CHAPTER 3

Evolution of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) : Origin, Structure, Activities and Factors Motivated it, establishment
CHAPTER -3

EVOLUTION OF ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY (OAU): ORIGIN, STRUCTURE, ACTIVITIES AND FACTORS WHICH MOTIVATED ITS ESTABLISHMENT

This chapter examines the factors and forces that motivated into the establishment of the organization of African Unity (OAU), an apan-African Organization charged with bringing together all African States under one common and unifying forum. The need for such a study of the OAU stems from the fact that, to understand African regionalism one must have adequate understanding of its historical origins. Needless to mention, some socio-political tendencies and processes which influenced the formation of the OAU have been alluded in the previous chapter. Hence, these issues will be dealt more rigorously as well as the structure of the OAU will be discussed systematically. This will facilitate in comprehending the nature and character of the roles played by the OAU in conflict management both regionally as well as trans-regionally.

The Origin Of OAU:-

To many outsiders, the idea of African unity has always contained a strong element of fantasy. Divided racially between Africans, Arabs and former entrenched white minorities in the South, geographically by the Sahara desert and the primitive transport and communication lines between North and South, East and West Africa, but event between neighbouring states, culturally and linguistically into numerous small and often hostile groups, and finally partitioned in the eighteenth century amongst the European powers. How could such a continent be united? Yet, the idea of African unity undeniably exercised a strong interests to African nationalists, who used it as an
instrument of considerable political potency in the struggle of independence. There are three possible reasons for this development, viz., the Black Diaspora, Education and Ideological Revolution and lastly Colonialism and Imperialism.

a. The Black Diaspora:

Pan-Africanism is probably one of the most complex phenomena in modern history, but also one of the hardest to pin-down, since it is one of the political forces active in the current world scene, and since scholarly research into it has scarcely begun, the literature on the subject is still unsatisfactory. Nevertheless, the origins of the pan-Africanism movement do lend themselves scholarly treatment.

WEB DuBois and George Padmore were responsible for all the current cliché’s about the history of pan-Africanism. This is all the more unsatisfactory because both men were among its most articulate spokesmen. Since Padmore quotes amply from DuBois, our picture of the development of the pan-African movement as the last resort indirectly reflects the subjective views of DuBois. As the father of pan-Africanism in many cases had tendency of self-adulation, the result is doubly inadequate. The problem is others replace the personally biased view of pan-African given by DuBois and Padmore with a more objective one. Any further attempt to based generalizations on, let alone draw conclusions from, fragmentary and limited knowledge could only add to the prevailing confusion and make people reluctant to deal with pan-Africanism at all.

In order to understand twentieth century pan-Africanism it will also be necessary to explore its historical antecedents in the nineteenth and eighteenth centuries more systematically than was done by Padmore who correctly appreciated their significance, but dealt with briefly and in an amateurish way.
It is still difficult, perhaps even impossible, to provide a clear and precise definition of pan-Africanism. It is a complex problem which can best be approached historically. By looking at various manifestations we can arrive at simple and comprehensive formulae, compare them with objective reality and modify them continually in the light of modern knowledge. By pan-Africanism we understand the following:

1. Intellectual and political movements among Africans and Afro-Americans, who regard or have regarded Africans and people of African descent as homogenous. This outlook leads to a feeling of racial solidarity and a new self-awareness and causes Afro-Americans to look upon Africa as their real homeland, without necessarily thinking of a physical return of Africa.

2. All ideas which have stressed or sought the cultural unity and political independence of Africa, including the desire to modernize Africa on the basis of equality of rights. The key concepts here have been respectively the redemption of Africa and Africa for the Africans.

3. Ideas or political movements which have advocated, or advocate, the political unity of Africa or the least close political collaboration in one form or another.

In addition to the difficulties encountered in defining the concepts, to their factors make the history of pan-African movement complex and difficult to comprehend. Firstly, development occurred simultaneously on three continents - in North America (USA and the West Indies), in Africa (especially West Africa) and Europe (especially England) - sometimes influencing one another but sometimes in solution. Secondly, those developments must be seen within the framework of the general history of Africa, America and Europe, so that one always has to bear in mind a fair amount of world
history, even though one cannot draw the lines as precisely as one might wish. Six factors have influenced the development of pan-Africanism.

a) Pan-Africanism frequently took the form of a movement of all colored and colonial peoples, which has been called since Bandung the Afro-Asian solidarity movement, or the pan-Colonial or earlier, pan-colored movement.

b) In most cases pan-Africanism was understood as pan-Negroism, i.e. was defined primarily in racial terms. This view ignored Arabic North-Africa and concentrated on the solidarity between Black African’s and Afro-Americans.

c) Only after the unity of the whole African continent had become the goal, and Afro-Americans of the new world had been excluded, did pan-Africanism attain the form from which it derives its home and the meaning generally associated with today. Two sub-categories may be for the distinguish the drive for the unity of Black Africa South of the Sahara and that for the unity of the entire continent including the Arabic North.

d) A regional union has frequently been regarded as a preliminary stage on the road to continental unity, especially in British West Africa during the earlier years. Only in very recent times have such ideas been taken up in other regions as well notably in East-Africa.

e) The fifth factor to be considered is the national one. Until a short time ago it was at this level concrete action as a role took place, where theoretical discussions, propaganda and agitation were oriented mainly to supra-national plane.

f) Nationalism frequently first developed on tribal level. Pan-Africanism has hardly been a clearly defined, precise or rational concept. On the contrary, it has been (and still is) a matter of vague emotions - a vision or a dream, as Dubois put it, “pan-African’s is thus predominantly a modern movement.” It is the reaction of the most advanced, most
intensively Europeanized Africans and Afro-Americans to contact with the modern world.

As a movement worthy of the home, pan-Africanism first appeared among Afro-American in the new world in about 1900. But in the earlier struggle against the slave trade and slavery traditions developed which led to pan-Africanism, and this abolitionist movement also forms parts of the background to pan-Africanism.

In the first place there, the primordial dynamics of race distribution and cultural evolution that gave the world the population distributions that, is to say existed at the advent of Christendom. Since then, innumerable other forces have caused the redistribution of races, people, cultures and populations which have produced entirely new patch-work effects on the globe.

