

# The Character of the “Euro-African Community”

— An Aspect of the Political Situation in Africa in the Early 1960's —

**Seiro Kawasaki**

*Ex Africa semper aliquid novi.*

— Gaius Plinius Secundus, *Naturalis Historia*, VIII, 16, 42

*NOTE : This article was written in February 1964. It goes to print now, exactly as it was written more than forty years ago.*

*The last four decades have seen many great changes both in Africa and Europe, and consequently, in the relations between the two continents. My belief is, however, that the article is still worth while being printed, as very little literature on the subject exists.*

*It is kindly requested that the readers refer to the article which I contributed to Vol. IV of the Bulletin of Tokyo Kasei Gakuin Tsukuba Women's University (March 2000) under the title “Origins of the Concept of the ‘Eurafrikan Community’.”*

—S. K.

## INTRODUCTION

The Treaty establishing the European Economic Community (E. E. C.) was signed in Rome on March 25, 1957 and went into effect on January 1, 1958. Of the six signatory nations, Belgium, France, Italy and the Netherlands were in possession of a considerable amount of overseas countries and territories (OCT) at the time of the conclusion of the Rome Treaty. These overseas

territories, with some exceptions <sup>(1)</sup>, were associated with the E. E. C. in accordance with the provisions of Part IV of the Treaty (Articles 131-136). It happens that most of the associated overseas territories are in Black Africa. They occupy approximately half of the total land area of the African continent.

Since the E. E. C. Treaty came into effect, all of these associated African territories, with only two exceptions, have gained political independence. Of these independent territories, Guinea has broken off her association with the E. E. C. <sup>(2)</sup> The following 18 African States either expressed their desire to maintain or *de facto* maintained the association with the Community and, together with the E. E. C. countries, drew up a new Convention of Association which was finally signed in Yaoundé, capital of Cameroun, on July 20, 1963 (not yet in effect) :

Cameroun, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Congo (Brazzaville), Dahomey, Gabon, the Ivory Coast, the Malagasy Republic, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, Togo, the Upper Volta; Burundi, the Congo (Léopoldville), Rwanda ; and Somalia.

As can be seen by the above list, 14 of the 18 associated States are former French territories, three formerly belonged to Belgium and one to Italy. There

---

(1) At the time of the conclusion of the Treaty, France and the Netherlands had, under their administration, some territories which were not associated with the E. E. C. : (1) Algeria and the French Overseas Departments—Martinique, Guadeloupe, Réunion and French Guiana, (2) Suriname (Dutch Guiana) and the Netherlands Antilles, and (3) New Hebrides, governed jointly by the United Kingdom and France. As to Algeria and the French Overseas Departments, it should be noted that many of the important provisions of the Rome Treaty apply to these territories (Article 227, 2.). Not only that but the stipulations of Articles 1-8 of the Implementing Convention relating to the association with the E. E. C. of the overseas territories (referred to hereafter as the old Convention of Association) also applied to these territories until December 31, 1962 (Article 16 of the Convention). As for the two Dutch territories, a Declaration of Intention, with a view to their eventual association with the E. E. C., was made at the same time as the Rome Treaty, and Suriname entered into association with the E. E. C. as of September 1, 1962. As for the Netherlands Antilles, provision was made on November 13 of the same year to revise the Rome Treaty with a view to associating it with the E. E. C. (not yet in effect).

(2) According to Mr. Rivkin, "... the nonassociation of Guinea with the EEC may be considered as much an act of French disassociation of Guinea from the European Community as one of Guinean withdrawal from association with the EEC" (Arnold Rivkin, *Africa and the West : Elements of Free-World Policy*, 1962, p. 45).

## The Character of the “Euro-African Community”

are associated territories which are still dependent. (In Africa, there are two : the French Somali Coast and the Comoro Archipelago.) But these territories are, though dispersed in many parts of the world, limited in number and not economically important, as compared with the independent Associates. In this way, the system of association, as stipulated by the Rome Treaty, has now focused its attention on the Associated African States and Madagascar (AASM).

