Iron ore, diamonds	-Coffee cocoa and wood (more than 60%)
22.	Kenya	582,646	15.9	1963	1964	420	-Multiparty	-Oil, gold, silver coal, uranium	-Coffee, tea and petroleum products (60%)
23.	Lesotho	30,355	1.3	1266	1961	420	-Multiparty	-Gem stones, diamonds, uranium oil, coal.	-Diamonds, timber
24.	Liberia	111,370	1.9	1847	1955	530	-One party	-Iron ore, diamonds	-Iron ore (50-60%)
25.	Libya	1,759,550	3.0	1957	1945	8,640	-Dictatorship	-Oil and gas	-Oil (more than 90%)
26.	Madagascar	587,041	8.7	1960	1973	350	-Multiparty	-Crude oil, cronite, graphite	-Coffee, clovers and vanilla (more than 75%)
27.	Malawi	118,485	6.1	1964	1964	230	-One party	-Very poor; Mainly agriculture	-Tobacco (56), tea (17%)
28.	Mali	1,204,021	7.0	1960	1961	190	-One party	-Salt, tin, phosphate -Diamonds, bauxite and uranium are also found	-Cotton and cotton products (50%).
29.	Mauritania	1,118,700	1.5	1960	1964	440	-Multiparty	-Iron ore	-Iron ore (over 75%)
30.	Mauritius	1,974	1.0	1968	1973	650	-Multiparty	-Poor: Mainly agriculture	-Sugar (66%), export processing zone(25%)
31.	Morocco	624,550	20.2	1956	1961	900	-Kingdom	-Phosphate (3rd in the world) coal, lead, manganese, uranium	-Minerals (over 35%)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
32.	Mozambique	783,030	12.1	1975	1976	230	-One party	-Coal, bauxite, copper and diamonds	-Cashew nuts (over 30%)
33.	Namibia	823,620	1.0	—	—	1,080	-Multiparty	-Diamonds (world's largest producer) uranium, iron copper, zinc	-Meat and live animals (50%) -Export figure of diamonds are not disclosed.
34.	Niger	1,267,000	5.3	1960	1973	330	-One party	-Uranium (5th) Casserites coal, iron, oil.	-Uranium (over 65%)
35.	Nigeria	923,768	48.7	1960	1964	1,010	Multiparty	Oil, gas, coal, iron ore	-Oil (over 90%)
36.	Rwanda	26,388	4.9	1962	1979	190	-Military dictatorship	-Poor Gas, and tin	-Coffee (over 55%)
37.	Sao Tome and Principe	963	0.8	1975	1979	500	-One party	-Poor Mainly agriculture	-Cocoa (80-90%)
38.	Senegal	197,161	6.0	1960	1961	360	Multiparty	-Phosphate, iron ore, petrol	-Ground nuts (35%)
39.	Seychelles	288	0.1	1976	1976	1,068	-One party	-Poor -Tourism is the main sector of economy	-Copra (65%)
40.	Sierra-Leone	71,740	3.4	1961	1964	230	-One party	-Diamond, bauxite, iron	-Diamonds (over 65%)
41.	Somalia	637,140	3.9	1969	1961	130	-One party	Rich Oil and uranium deposits are expected	-Livestock 80%)



1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
42.	Sudan	2,505,813	18.3	1956	1955	340	-One party	-Precious metals, gold uranium, oil and copper are expected	-Cotton (over 40%)
43.	Swaziland	17,364	6.0	1968	1970	1,340	-One party	-Forest (largest in Africa), iron, asbestos coal	-Sugar, timber and asbestos (over 60%)
44.	Tanzania	939-361	18.7	1961	1964	280	-One party	-Gold, diamonds, salt, Coal, gas and oil are expected	-Cloves and coconuts over 90%)
45.	Togo	56,000	2.5	1960	1964	410	-One party	-Phosphate (6th) Limestone, marble, oil	-Phosphate (over 40%) cocoa 25%)
46.	Tunisia	164,150	6.4	1956	1961	1,310	-One party	-Crude oil, chemicals and agricultural products	-Oil (45%)
47.	Uganda	243,411	12.6	19.62	1964	300	Multiparty	-Copper, iron and phosphate are available -Main manufacturing sector	-Coffee, cotton, tea, copper
48.	Upper Volta	274,200	6.1	1960	1973	210	-Multiparty	-Manganese, limestone and phosphates are available but agricultural processing are prominent.	-Raw cotton nuts, live animals.
49.	Zambia	752,618	5.8	1964	1964	560	-One party	-Copper, cobalt, gold, silver, zinc, coal	-Copper (83%)
50.	Zaire	2,344,932	28.3	1960	1961	220	-One party	-Copper, cobalt (60% of world's reserve), diamonds, manganese, zinc, oil	-Minerals
51.	Zimbabwe	391,109	9.4	1980	1964	630	-Multiparty	-Asbestos, chrome, coal, gold	-Tobacco, asbestos and gold (about 50%)