Pan-Africanism was originally expounded by intellectuals from the Caribbean and North America who had lost contact with their own ancestral past and for whom Africa represented both an Arcadian and utopian future. The African Diaspora of North America and the Caribbean, home of the intellectual pioneers of pan-Africanism such as H. Sylvester Williams, W.E.B Dubois, George Padmore, Marcus Garvey, inspired African nationalists to fight against racism and oppression. As an intellectual movement pan-Africanism represented the rise to self-assertion of Africans and peoples of African decent outside the continent with the overriding goal of regaining their social dignity as a people and eventually establishing an independent nation in the African homeland. This was especially true for Garveyism the prophetic and mass-based wing of the movement, whose influence was felt all over Black Africa. As a result it can rightly be concluded that were it not for slavery and the Black Diaspora, for the sensitive education of Black
Americans and West-Indians, pan-Africanism would have made a much later entrance into African politics.

b. Education And Ideological Revolution In Sub-Saharan Africa :-

The colonial powers sowed the very seeds of their supplanting, for out of their selective educational systems a few sharp thinkers grew. Consequently, the ideas developed in the New World found a receptive audience amongst African especially those educated in London and Paris who in the alien environment found more similarities in their historical experience and aspirations than they would have recognized had they been confined to the geographical confines of Africa. These young and educated Africans joined the rank of the leading apostles of pan-Africanism, they were soon to awaken the latent masses to a general political awareness of their debased position and the need for independence. Also, it was the quest for higher education that brought Kwame Nkrumah, Jomo Kenyatta, etc in contact with the facts of the Black Diaspora, which were to become politically lethal to colonial imperialism.

Further world war I brought little awareness to the Africans, but the spread of communism and Fascism soon after war, to have their repercussions in Africa. Africans visited foreign lands where they saw cultures and ways of life which awakened them to the realities at home. Later on, in a number of territories, the communist condemnation of colonial capitalism and imperialism helped fan the fire of the struggle for independence by giving it moral and political support in the UN organs. Communist governments supplied some parts of Africa with substantial weaponry, training and logistic support for guerrilla warfare - which, in turn, won eventual independence and membership of the OAU for these African countries.
Imperialism and colonialism are generally viewed as monopolies of the white man. This view has become so widespread that the terms "imperialism" and "colonialism" have assumed a pejorative connotation in the West itself. To call a motion "imperialistic" has come to be an indictment, and to describe a dependent territory as a "colony" is likely to be construed as an insult. In effect, the two concepts have in the western world become symbols of a kind of collective guilt complex, yet as a noted historian has pointed out, that the West's record in this regard is by no means as unqualifiedly deserving of condemnation as is often alleged or felt to be the case. For, though the brief history of western imperialism has witnessed many injustice and cruelties, which however were in no way worse than the normal happenings in Africa before the advent of the white man, it has been on the whole a period of which the west, and especially Britain, has not to be ashamed. It would be wrong to apply twentieth century standards and principles of international law to preceding centuries. By doing that - and it should not be forgotten that these new twentieth century standards were developed by the Western World - the West suffers a bad conscience.

The terms "imperialism" and "colonialism" simply denote a power relationship of one political entity over another. Imperialism describes the process of establishing that power relationship, and colonialism has to do with the pattern of domination and rule once the relationship has been consolidated. Neither is a monopoly of the white man or an exclusively modern phenomenon. Black people are known to have exercised power over one another many centuries before the white man set foot on the African continent, and the history of political evolution in the west is the story of white men dominating other white men.
Historical perspective shows that these two terms have not always been in disrepute. The imperialist or colonizer of the nineteenth century was a hero to his contemporaries. Today, a very different view is taken of Cecil Rhodes in both West and in the new nations, than was taken of him two or three generations ago. The concept of colonialism has undergone a radical transformation in both time and space. The truth is, of course, that as concepts the terms “imperialism” and “colonialism” are neutral. Whether the relationship of domination they refer to is good or bad depends entirely on the values of the beholder. Power always remains power, best the values regarding what constitute desirable or undesirable power relationships are ever changing.

It is clear that, in our day, the new nationalism sees western colonialism as its great antagonist and directs most of its energies toward destroying it. This tendency to place colonialism and the new nationalism at opposite poles may be some what misleading. Actually, when viewed in historical perspective, the relationship between imperialism and nationalism has not been essentially of antagonism, but of dialectical interrelation. Frequently, as in the course of the France Revolution, imperialism has grown out of nationalism, and such imperialism, in turn, has spawned new nationalist movements, as witness as to the rise of nationalism against the Napoleonic Empire. Indeed, the germs of imperialism are already in evidence in the nationalism of some of the new countries - Premier Nkrumah’s aim to create a pan-African movement under the leadership of Ghana is a case in point.

“Colonialism, with its train of humiliating policies and dispossessions made a rude entry into sub-Saharan Africa. Their rudeness led many Africans to begin seeking a permanent solution to the endemic plague!” This was certainly the case, for if the imperial powers had met dispossessed Africans for their liberty, dignity and property,
people like Jomo Kenyatta of Kenya, would never have gone with delegations to England to ask for the return of African land. It was the imperial style of discrimination and derogatory mismanagement of Africa that sensitized the African to their plight, and made their psyche and fleeting a fertile ground against the colonial powers. Therefore, drawing on various disaffected groups the pan-Africanist movement gradually grew stronger and anti-colonialism was the natural consequence.

In addition to this, the establishment of the United Nations (UN) in 1945 created a forum for anti-colonial pressure, a unity of interest emerged among African nationalists which bore little relations to the problems they would face in the exercise of power in independent Africa. Although their goal was invariably the independence of their own respective countries they paradoxically grafted pan-Africanism onto the theory of African nationalism. Unity was not at this state seem as an ambiguous concept precisely because no one felt a need to define it. However, this situation changed dramatically in 1960 when seventeen African states were admitted to the UN. These new states that emerged had attendant emphasis on nationalism, anti-colonialism and self-determination. In this regard they articulated many proposals for mutual cooperation for tackling their common problems. From the first pan-African gathering in Manchester (United Kingdom) in 1900 to the historical conference of independence African states (IAS) in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, numerous of attempts were made to land a pan-African character for freedom, equality, liberty, justice and progress of the colonized people of Africa. The major landmarks on this road to continental solidarity were The Ghana-Guinea Union, 1958 which was joined by Mali in 1961; The All-African People’s Conference, Accra 1958, The Casablanca Group, 1961, The Pan-African movement for East, Central and South Africa (PAFMECSA), the Monrovia Group, 1961, and the Brazzaville Group, 1961.
However, it should be pointed out that the Conference of Independent African States (CIAS), the Casablanca Group, the Monrovia Group and the Brazzaville Group need to be taken note of as they are the most important forces for understanding the establishment of the OAU. So many political changes are occurring in the continent of Africa that it is difficult to determine even general trends. Amidst much talk about African unity “African personality”, and African federation, multitude of new states have suddenly emerged, with attendant emphasis on nationalism, anti-colonialism, and self determination. These states vary greatly in historical experience and orientation and they are just beginning to develop patterns of cooperation for common interest. Many proposals for African regional association have been discussed, a few have actually taken organizational form.