At the fifth session of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), held in Léopoldville from February 18 to March 2, 1963, M. Philippe de Seynes, Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations, referred to the new Convention of Association and said that it “constitutes in some respects a remarkable expression of what might be described as a new economic solidarity between industrial and underdeveloped countries” and “is, in short, a type of comprehensive agreement that we should like to see applied to the world as a whole, or at least to the Continent as a whole.”<sup>(3)</sup>

A little while before, when the rudiments for the establishing of the new Convention were being solidified, *Marchés Tropicaux* went so far as to say : “Nous sommes à un tournant de l'histoire du monde...”<sup>(4)</sup>

In reality, the relationship between Europe and Africa—which up to fairly recent times has been nothing more than a one-way approach by the former to the latter—is, with the E. E. C.'s system of association, fundamentally changing. It will, to an increasing degree, influence the economic and political situation of the world. This relationship has recently come to be referred to as the “Euro-African Community,” which would indicate that both parties are now on an equal footing and that the interests involved are mutual. The E. E. C. is not only an international organization of six European States but extends way out to

---

(3) UN Press Service, *Press Release*, ECA/98/Rev. 1, 18 February 1963. M. de Seynes's remark was quoted by the French Representative, M. Joannes Dupraz, at the same ECA session (ECA, Fifth session, *Provisional Summary Record of the Ninetieth Meeting*, E/CN. 14/SR. 90 (V), 23 February 1963, p. 2).

(4) “Accord entre les Six et les Dix-huit : une étape décisive,” *Marchés Tropicaux et Méditerranéens*, 3 November 1962, p. 2271.

Africa.

Originally, the purpose of association was to help the overseas territories to develop economically. For that purpose, (1) a free-trade area between the territories concerned and the customs union, being formed by the six European nations, will have to be created ; (2) The E. E. C., through the FED (or the FEDOM ; the European Development Fund for the OCT), will have to furnish the funds for the development of these territories ; and (3) the right of establishment will have to be extended in the associated territories.

In this way, as far as the stipulations of the Rome Treaty and its annex are concerned, the association can be thought of as having purely economic aims with no political ramifications <sup>(5)</sup>.

But can it really be said objectively that the association, which binds the six countries in Europe and the eighteen in Africa, is completely void of political implications ? Some of the African States, not associated with the E. E. C., as well as the countries within the Soviet bloc, seem constantly to harp on this point. What is more remarkable is that some of the African nations associated with the E. E. C. have recently made clear that they themselves feel the association is not only an economic, but also a political, instrument.

The members of parliament of most of the AASM, assembled at Ouagadougou, capital of the Upper Volta, on 5th, 6th and 7th June 1961, that is, a few weeks before the famous Euro-African Parliamentary Conference which was organized at Strasbourg (19th-24th of the same month), declared :

“... l'Afrique est surtout humanitaire et d'un humanisme libéral qui lui permet de constituer un bastion capable d'empêcher l'extension de la guerre froide et de renforcer la paix dans le monde.

---

(5) In the four Declarations of Intention, relating respectively : (1) to the independent countries of the franc area, (2) to Libya, (3) to Somalia (which was under the Italian trusteeship at the time of the conclusion of the Rome Treaty), and (4) to Suriname and the Netherlands Antilles, the E. E. C. countries declared their readiness to propose these countries and territories (in the case of Somalia, after the termination of the Italian administration) the opening of negotiations with a view to concluding conventions for *economic* association with the Community [Italics the author's]. This would permit us to say that the association, which was established under the Rome Treaty, is primarily economical in nature.

## The Character of the “Euro-African Community”

“La Conférence est consciente que la liberté ne se défend pas seulement en Europe, mais à l'échelle du monde ; elle est consciente que la pauvreté de l'Afrique constitue une menace permanente pour la paix du monde.

“Devant toutes les forces qui s'affrontent ou qui peuvent, demain, sur l'échiquier mondial, se heurter, la Conférence demande à la C. E. E. de saisir l'ampleur du problème de développement des pays d'Afrique.”<sup>(6)</sup>

African delegates at this Conference apparently felt that the regime of association, whilst having economic problems as its primary concern, was also a means through which political pressures could be exerted from Europe, should the need arise.

