

who said it was inadmissible to place the United States and the Soviet Union on the same footing. The Soviet Union had no "monopolies" and its record in aiding oppressed people in Third World countries and in helping liberation movements had to be remembered.

However, this only served to spur on Colonel Gaddafi, who never misses a chance to declare that the United States and the Soviet Union are equally imperialist, into saying, in effect, that Castro had no business attending a nonaligned summit meeting. He added that the difference between himself and Castro was that Castro was aligned and he was not; he was a socialist, while Castro was a Communist. Cuba, moreover, was a country that was under the "domination" of the Soviet Union.

Castro-Gaddafi reconciliation

So far as amiability was concerned, this exchange marked the low point of the conference and made it plain for all to see just how wide the ideological differences were between the participants. However, most significantly, only a few hours later a reconciliation between President Gaddafi and Cuba's Castro was effected, the necessary olive branch being offered by the Cuban leader in the form of an announcement that Havana would sever all diplomatic links with Israel. The manner in which the reconciliation was achieved is significant because it showed that, within the nonaligned grouping (as, indeed, in most other political groupings), particular national or regional interests — in this case the overriding Arab aim of isolating Israel diplomatically — could smother even the deepest ideological disputes. There is no reason why this should not continue to apply in the future, and there is, of course, a reverse side to the coin. This is that it is equally likely that particular national or regional interests will carry more weight within the non-aligned grouping, or in the Third World, than the vague sense of Third World or nonaligned solidarity, which nevertheless certainly does exist and just conceivably could grow stronger in the next few years.

Havana offered 'olive branch' with word it would sever diplomatic links with Israel

An example will illustrate this point. The Arab states have been extremely successful in making their case in their dispute with Israel the case of the nonaligned grouping. However, when, in the aftermath of the 1973 Middle East War, the Arab states resorted to the use of their oil weapon, we were regaled with press pictures of Mrs. Indira Gandhi being driven to her office in a bullock cart. Indeed, there were signs at first that the restric-

tions on oil production could hurt aligned countries just as badly as the West. Just at the moment when the major primary-product prices had reached high and remunerative levels, the shortages made possible a recession perhaps even a major economic slump in the industrialized world, which could impose compound problems on the economies of the Third World.

The Ghanaian newspaper *The P* complained that the Arab oil embargo, though ostensibly directed against the West in retaliation for its support of Israel, were in fact hitting Africa hardest. It allowed the oil crisis to hit Ghanaians for that matter other African states in a poor way of showing gratitude for the sympathy demonstrated with them in their conflict with Israel." And a Ghanaian newspaper asked: "Are our brothers going to abandon us to share the dog-house with those countries against whom the cuts are primarily directed?"

Role of OAU

In fact, the Arab states did show a certain measure of *political* solidarity with the African states, even though they at first do little to help them avoid the economic effects of the cut-backs. The political gesture was the Arab decision to ban oil supplies to South Africa, Rhodesia and the Portuguese territories. However, this was not so much a result of solidarity within the nonaligned world as a result of Arab *quid pro quo* within the framework of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) to pay for the black African decision to break off diplomatic relations with Israel.

It is hard to overstress the importance of the OAU to the nonaligned movement. For a start, over half the states attending the last nonaligned summit meeting were African (a fact which led, in the last few years, to real anxiety on the part of the Asians, the Arab and Latin American states that are somehow "under-represented"). Secondly, the OAU provides a link between Africa and the Arab world, since Sudan and the Maghreb states are members. Thirdly, the OAU meets frequently (at both the ministerial level twice a year — and summit level a year) as the nonaligned, and provides a permanent secretariat. This has led to the fact that there has been a tendency for the OAU to become, in a sense, the dominant component of the nonaligned grouping, or at least a dominant component.

There have been repeated calls to formalize the nonaligned grouping by providing it with a secretariat, but