Conference of Independent African States (CIAS) :-

In April 1958, delegates of eight African states, i.e. Ethiopia, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Sudan, Tunisia, and Egypt, met in Accra. They agreed on the necessity for establishing machinery for consultation and cooperation. They also decided to hold a conference every two years. The permanent representatives of the participating government, at the United Nations were designated as the members of the informal council for CIAS. The second conference, held in Addis Ababa in June 1960, was attended by delegates of eleven independent African states and of five areas - the Mali Federation, Madagascar, Nigeria, Sierra Leone and Somalia - whose dates for independence had been set. The conference recommended the establishment of a Council for African Economic Cooperation (CAEC) a joint African Development Bank, and an African Commercial Bank. These proposals shape under the influence of the experience.
of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) and the European Economic Community (EEC) represent the early schemes to promote inter-state functional organizations in post-colonial Africa. These proposals never took off as the CIAS lacked organizational experience and purpose, its working was hampered by conflicting interests and orientation of the new African states and by rivalries among the leaders. As a result, there emerged two competing groups, the Casablanca and Monrovia groups.¹⁵

The Casablanca Group:–

In January 1961, the heads of five non-aligned states of Africa, i.e., Gamal Abdul Nasser of Egypt, Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, Sekou Toure of Guinea, Modibo Keita of Mali, and King Mohammed V of Morocco, met in Casablanca and proclaimed what they called the African charter of Casablanca. The charter pledged its signatories to a policy of non-alignment. It called for a new African organization which all independent African states were invited to join. The organization would include an African consultative assembly, having a permanent seat and holding periodic sessions, a joint African High Command, committees on political economy and cultural affairs, and a secretariat.

However, this group was never active or cohesive organization. Only Algeria and Libya, in addition to its original members, adhered to it in any way. It was hampered by its own military, and by the conflicting aims and ambitions of the leaders of the member states. Despite its radical reputation, the Casablanca group had from the start attempted to reconcile an oddly disparate set of interests. Morocco, which had summoned the original conference had been primarily concerned to secure diplomatic support for its claim to Mauritania, Egypt was concerned with gaining African support in the Middle East conflict, while the GPRA was also pre-powered to overlook its own disputes with
Morocco in return for recognition. This left Ghana, Guinea and Mali, which were already united in the Union of African states, a federation which had never existed except on paper. The process of reconciliation between them has a continuing relevance for the OAU's role in African affairs, for it involved reaching agreement on an official definition of unity, which is still in use. After the Addis Ababa conference of 1963, the Casablanca group was officially dissolved.

The Monrovia Group:

Four months after the Casablanca Conference leaders of twenty African states i.e. all of the former French Community except Guinea, Mali and Mauritania, plus Ethiopia, Liberia, Libya, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, and Tunisia, came together in Monrovia, Liberia, in the first major conference of leaders of French-speaking and English speaking African States. The conference was boycotted by the states of Casablanca group, but hope was expressed at Monrovia that the Casablanca states would join the Monrovia group in subsequent conference, and would participate in the establishment of an inter-African organization.

The Brazzaville Group:

It was composed of Cameroon, central African Republic, Peoples' Republic of Congo, Ivory Coast, Dahomey, Gabon, Mauritania, Upper Volta, Madagascar, Niger, Senegal and Chad, all French-speaking African states. They signed the Brazzaville charter in December 1960 which came into force in September 1961. All these except Mali and Guinea joined the African Malagasy Organization for Economic Cooperation (AMOEC), a major regional economic organization. The aims for the organization were
specifically for cooperation in planning for economic development, extension of a customs union, harmonizing fiscal policies, and other measures of economic cooperation, also proposals to have more general aspirations in the direction of political integration.

Towards Reconciliation And The Birth Of OAU:

With the independence of Ghana, 1957, pan-Africanism had a political base on the African continent. Subsequently, preparatory activities by the early leaders of African independence (with the emergence of the Brazzaville, Casablanca and Monrovia groups of states) finally led to the birth of the OAU on 25 May 1963. Thus pan-Africanism was crystallized in a nascent continental body pledged to unity.

The blocs developed as an immediate reaction to the involvement of African states in the Congo and Algeria crises. But in the process of defining their position on these two crises, the Casablanca, Monrovia and Brazzaville groups found themselves competing also for the true interpretation of African unity. There was little in the objective conditions of most African states to justify ideological labels such as radical conservative and moderate, which were widely attributed to Casablanca, Brazzaville, and Monrovia respectively, but they did correspond broadly to the public position taken by the three alliances. Led by presidents Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana and Sekou Toure of Guinea, the Casablanca powers adopted a maximalist position under political integration which was seen as the only legitimate way of Africa securing independence and achieving the final liberation of the continent. By 1962 it was already clear that Nkrumah's views had failed to penetrate very deeply even within the Casablanca group, but he promoted them nonetheless with sufficient persistence to force Ghana's Francophone neighbors in formulating an alternative minimalist definition of African unity. Their own organization
the Union Africane et Melgache (UAM), proceeded the formation of Casablanca, but its position was essentially defensive. Alternative to militant neutralism, they maintained a close relationship with France while placing emphasis within Africa on the principles of territorial integrity and hence cooperation rather than integration between African states. While there were differences on other matters, essentially the same position was adopted by the wider and looser Monrovia group on the central issues of unity.

Despite their mutual antagonism, all three groups insisted, on the face of it that African Unity was incompatible with the maintenance of affiliations to rival blocs. Things were even made better by Algeria’s attainment of independence in June 1962 and the ending of Katangan secession in the Congo in January 1963. These two monumental events among a horde of others facilitated the removal of immediate causes of inter-African friction, and thus the way was open for the reconciliation which culminated in the signing of the OAU charter on May 25, 1963 in Addis Ababa by thirty African Heads of States and Government.

The establishment of the OAU formally ended the conflict over interpretation. Yet while there was agreement on the need for reconciliation the underlying dispute was unresolved. In the circumstances of the 1960’s Nkrumah’s insistence that unity should be based on a commitment to transfer sovereignty a commitment to transfer sovereignty to continental institutions had no chance of success. But the debate on the alternative to regional or diplomatic cooperation, which this policies precipitated was in fact only one manifestation of a recurring dispute. Essentially the question was one of criteria. What should be the modalities for transferring power from state to the regional organization and what were to be the qualifications for membership of the organizations changed with fulfilling the objectives of unity?
The formula devised in the OAU charter represented a compromise, although in no sense an equal one, between the maximalist and minimalist conceptions. A common antagonism to the white South Africa provided the basis of this agreement. As Catherine Hoskyns has pointed out, the OAU charter contained, "a curious hodgepodge of principles and purposes which combined very conservative statements designed to protect the status quo in intra-African relations with radical commitments to the outside world." Thus the Brazzaville and Monrovia groups secured a commitment by all member states to the principles of sovereign equality (Article II (c) and III (I) non-interference in internal affairs, Article III (iii), and the condemnation of political subversion and assassination (Article III (V), while the Casablanca powers reconciled to a diplomatic rather than a political structure for the organization by an equally binding commitment to the final eradication of colonialism in Africa, (Article II (d) and III (vi), and in affirmation of non-alignment with regard to all blocs (Article III (vii)."