At the the Conference between Ministers from the associated African countries and the E. E. C. Member States, which was held in Paris early in December 1961, with a view to framing the new Convention of Association, M. Jacques Rabemananjara, Minister of State in charge of Economic Affairs of the Malagasy Republic, stated as follows :

“Ne nous y trompons pas, l'association des Etats d'outre-mer à la C. E. E. est un acte politique: il serait vain et dangereux de masquer cette vérité profonde sous la technicité des mécanismes économiques. Elle est politique d'abord parce qu'elle consacre et renforce nos liens avec l'Europe ; elle l'est encore et surtout parce que le développement économique est, pour des pays comme les nôtres, l'impératif politique numéro un.”<sup>(7)</sup>

At the Conference of Heads of State of the Afro-Malagasy Union (UAM), held in March 1963 at Ouagadougou, President Léon M'Ba of Gabon, who was then acting as President of the Union, spoke as follows in his opening speech (on March 10) :

“... Présents en Afrique, nous sommes aussi présents dans le reste du monde et par exemple en Europe, cette Europe dont on est quelquefois

---

(6) *Des Formes Politiques et Institutionnelles de la Coopération* (Document de Travail élaboré par les parlementaires africains réunis à Ouagadougou le 5 juin 1961), June 1961.

(7) E. E. C., “Première réunion ministérielle entre les Etats africains et malgache associés et le Conseil de la C. E. E.,” *Bulletin de la Communauté Economique Européenne*, January 1962, p. 12.

tenté de se demander si elle apprécie le sens réel et profond de notre solidarité et notre association, les événements survenus récemment dans le cadre de la C. E. E. permettant cette interrogation.

J'aurais aimé souligner le caractère éminemment politique que prend de plus en plus cette affaire de notre association au Marché commun..."<sup>(8)</sup>

Let us take a look at the political character that the Euro-African Community has—or is thought to have. In order to do this, we should find out in the first place why the African States not associated with the E. E. C. are in opposition to this association. Let us then examine some of the examples of what is thought to be political about the association by looking at recent activities of the member countries of the E. E. C. and the associated African States.

## I ATTITUDES OF AFRICAN STATES AND TERRITORIES TOWARD THE E. E. C.

As has been mentioned previously, eighteen of the African States are associated with the E. E. C. (So are the two non-independent areas of the Somali Coast and the Comoro Archipelago, both French possessions). Since there are 35 independent countries in Africa at present, seventeen of them have no institutional links with the E. E. C. However, of these seventeen countries, Algeria, who gained her independence in July 1962, is, it may be safely maintained, associated in one sense with the E. E. C. (See Note 1). Tunisia, Morocco and Libya, in accordance with the Protocol relating to goods originating in and coming from certain countries, continue to enjoy special customs treatment on importation either into France or into Italy ; in addition to this, these

---

(8) *Carrefour Africain* (A newspaper published at Ouagadougou), March 17, 1963.

(9) Tunisia and Morocco are both in the franc area. See Note 5. Actually, Tunisia once negotiated for an association with the E. E. C., but negotiations were halted at the beginning of 1960. At the third session of the ECA, held in February 1961, Tunisia's Representative, M. Fathi Zouhir, stated that Tunisia had started negotiations with the E. E. C. in 1959, but preferred to await the outcome of the [E. E. C.'s] negotiations with Greece and Turkey, which had a similar economic structure to Tunisia (ECA, Third session, *Summary Records*, E/CN. 14/110-E/CN. 14/SR. 33-55 (III), 31 December 1961, p. 137).

## The Character of the “Euro-African Community”

three North African States are being offered an association with the E. E. C. <sup>(9)</sup>. The possibility of the three countries of the Maghreb becoming associated with the E. E. C. as a group has been much discussed, at least until the break-out of the border dispute between Algeria and Morocco in the latter half of 1963. It has also been said that Guinea, who discontinued her relations of association with the E. E. C. <sup>(10)</sup>, has recently been leaning towards renewal of her relations with the Community.