In effect what this compromise did was to solve the question of definition which had been the cause of such friction's on the axiomatic ground that all Africans were united by the simple fact of being an African. The exclusion of the white South Africa was used to validate this otherwise vacuous preposition. Hence, it can be said that the motivational background for the establishment of the OAU flows from two different concepts: (1) a movement for the formation and consolidation of independence of states within existing boundaries, and (2) a pan-African movement hoping to join together all such states or groupings of them as were prepared to join forces for general or particular purposes. On the whole, these was agreement among African leaders that Unity and solidarity would give African states a more effective voice in international politics, counter foreign influences in the solution of African problems, curb the danger of
fragmentation among African states, and enhance their economic and social development.

Thus, the basic motivations for the establishment of the OAU were primarily political in nature.  

Aims, Principles And Objectives Of The OAU :-

Pan-Africanism has been a political principles of the black African peoples for over 80 years of the inception of the OAU, the continental body was pledged, The principles and objectives of the OAU are stated in Article II and III of the charter.

1 - to safeguard the national independence and sovereignty of African states,
2- to eradicate all form of colonialism from the dependent territories in Africa,
3 - to support African Unity among member nations,
4 - to uphold non-alignment in Africa’s resolutions with the rest of the world.
5 - to promote the unity and solidarity of the African states,
6 - to coordinate and intensify the cooperation and efforts to achieve a better life for the people of Africa,
7 - to defend their sovereignty, their territorial integrity and independence,
8 - to promote international cooperation having due regard to the charter of the United Nations and the Universal declaration of Human Rights

To achieve these goals member states pledged themselves to harmonize their politics in the following fields,

1 political and diplomatic cooperation,
2 economic cooperation including transport and communication,
3 educational and cultural cooperation,
4 health, sanitation and nutritional cooperation,
5 scientific and technical cooperation, and
6 cooperation for defense and security

To achieve these objectives seven fundamental principles are stated that should facilitated their attainment
1 the sovereign equality of all members states,
2 non-interference in the internal affairs of other states,
3 respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of each state and for it, inalienable to independence existence,
4 peaceful settlement of disputes by negotiation, mediation, conciliation and arbitration,
5 unreserved condemnation in all its forms of political assassination as well as of subversive activities on the part of neighboring states or any other state,
6 absolute dedication to the total emancipation of the African territories which are still dependent, and
7 affirmation of a policy of non-alignment with regard to all blocs In proclaiming OAU principles, aims, and objectives the founding members envisaged clearly a unity that transcends ethnic differences and national demarcations.

Membership And Funding Of OAU :-

The OAU is composed at present of 53 independent African States, According to the term of Article I and V of the charter membership in OAU is open to all independent sovereign African states and neighboring Islands Initially the OAU deliberated membership to the Apartheid countries, Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa However, with the attainment of independence by Zimbabwe in 1980 and by Namibia in
1990 and the holding of multi-racial elections in South Africa in 1994, the OAU has changed its position with regard to these states, and welcomed them as member states. In terms of the OAU funding, it receives contributions from member states in accordance with the scale of assessment of the United Nations, provided, however, that no member state shall be assessed an amount exceeding twenty percent of the yearly regular budget of the organization. As a whole it is left to the member states to pay their respective contribution on a regular basis.

The OAU also recognized various liberation movements in the continent by granting them observer status, which enable them to put their case and influence decisions in their favour. These liberation movements include: liberation Front of Mozambique (FRLIMO), African Party for the Independence of Guinea Bissao and Cape Verde (PAIGC); the Peoples Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA), the National Liberation Front of Angola (FLNA), The South-East African Peoples Organization (SWAPO), the Zimbabwe African peoples Union (ZAPU), the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU); the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), the pan-African Congress of South Africa (PAC), the Djibouti Liberation Movement (LMD), Sudanese People Liberation Movement, (SPLM), of Sudan and Sudanese People Liberation Army, (SPLA) of Sudan.

The General Secretariat Of The OAU :-
The Headquarters of the OAU General Secretariat is located at AFRICA UNITY HOUSE in Addis Ababa which also plays host to the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA). The General Secretariat is the permanent OAU organ whose task is to organize its meetings, implement its decisions and resolutions keep its documents, and generally
speaking, conduct the daily work of coordination among its member states in all fields stated in the charter. The General Secretariat of the OAU is the Secretariat of the Assembly of the Council of Ministers, of the specialized commissions and other organs of the organization. It is headed by an Administrative Secretary General who directs its activities. He is assisted by four Deputy Secretary Generals. The Secretary General and the four Deputy Secretary generals are appointed by the Heads of States for a four year term. Their tenure can also be renewed by the Heads of States.

The General Secretariat has the following departments:
1. the political, legal and defense department;
2. the economic and social department, and
3. the administrative, conference and information department.

The Administrative Secretary General is empowered to improve the functions of the secretariat, but he has to seek the approval of the council. There are the 300 or so staff members of whom 71 belong to the professional category who work either at the Headquarters or in the regional and sub-regional offices. Plenary and general body, meetings of the members states are held inAfrica Hall in Addis Ababa. Finally the OAU working languages are English, French and Arabic.

The Structure Of The Organization Of African Unity is described in the following chart, page 112.
Programs And Policies Of The OAU:

At the OAU founding conference in May, 1963, the participating heads of states showed considerable awareness of the various concerns with which an African regional organization would have to concern itself. Consideration was given to such potential problems as internal disturbances, border disputes, allegation of subversion by neighbouring states, threats of the extra-regional aggression and the need for collective action against the remnants of colonialism. Briefly stated, the OAU was not set up with any narrow end in view but rather for the purpose of promoting the common interest of members in peace, security and general well-being. An organization like the UN recognize that it is not enough to deal with inter-state disputes in and threatening political situations as they arise; it also necessary to create a continent with wide economic social and political environment which will be favorable to peace and which will make it undesirable and unnecessary for governments to embark on policies and courses of action which will create the danger of violent conflicts. It was for this purpose that the specialized commissions were set up. On the whole, there seems to be no doubt that the OAU is potentiality the most important advance that has yet been made in the domain of inter-African cooperation. In this regard it will be appropriate to briefly elucidate on the various programs and policies of the OAU. The OAU has evinced significant interest in the following:

I. Decolonization Of Sub-Saharan Africa:

In this field the OAU coordinating committee for the Liberation of Africa has organized diplomatic support and channeled financial, military and logistic aid to liberation movements. The struggle for liberation movement gained considerable
momentum as the OAU commanded increasing support from world opinion. At the UN, the liberation struggle was recognized as legitimate, as representative from these movements set as observers at UN meetings. Through an OAU fund international support was channeled to liberate areas in Guinea Bissau, Angola and Mozambique to mention a few. The organization also drew the attention of the international court of justice to the Namibian issue where it declared south-Africa had no right to stay in Namibia. As a result of resilient efforts the OAU succeeded in pressurizing the UN to consider accession of independence to Namibia in 1990. Likewise, a UN boycott was enacted against Rhodesia's racist minority regime until majority rule was obtained in 1980. As a whole the OAU, opposed the colonial powers Britain, France, Portugal, Belgium and the North Atlantic Treaty organization (NATO) allies, condemning them for their colonial and racist policies in Africa, particularly at the UN where the African group commended a near blocking third vote. In term of bringing an end to colonialism in the continent, the OAU's role in this area remains one of its most significant achievements since its inception in 1963.

II. The Struggle Against Apartheid In South Africa:

The eradication of colonial and racist regimes has been among the cardinal foreign policy objective of African countries since independence. The Birth of the OAU along with the liberation of most former colonies and trust territories provided a desire which spread throughout the continent. As professor Vernon Mckay has stated, “anti-colonialism is the most obvious and consistent, and all embracing common denominator of African foreign policies.” This further acquire a single coordinating centre because
the mission of eradicating colonial and racist regimes in Africa was formalized in the OAU charter. 32

The motivations for this are not difficult to grasp. The first is that with the exception of Liberia and Ethiopia, all African countries have undergone various forms of colonialism. Most of them are recently of any type of colonialism. For instance, many African nationalist leaders such as Dr Kwame Nkrumah, Jomo Kenyatta, among others believed that colonialism was a slur on the dignity of black people everywhere, and until colonialism and white supremacist rule was eliminated in Africa no black man could lead a life of self-dignity, self-pride and self-respect. President Nyerere graphically stated this position as “no citizen of Africa can live in the comfort of his own self-respect while other African citizens are suffering from discrimination and humiliation for being born or black or what they are.”33

Secondly, many African leaders believed that the existence of the colonial and white supremacist regimes constituted a positive menace to the security of their countries. That is colonialism was to be wiped out in Africa before any post-colonial independent states could feel secure. Evidence of this includes the Portuguese led invasion of Guinea in November 1970, support of the colonial and white supremacist regimes for Biafra during the Nigerian civil war of 1967-70. Tanzania, Zambia, and even some moderate countries like Senegal have suffered attacks from Portuguese colonialists.

Lastly, the belief that the colonial regimes would continue to work against African unity by spreading confusion among African states, and by trying to divide them against one another. A point in case of this tactic is exemplified by the ‘dialogue’ proposal which South Africa sold to some black Francophone states in order to split the ranks of the African states during the 1970-71 period. This was aimed at signing a non-
aggression pact with any willing African states from those seriously committed to the eradication of colonialism and racism from Africa.

As a consequence the implications of these on the foreign policies of the African states are quite clear. On the question of the elimination of colonial rule:

a. providing bilateral assistance to the freedom fighters,

b. the funding of freedom movements through the OAU Liberation Committee, much of the energy behind African unity stemmed from the concept that only a united Africa could successfully cope with the problems of colonialism and racism in the continent, this was due to the fact that individually the African states were too weak to challenge South Africa;

c. Attempts at isolating South Africa from various international organization. The OAU has found world-wide recognition as an influential anti-colonial and anti-racist force. This has been pursued largely through two of its institutions the African group at the UN and the African Liberation Committee (ALC). The former has functioned as a coordinating and unifying body, working to extend its influence through third world associations, like the NAM and Afro-Asian Cooperation Institutions such as the Afro-Asian Peoples Solidarity Organization (AAPSO), as well as through the associations of its members like the Commonwealth of Nation, and the Francophone commute. The latter provides the sharp cutting edge of the OAU’s commitment to complete the decolonization process. As a result, South Africa was forced out of the Commonwealth in 1961 due to Afro-Asian pressure. By 1965, she had also been expelled by the African from a number of other international bodies such as the ECA, ILO, WHO, FAO, and the International Olympic Committee (IOC).
Lastly, African states exerted pressure on the western trade partners of the colonial and racist regimes to stop trading with them especially in arms. African diplomacy won a major victory when the UN Security Council imposed an embargo on arms sales to South Africa in Autumn of 1977, this was the first time the western powers were forced to agree with this step. In addition to this, African countries cut-off their commercial, communications, and other links with South Africa.

The facts therefore prove that African diplomacy has been capable of contributing effectively to the liberation movements. However, the question of African commitment has not been raised satisfactorily, that is they have in the past not displayed complete unity and steadfastness in this matter. For instance, most African countries failed to observe the 1965 OAU decision to sever diplomatic relations with Great Britain if it did not cut its ties with Ian Smith's Apartheid regime in Rhodesia. Further, in contradiction to the UN and OAU resolutions on economic sanctions against South Africa, several African countries continued to trade with it, and some even established economic contacts. Consequently, the progressive forces in the OAU had to wage continuous and relentless struggle for greater material assistance to liberation movements, and pressurized many African countries who were behind in their contributions or did not contribute at all to honour their commitment to the OAU liberation committee fund which channeled assistance to the liberation struggles. Moreover, there was an apparent discrepancy between the declarations at the UN and the actual record of some African countries, this gave rise to the claims by western nations that the mission of African diplomacy at the UN was to furnish an alibi. This stemmed from the fact that even in Africa, the anti-colonialism of such countries as the Ivory Coast, Malawi was really quite relative. Several African leaders, including President Houphouet Boigny of the Ivory
Coast who advanced the idea of a dialogue with South Africa as early as 1969-70, established and maintained personal contacts with leaders of the South African regime. African diplomacy generally was intransigent to racists and even advocated violent armed struggle to fight it. Most OAU countries rejected proposals aimed at reaching an understanding with the South African regime. In a speech by president Nyerere of Tanzania at the 25th session of the UN general assembly, he said, "An African Munich would no more bring peace than did that of Europe in 1938. It would be a betrayal and as such it would weaken the struggle for justice everywhere." This clearly reflected the attitude of most African countries with regard to imperialist and South African attempts to reach a so-called peaceful settlement on the wishes in the southern African region.

Through action of the African group at the UN and appropriate information campaigns against Apartheid, the abhorred system of state imposed racial discrimination in South Africa, Rhodesia and Namibia, was universally condemned as "a crime against humanity" (Teheran Conference 1968). As a result of increasing pressure from all quarters, South Africa was forced out of the commonwealth, a number of specialized agencies of the UN, the Olympic Games and others world sports meets. It can be summarized that the OAU has played a significant role in the dismantling of the Apartheid system in South Africa.