The seven nations of Ghana, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Tanganyika, Uganda, Zanzibar and Kenya are African members of the Commonwealth. When the Conference of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers was held on September 10-19, 1962 in London, the United Kingdom had reached agreement with the E. E. C. that the Commonwealth members in Africa should be, if they so desired, associated with the enlarged Community on terms equal to those of the new Convention of Association which was then under negotiation. At the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference of September 1962, all of the then independent African States, except Sierra Leone, flatly refused the idea of an association with the E. E. C. <sup>(11)</sup> *The Economist* wrote, when the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference was over :

---

(10) Guinea did not participate in the Euro-African Parliamentary Conference at Strasbourg, held in June 1961, in spite of the various contacts made with a view to securing her participation (Walter Scheel, “Neue EWG-Beziehungen zu Afrika,” *Aussenpolitik*, June 1961, p. 372).

(11) Sierra Leone did not make a definite stand at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference ; some months later, that is, on November 28, 1962, Sir Milton Margai, Prime Minister of Sierra Leone, made it clear that his Government would apply for an association with the E. E. C. when Britain joined the Community. Interesting to note is that Sierra Leone's attitude toward the E. E. C. and its system of association was skeptical, if anything, prior to the September, 1962, Conference of Commonwealth Prime Ministers. At the fourth session of the ECA (February—March 1962), Mr. S. T. Navo, Representative of Sierra Leone, “regretted the conclusion reached by EEC that it was serving the interests of the African countries without even having attempted to assess the alleged advantages of association with the European Common Market...The European economic groupings undoubtedly tended to preserve the former structures ; they wanted Africa to remain a source of raw materials for Europe, and by way of mitigating the difficulties facing the African primary-producing countries, they were proposing solutions that were as futile as they were subtle” (ECA, Fourth session, *Summary Records of the Twenty-Five Meetings*, E/CN. 14/SR. 56-80 (IV), 28 January 1963, p. 60).

Having rejected the best possible economic terms on political grounds, they [the African States of the Commonwealth] can now expect no more than an economic second best <sup>(12)</sup>.

In the eyes' of the Commonwealth States of Africa, the "economic second best" is apparently to conclude a trade agreement with the E. E. C., according to Articles 111 and 113 of the Rome Treaty, following the example of Iran which finally signed a trade agreement with the Community on October 14, 1963. At least Nigeria and the three East African States (Tanganyika, Uganda and Kenya) as a group appear to agree with the conclusion of a trade agreement with the E. E. C. which, to their way of thinking, is purely an economic act.

Sir Abubaker Tafawa Balewa, Nigeria's Federal Prime Minister, who had rejected, at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, the idea of the association with the E. E. C., said, on September 24, 1962, at a joint session of both Houses of Nigerian Parliament, that he was satisfied that the conclusion of a trade pact was being sought by the E. E. C. In April 1963, Nigeria appointed Mr. Charles Okigbo as Ambassador to the E. E. C. <sup>(13)</sup> with a view to exploring the possibility of concluding such a pact. Ambassador Okigbo has conducted an exploratory talk with the E. E. C. starting in November 1963, the outcome of which is not known.

The three East African States are also carrying on negotiations with the E. E. C. Mr. Rashidi Mfaume Kawawa, Tanganyika's Prime Minister, while strongly opposing an association with the E. E. C., made it clear, at the 1962 Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, that the East African countries (He was reported to be representing not only Tanganyika but also the two not-yet-independent territories of Uganda and Kenya at the Conference.) "would like to have some other arrangements with the Common Market besides associate membership." <sup>(14)</sup> The East African countries sent a mission to the E. E. C. in March 1963 and formerly applied, in November that year, for the opening

---

(12) "A Commonwealth at Sea," *The Economist*, September 22, 1962, p. 1080.

(13) Not to be confused with Alhaji Abdul Malik, the Nigerian Ambassador to Belgium. (He is also Nigeria's High Commissioner to the United Kingdom and resident in London.)

## The Character of the “Euro-African Community”

of negotiations with a view to concluding a trade agreement.

Under these circumstances, it is likely that Ghana in some near future will find herself isolated from the other Commonwealth members of Africa, as far as her attitude toward the E. E. C. is concerned.