The OAU In International Politics:-

To analysis or examines the role of the OAU in international politics. It will highlight the issues and concerns of the OAU as well as the way it has attempted to achieve its objectives. The OAU has been active in several areas with of course its
activities varying in will and priority on different issues areas as well as interests. Some of these areas are of global wide significance, while others are of more immediate concern to Africa. Needless to mention the constraints and concerns on the issues of the global and regional settings, they have some distinctive features, notwithstanding their similarities from general perspective. In order to systematically analyze the general broad patterns and trends in the OAU's responses and role to various problems and issues in international relations, it will be appropriate to analytically differentiate the role of the OAU at two levels, the systematic and regional. Here, will focus on the roles of the OAU at the level of international system while its role in the context of African international relations and development will be dealt in the subsequent chapter. This handling of the empirical referent and analytical strategy will help in providing depth and clarity to the study.

Before we proceed further, it is necessary to clarify that in reality regional issues have global underpinning and linkages, and likewise global issues have regional basis. While this work does not deny this situation but merely deals with them separately for analytical convenience and clarity. It will be appropriate at the outset to reiterate some of the major features of the post-second world war international system, within the backdrop of which OAU had its formation and functioned as a regional organization. This international milieu to a large extent provided issues and problems as well as shaped the responses of the OAU.

The OAU And The Cold War Milieu:

In 1960 when a large number of African states achieved independence, they were faced with a world cleft into antagonist power blocs - the East and West. Consequently,
due to the global nature of the power and influence of the two superpowers the African states could not totally avoid interacting with them. Catherine Hoskyns maintains that, "strategically and economically all the African countries were at the time of independence within the orbit of the western bloc". That is, in terms of cultural, commercial, military and professional links with western Europe. As a result, the question that bothered most African leaders was what should their policies towards the superpowers blocs after independence be? Should changes in their formal status not lead to a change in their basic traditional relationships with the west? Most African leaders opted not to be tied to either of the power blocs and instead pursued a policy of non-alignment. The fact that the non-aligned policy adopted by some Asian countries such as India and Indonesia gaining much political mileage in international politics provided a guideline for the African countries. In this sense, there can be no doubt that many African leaders had genuine reasons for embracing it. Thus in 1958, Dr. Nkrumah said, "when we in Africa survey the industrial and the military power concentrated behind the two great powers in the cold war, we know that no military or strategic act of ours could make one dot of difference to this balance of power, while our involvement might draw us into areas of conflict which so far have not spread below the Sahara, we do not wish to be involved". In addition to this, Nkrumah stated that his country's non-alignment did not mean "isolationism, but it meant freedom to judge issues on their merits and to substitute peaceful settlement of all disputes for violence and war". Further, according to Sylvanus Olympio, the newly independent African states had to adopt a policy of "neutrality" between the power blocs since any association with either of them would suggest a new bandage. In the same vein, Didlo Telli, a former secretary general of the OAU, maintained that, "if Africa is to contribute to the maintenance of peace, it can do so only
by effectively insulating itself from the cold war". In addition to these positions, other external links meant striking new ones with the socialist countries of Eastern Europe and China.

**The Cold War Major Trends:**

The second world war, like the previous one significantly altered the international scenes. One of the most important changes was the emergence of the Soviet Union and the United States as the two most powerful states. For the first time in the history of international relations, a non-European power, the USA became a decisive factor in international politics. It was during the conduct of the allied strategy against the Axis powers in the course of the war that the USA and USSR emerged as the new leaders within the world community, the weakening of the European states created a power vacuum that was speedily filled by the two powers. USA became the leader of the western bloc consisting of the liberal capitalist states in the main and the Soviet Union led the communist state referred to as the Eastern bloc countries. As a result the dominance of these two superpowers in international politics came to be described as 'international bipolarity'.

In the early stages of East-West rivalry, there was a considerable degree of bloc cohesion, because of intense inter-bloc competition and partly due to the acute dependence of the bloc members on their mentor powers. The eminence of the USA and USSR was based on their massive superiority in military and economic capability with regard to the other members of their respective blocs. They also exercised such bloc eminence because of the charismatic assertive qualities of their leadership, Roosevelt and Stalin. But the leadership factor also to acquire significance because of their superiority.
in military and economic capability over members of their respective blocs who were actually dependent on them for the national security and reconstruction. Another factor was their intense competition to increase their respective spheres of influence, especially that of establishing military bases in Asia and Africa. However, towards the late 1960's several countries in the western bloc and China in the Eastern regaining economic and political confidence were no longer willing to accept subordinate status to their monitors in international relations, they were keen to acquire space themselves to play independent roles.

The jockeying for supremacy, enlarging of spheres of influence by the superpowers led to the division of the globe virtually into two power blocs. The contradictions of the cold war certainly created the context in which it became necessary for the newly independent states in Asia and Africa to declare their determination to avoid military alliance dominated by two superpowers. The systematic attempts made by the contending power blocs to draw these states, into their sphere of influence merely strengthened the determination of the new states to preserve and protect their independence and led to the crystallization and consolidation of the non-aligned movement. The Afro-Asian conference at Bandung, Indonesia, in 1955 gave added strength to the policy of non-alignment, it was the first time that Afro-Asian countries were brought to a common platform.

However, the acquisition of nuclear weapons capability by UK, France and China which added strength and will to their desire to assert their status and interest within their respective blocs as well as in international politics on the one hand, and the experience of the Cuban missiles crisis which had brought the two superpowers on the brink of a nuclear show down on the other, constrained the USA and the USSR to introduce some
moderation in their rivalry so as to avoid the reoccurrence of high risk situation such as the Cuban crisis, to keep the pressure for autonomy and independence from their bloc partners within acceptable bounds and to create an atmosphere which will allow them to cooperate with one another to retain their supremacy in international politics. This relaxation in inter-bloc politics is referred to as the process of détente.

By late 1950, Britain and France looked towards not replacing the monitor powers but rather carving out areas of influence for themselves. In this sense, England enhanced its presence in Asia and Africa by establishing the Commonwealth of Nations. France on the other hand was more confined to the Francophone countries in Africa as it had few colonies. Like the two superpowers, Britain and France also sought to enhance their spheres of influence. Thus, as declining former colonial powers, Britain and France had political and economic aspirations which oftenly led them to be soft in their bloc commitment.

Another case pin point was the People Republic of China which experienced a difference situation, during the initial stage China stayed in the orbit of the emerging international system. However, after the Sino-Soviet split of 1958-59, communist China openly competed with both the USA and USSR for global status and role. She wanted to carve out an independence status and image for herself in international politics of the third world by articulating its sense of belonging to it in term of her socio-economic and historical conditions. The Chinese policy in Africa was part of its global policy to oppose imperialism, and domination of the third world by the superpowers as well as champion social justice and dignity for the third world countries including those of Africa.

Lastly, while the second world war was in full swing, the allied powers, for political and psychological reasons felt the necessity for creating an international
organization. The League of Nations was beyond resuscitation, and yet its experience proved valuable in the creation of a new international organization, the UN. As a result, the charter of the UN was signed on 26th, June, 1945 and came into effect on 24th, Oct, 1945. It was charged with functioning at three different domains—question of politics and security, decolonization, and economic, social, and humanitarian questions.

The OAU And Superpowers Rivalry In Africa:

Before independence, the struggle of the African peoples as limited to clearly defined goals, though the details of the strategy and tactic of achieving these goals differed from one country to another. However, the objective was in general clear enough to secure political independence from colonial rule. While the main strength of the struggle came from the people of Africa themselves, the international system was an important source of material and diplomatic support in the cause of political independence. Neither the USA nor the USSR had a particular interest in preserving European colonialism in Africa: the demise of Euro-colonialism, necessitated the staking of superpower claims to Africa.

The achievement of political independence by African states marked the end of European political control, however this created a power vacuum in sub-Saharan Africa. At the same time, the global superpower struggle intensified and Africa became a major theater of superpowers rivalry, mainly because of the strategic materials it possessed. As a result, the power of African governments to influence not only the international system but also their own domestic environment was circumscribed by the global superpower struggle. To illustrate this discussion, the following examples are deemed necessary, the point of these examples is not to discuss the merits of the various policies pursued by
African government's, but to make the general point that underlying all these changes in policies and personalities are two factors. At the international level they were the product of the superpower conflict to secure economic and/or political leverage in Africa against the background of an ideological and power vacuum in the continent. At the local level, the dynamics of superpowers conflict manifested themselves through intra-class struggle among the petty bourgeoisie who everywhere in Africa held the seat of government and used their position to advance their interests by jockeying one or the other superpower.

If we consider all the major events which have disrupted or are disrupting the peace and development of Africa, such as the Nigerian civil war, the civil war in Chad, the civil war in Sudan, Morocco-Saharawi republic conflict, the problems on the Zaire-Angola border, the Ethiopia-Somalia conflict, the conflict between the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (NPLA) and Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA) in Angola and so on, we would contend that although factors of tribe, religion, race and internal class divisions do fuel the fire, the origin of the conflict lies in the larger struggle between external intervention and the aspiration of Africans for national liberation. In some of these conflicts, the USA and the USSR were directly involved. In some, however, the prevailing configuration of forces allowed a minor western power to play the lead role instead of the United States, for instance, France in Chad and Zaire and Britain in Rhodesia and Uganda. Similarly, the Soviet Union may not have been directly involved in certain situations, allowing its interests to be advanced rather by its allies and associates such as Cuba in Angola, Libya in Chad and North Korea in Uganda.

The result of all these made Africa go through a series of political convulsions in which the African states became increasingly polarized between the options offered by
the Americans on the one hand and those of the Soviets on the other. Kwame Nkrumah used to talk about the creation of an African high command, which under the umbrella of a pan-African organization like the OAU would militarily intervene in a conflict situation in Africa. The motive underlying this suggestion was to reduce the scope for the involvement of the superpowers in Africa. However, the OAU has failed to measure up to Nkrumah’s vision. It is important none the less to state that the OAU has not succeeded in withstanding meddling and interference of the superpowers in the crises in Africa. It is seriously handicapped in pursuit of this goal by the contending proclivities towards the superpowers of its member states.

The OAU And Non-Aligned Movement:

A radical transformation in the character of international politics was brought about by the emergence of a large number of Asian and African states, beginning with the independence of India in 1947, in the international system. This phenomenon marked the end of the age of historical imperialism and also announced the end of the exclusively western character of international politics. Powerful common historical experiences and interests bound these states, they had all been military subjugated, economically exploited and racially discriminated against by all imperialist powers. Further, all of them were economically underdeveloped and had the common and urgent task of rapid economic development. They recognized the imperatives of their national security because of the susceptibilities of their state structure to the machinations of the cold-war. Further, they were strongly driven by nationalist zeal to play an important role in international affairs. Cumulatively these concerns motived these states towards the adoption of non-alignment as their foreign policy orientation.
The non-aligned movement also provided scope and maneuverability to the African states to direct their attention for the improvement of their peoples social and economic conditions. It should be noted that so much were some African leaders concerned about the need for all African states to pursue a policy of non-alignment that they succeeded in May, 1963 in making it one of the principles of the OAU. Although there was some controversy over the emphasis and connotation of the term non-alignment in Africa, these differences did not have much effect on its operations in the sense that the overriding contexts of colonial inheritance, national liberation struggle, and the cold war shaped it as a dynamic foreign policy strategy which enabled them to generate capability for and influenced international policies in significantly disproportionate terms to their national power. However, it worth noting the controversy which shrouded the term. Progressive African states led by leaders such as Sekou Toure and Julius Nyerere viewing it as an anti-colonial and anti-imperialist foreign policy strategy for it provided impetus for close relationship with the socialist bloc led by the Soviet Union, while a few conservative states uncomfortable with such predication argued that it should be equated with legal neutrality practiced by Switzerland. Some leaders such as Felix Houphouët-Boigny among other were apprehensive that non-alignment in the African context would result in nurturing a pro-China foreign policy. Inspite of the divergent positions among the African leaders, the majority of the African States have interpreted non-alignment as implying the diversification of the political, commercial, cultural and military links with the great powers. Since their traditional relationship were with the west, their efforts aimed at diversification of national interests for achieving domestic political stability and economic progress in addition to safe-guarding their identity and dependence.
The organizational and conceptual cornerstone of non-alignment as an international movement was laid at the 1955 Bandung conference. However, its official inauguration was in Sept 1961, when the first summit conference of the non-aligned countries was convened. The formation of the OAU and the legal normalization in its charter of non-alignment principles as mandatory for all the OAU members was a turning point in the evolution of the movement as a whole. This marked the start of the African period in its development, “African non-alignment”, which reflected the distinctive African participation in the movement. As a result, Africa became a powerful catalyst in enhancing the prestige and anti-imperialist content of the non-aligned movement. This development was motivated by a number of reasons. First of all, the OAU which comprised of Africa's independence countries and the non-aligned movement in general needed each other and were interested in becoming mutually stronger. That is, these two third world collectivizes and the philosophies shaping their programs were closely interdependent and mutually complementary for effective mobilization of the third world countries for overcoming the burden and bequeathed problems of long and messy history of imperial domination.

The rapid decolonization in the 1960s and 1970s was another important factor behind independent Africa's revolutionizing impact of the non-aligned movement. But the existence of neo-colonial structures in the states which gained political independence as well as the continued existence of vestiges of imperialism in various parts of Africa, especially southern Africa, led the African states to adopt aggressive and radical programs for the eradication of these anomalies. This kind of orientation made their foreign policies pronouncedly anti-imperialist, anti-racist and some time even anti-capitalist. This was acknowledge at the 5th non-aligned summit in Colombo in 1976.
conference political declaration stated that the solidarity of Africa as a whole with the principles of non-alignment was "a development of major significance in the history of non-alignment. Africa gave a firm anti-colonial, anti-racist content to the movement" But much prior to this acknowledgment by the non-aligned movement (NAM) conference of the contribution of the African states to the movement, the OAU way back in 1963 had formalized these connotation to non-alignment in its charter. Thus, African participation in non-alignment radicalized, and also strengthened the centripetal trends in the movement.