Ethiopia, Liberia, the United Arab Republic, the Sudan and the Republic of South Africa are five other nations in Africa. These countries, with the exception of South Africa, have been critical of the formation of regional economic groupings in industrialized Europe. South Africa established, in December 1960, a diplomatic mission to the E. E. C. (which is at the same time South Africa's Embassy in Belgium) to keep in close contact with the Community, and, in 1962, following the developments of the Brussels negotiations, she exerted great efforts so that her agricultural products be treated, upon importation into the enlarged E. E. C., in the same way as those of Canada, Australia and New Zealand <sup>(15)</sup>.

As well as these independent nations in Africa, there are still some areas remaining dependent. Some of these enjoy varying degrees of self-government and have clarified their attitudes toward the E. E. C. from their individual standpoints. A good example would be the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, which, since January 1964, has been split into the three territories of Nyasaland, Northern Rhodesia and Southern Rhodesia. The Federal Government, which has now disappeared, was very enthusiastic about setting up an association with the E. E. C. during the Brussels talks <sup>(16)</sup>. At the Commonwealth Prime

---

(14) *The Times* (London), September 18, 1962. It is interesting to observe that Tanganyika, in her pre-independence days, was not so critical about the E. E. C. as she is now. At the third ECA session, which took place in February 1961, that is to say, some time before her acquiring independent status later that year, Tanganyika as an associate member sent to the session a delegate, Mr. A. Z. N. Swai, who stated that “his delegation had made a careful study of the impact of the European Common Market, from the point of view not only of Tanganyika itself, but of the whole of East Africa, and [that] it had reached the conclusion that the consequences of the agreements in question would probably be considerably less unfavourable than had been feared at the outset... In any case, it [Tanganyika] was not filled with any great apprehension concerning the general effects of economic groupings such as the Common Market” (ECA, Third session, *Summary Records*, p. 145).

(15) Dr. M. Diederichs, Minister of Economic Affairs and of Mines of South Africa, during his European tour, presented to the E. E. C. Commission a memorandum to this effect (*Le Monde*, August 4, 1962).

Ministers' Conference in September 1962, Sir Roy Welensky, Prime Minister of the Federal Government, said the Federation was willing to accept association <sup>(17)</sup>. Mr. John Caldicott, Federal Minister for the Public Service, additionally in charge of E. E. C. affairs, went so far as to state, on July 7, 1962, on his return from Europe, that it would be tragic if the Federation were not admitted as an associate member of the E. E. C. <sup>(18)</sup>. Great Britain's negotiations with the E.E.C. being interrupted early in 1963, and as the Federation was disintegrating, the E. E. C. problem appeared to be laid aside in the Federation throughout that year.

\* \* \* \* \*

It is often said that the African countries are divided into two groups—those ex-French countries which are associated with the E. E. C. and those ex-British nations who reject association with the Community. This is an oversimplified statement. The former Belgian and Italian territories are associated with the E. E. C. along with the former French ones; Guinea, which was once administered by France, is strongly attacking the E. E. C.'s system of association (though to a much lesser degree in recent months); Sierra Leone, an ex-British territory, appears to accept association with the E. E. C.; many of the African nations, neither ex-French or ex-British, are also against the system. With

---

(16) At the Federal Assembly, it was even suggested that the Federation might well choose, given the opportunity, to become an Associate in accordance with the provisions of Article 238 of the Rome Treaty (Federal Assembly, Parliamentary Debates, *Official Report*, 31 January 1962, p. 3272 and p. 3283).

(17) Dr. Kenneth Kaunda, President of the United National Independence Party (U. N. I. P.) of Northern Rhodesia, ending an annual conference of the Party held at Mazabuka early in August, 1962, that is to say, when Sir Roy Welensky, Prime Minister of the Federal Government, was doing his best to establish links of association with the E. E. C., said that when his party came to power it would have nothing to do with any arrangements made by the Federal Government to drag Northern Rhodesia into the Community (*Evening Standard*, August 7, 1962). As the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference drew near, Dr. Kaunda again attacked Sir Roy for his move to associate the Federation with the E. E. C. and said: "By joining the European Common Market, Sir Roy Welensky is seeking some form of co-operation with his kith and kin. What is wrong with us in seeking strength of African solidarity in Pan-Africanism, which he says is Communist inspired?" (*The Northern News*, August 26, 1962; this newspaper is published at Ndola).