Although the OAU has lived through several grave crises in the past, it has nevertheless functioned effectively as a mechanism of African unity in international affairs and helped in the development of a concerted and sometimes even common position in the non-aligned movement. For instance the 1979 Havana non-aligned summit reaffirmed the role of the OAU as an effective instrument in the drive toward peace, security and friendly relations among its members. It also acknowledge its leadership role in the struggle against racial domination. Further, the conference also appreciated the commitments contained in the OAU charter and expressed the desire for their observance in the resolutions and decisions of the OAU summit assembly.

Africa is an organized and dynamic part of the non-aligned movement. Since the third conference in Lusaka in 1970, non-aligned conferences have always been preceded by OAU meetings at which African countries attempt to workout a common agenda and course to be pursued at the forthcoming conference of the non-aligned movement. All this points to the conclusion that the principles of unity and non-alignment in African foreign policy are, as it were, mutually complementary. At the same time, there is ample proof that unity does not always emerge victorious in African non-alignment. It is suffice
to recall the January 1976, OAU Assembly, when disagreement on the Angolan conflict led to the gravest crisis in the organization's history

The difficulties in the formulation and consistent implementation of joint policy are formidable because of the heterogeneous composition of the African states system and the differences among the ruling elites of Africans states. The task of presenting a consensus stand in such a context often results in moderation of resolve and resolutions expressing it. Nevertheless, Africa has displayed relative cooperation in foreign policy matters, and has also viewed the non-aligned movement as a efficacious mechanism to pool the efforts of the developing world to fight domination, imperialism, racism and neo-colonialism.

African countries can also be credited with the broadening and organizational structuring of the movement. This is clearly reflected in the fact that long before Mozambique, Guinea - Bissau, Zimbabwe and South-Africa among others attained independence the vanguard organizations of their freedom had became legitimate constituents of the non-aligned movement as observers or full-fledged members such as MPLA, FRELIMO, PAIG, Patriotic Front of Zimbabwe and the like. In this sense Africa added new dimensions to NAM, that is, it is not only a movement for redressed of weak and exploited states but also of brutalized dominated peoples.

African countries also made distinctive contribution to the tackling and solution of many other global problems. It is due to their efforts that the agendas of non-aligned forums included items like the world-wide expansion of détente or the transformation of Africa into a nuclear free zone and of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. Moreover, African countries to some extent may be credited for providing initiative and inspiration to the NAM to champion for the restructuring of international economic order. This
stemmed out of the fact that Africa accounts for most of the least developed nations and
as a consequence its economic difficulties are greater than those of the other non-aligned
members. Another was the approach to détente, the assessment of its content, result and
prospects. Non-aligned countries approached these issues in two ways: on the one hand,
they stressed the positive results of détente and its conformity with the purposes and
principles of non-alignment. On the other, there was the desire to equate the foreign
policy of the capitalist world with that of the socialist community, to see the causes of
world tensions not in aggressive imperialist course but in the very existence of military
alliance and in the rivalry of the superpowers. Besides, some members of the non-
aligned movement maintained that the two socio-economic system pursued détente at the
expense of developing countries and vied for influence over them.

The fourth non-aligned conference in Algiers (1973) stressed that while détente
was in general progressive, it merely meant a shifting of confrontation from one region to
another. The next non-aligned conference, held in Colombo in 1976, displayed a more
objective understanding of the sources of international tensions. "The underlying cause
of international tensions... was attributable mainly to the forces of Imperialism,
Colonialism, Neo-Colonialism, Zionism, Racism and other forms of alien domination." 45
Further, the conference participants also identified correctly their allies in détente and
voiced their intention to continue with their efforts to ensure cooperation with all peace
loving and progressive forces throughout the world. This was in addition to
strengthening their ability to wage a successful struggle against imperialism. Hence, the
non-aligned nations claimed, closer relations with one of the superpowers could only
harm efforts to ensure the security of the developing world.
On the whole all this means that the African countries have played a leading role in the shaping of the theory and practice of non-alignment. Obviously the more progressive among them playing crucial and significant roles. For example, independent African countries took part in the Afro-Asian solidarity movement whose first conference was held in Cairo in 1985. The conference decided to create a permanent Afro-Asian Peoples Solidarity Organization (AAPSO). From its inception AAPSO has acted as a vigorous champion of the struggle against imperialism and colonialism, for national freedom, independence, peace and social progress. The organization has helped to a great extent the colonial and dependent peoples of Asia and Africa in their struggle for freedom. According to Facine Bangoure, former Deputy Secretary General of AAPOS, "of great importance is the coordinating and pooling of efforts by the progressive and democratic forces of Asian and African countries in the fight against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, and struggle for peace, democracy, social progress and resolution of conflict in the regions." 46

The OAU And The United Nations:

In the period between 1955 and the end of 1968, 37 African states, largely devoid of experience in the contemporary international relations and struggling with multitudinous problems of fashioning coherent national entities in the face of both internal and external pressures as joined the United nations (UN). As a direct consequence, the admission of these states substantially altered the UN’s environment and the demands confronting it. 47 The African desires for UN membership find manifest in the organization’s role in decolonization process. Further, the prestige and psychological rewards of UN membership was perceived to be of much importance by the ruling elites of the emerging African states. Africans were also aware that economic
and military have notes have scope to make some gains in a reallocation of power and resources resulting from a stronger UN. Beside the power of small and poor countries is exaggerated in the relatively egalitarian UN. Hence opportunities for such states to act together and influence the exercise of power by large and wealthier states are comparatively greater in the multi-lateral forum than in the framework of bilateral interaction. For instance, the UN environment increased to six times its size in 1955 while as a group the Africans composed more than 25% of it. Further, by the end of 1968 African states composed 32.6% of membership of the UN. Thus, in all measures, African states have pursued this line of thought in their foreign policy to achieve their goals.

Briefly stated, therefore, the OAU was not set up with any narrow end in view but rather for the purpose of promoting and strengthening sub-Saharan Africa. To what extent, then has the OAU been able to provide for effective and durable impetus towards achieving the pan-Africanism dream envisaged in 1963? This question among a horde of others will be answered in the succeeding chapter where an in-depth analysis of the OAU’s programs and policies will be undertaken.

What really went in the evolution of the OAU - to great extent explained that there were gaps which African States had to overcome either at their individual or at regional level to realize their dream of projecting a forum (OAU). Did they succeed? The next chapter will deal with the work of OAU.
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