(18) *The Sunday Mail* (Salisbury), July 8, 1962.

## The Character of the “Euro-African Community”

this in mind, it is right to say with Lady Barbara Jackson that in Africa, “by a chance of history, the confrontation of Commonwealth and Common Market is physically most direct and potentially most disruptive.”<sup>(19)</sup>

As a matter of fact, the Commonwealth nations in Africa (except Sierra Leone), at least at this stage, are definitely turning their backs on the idea of association and, whenever a chance arises, they strongly oppose it.

Why are these Commonwealth nations opposing the E. E. C. in general, and its system of association in particular? There are many reasons for this. Mr. Mazrui feels that there are three major levels of objection to the E. E. C. apparent in the attitudes of the Africa members of the Commonwealth :

(1) The objection which amounts virtually to complete opposition to the idea of a united Europe ;

(2) The attitude which declares indifference to whether Europe unites or not, but which objects to Africa being directly linked at a united Europe ; and

(3) The attitude which concedes an African need to be linked to the prosperity of a united Europe, but not on the terms implied by formal associate membership<sup>(20)</sup>.

Why are there different attitudes toward this problem? This point must now be examined.

## II DIFFERENT ATTITUDES TOWARD ASSOCIATION

The African countries themselves are hoping for a united Africa. Why, then, are these very countries against the unification of Europe? Let us see what Mr. Mazrui has to say on the subject :

African nationalism started with the element of opposition rather than rivalry as its motive force. But with the attainment of at least formal independence by most of Africa rivalry has been slowly displacing

---

(19) Barbara Ward Jackson, “Free Africa and the Common Market,” *Foreign Affairs*, April 1962, p. 419.

(20) Ali A. Mazrui, “African Attitudes to the European Economic Community,” *International Affairs* (London), January 1963, p. 24.

opposition... [and] the rivalry is primarily with the Western Europe that once ruled Africa...

African nationalism seeks to achieve and to maintain equality with Europe. African unity was conceived ultimately as a means for gaining that equality...

The appearance of the EEC cuts right across this African nationalist ambition to achieve equality with the old, divided Europe... <sup>(21)</sup>.

What is more, if a united Europe would make the technological gulf between Africa and the more developed world, that fact alone could be enough to make it humanly difficult for a proud African to welcome the prospect of a united Europe<sup>(22)</sup>. We allow ourselves to add to this “human” element something which would very likely result from the widening of the technical gulf between Europe and Africa : that is, the Africans would feel like importing consumer goods, which appear one after another on the markets of the more developed nations, consumer goods which may in many cases be inappropriate to the level of economic development in Africa, thus hindering to a considerable extent the accumulation of capital in this continent <sup>(23)</sup>.

Mr. Mazrui goes so far as to say that there is in the logic to European unity a kind of opposition to, or rivalry with, non-Europeans <sup>(24)</sup>.

However, as Mr. Mazrui himself concedes, the attitude of objection to the very idea of a united Europe is, after all, the least expressed <sup>(25)</sup>.

### III AFRICA'S LINKAGE TO A UNITED EUROPE

A good number of the countries in Africa do not particularly mind the idea of the E. E. C. being in existence, but opposition arises when it comes to

---

(21) Mazrui, “African Attitudes...,” pp. 24-26.

(22) Mazrui, “African Attitudes...,” p. 26.

(23) J. P. Meynard and A. Préjean, “Marché Commun et Néo-colonialisme en Afrique,” *Economie et Politique*, November-December 1962, pp. 187-188.

(24) Mazrui, “African Attitudes...,” pp. 26-28.

(25) Mazrui, “African Attitudes...,” p. 24.

## The Character of the “Euro-African Community”

Africa's being directly linked to it. This is because there is a feeling among many African States, not associated with the E. E. C., that association with such a grouping would harm their long-term economic interests.

(1) For one thing, the African countries, not in association with the E. E. C., seem to fear that an association with the Community will tend to hurt the consistent efforts of the African States with a view to diversification, and especially to industrialization, of their respective economies.

For example, at the third session of the ECA (February 1961), Mr. Abdel-Moneim El-Banna, the Representative of the United Arab Republic, expressed his opinion as follows :

It had been argued that the African associated countries were, under the provisions of the Treaty of Rome, free to introduce protective tariffs, but it was unlikely that an African country would be able to safeguard its economy sufficiently to offset the effects of population increase and at the same time raise the standard of living of its people <sup>(26)</sup>.

The provisions of the Rome Treaty, referred to by Mr. El-Banna, are contained in Article 133,3. of that Treaty :

The [associated] countries and territories may...levy customs duties which correspond to the needs of their development and to the requirements of their industrialisation or which, being of a fiscal nature, have the object of contributing to their budgets...

The most striking example of application of this escape clause seems to be that of Senegal which, at the dissolution of the Federation of Mali in 1960, feared that Senegalese industry would lose its traditional market in the neighbouring country of Mali. Senegal then imposed not only customs duties on imports of competitive industrial goods from member countries of the E. E. C., but import quotas to complete the customs barrier <sup>(27)</sup>.

---

(26) ECA, Third session, *Summary Records*, p. 135. See also Mazrui, “African Attitudes...,” p. 28.

(27) ECA, Standing Committee on Trade (STC), *The Association of the African States and the Malagasy Republic with EEC and the Development of Industrialization*, E/CN. 14/STC/4/Add. 1, 8 August 1962, pp. 5-6 (Paper submitted by the Government of France to the first session of the STC, held 12-22 September 1962).

This example, however, does not seem to have dissipated completely the fears of the suspicious non-Associates of Africa.

To their way of thinking, the E. E. C. would have an unfavourable effect not only on the structure of production of the African countries, but also on their trade set-up. Mr. El-Banna, at the previously-mentioned ECA session, went on to say that the African countries needed to diversify their import and export markets, but their association with E. E. C. might freeze the existing structure of their foreign trade and make it difficult for them to follow a policy of diversification <sup>(28)</sup>.

(2) It is only natural that the E. E. C.'s system of association will have some influence on the international stream of labour and capital.

The free movement of workers either from the associated countries and territories, or from the member countries, is to be achieved within the framework of association, upon unanimous agreement of the E. E. C. States (Article 135 of the Rome Treaty).

The E. E. C., by financing certain social institutions and the economic investments of general interest, respectively defined in Article 3 (a) and (b) of the old Convention of Association, participated, during the period of application of that Convention, in the creation of infrastructures in the associated countries and territories. Under the new Convention of Association, the financial assistance accorded to the AASM has been substantially increased and its scope extended—one of the three attributes which characterize, according to an ECA document, the new Convention of Association <sup>(29)</sup>. Financial interventions in the associated countries are no longer limited to economic and social infrastructure investments, but are also available for investments in more directly productive projects. Aid for diversification and production has also been conceived in the new Convention (Article 17). There is little doubt that the E. E. C.'s financial interventions in associated Africa will serve as an incentive to

---

(28) ECA, Third session, *Summary Records*, p. 135.

(29) ECA, *Information Paper on Recent Developments in Western European Economic Groupings*, E/CN. 14/207, 28 January 1963, p. 3.

## The Character of the “Euro-African Community”

private capital investment in that part of Africa.

What is, then, the attitude, taken by the non-Associates of Africa, with regard to these provisions? Mr. Abdelwahab of the Sudan said expressly at the second session of the ECA (January-February 1960) that the establishment of the Community would modify the international flow of capital “to Africa's detriment.”<sup>(30)</sup>

As to the E. E. C.'s financial aid to the AASM, criticism is particularly challenging. For example, Mr. Ali Ahmed Attiga of Libya, at the third session of the ECA, posed the following questions :

If the African countries associated with EEC were expected to specialise in the production of those commodities which enjoyed the greatest advantages and the least disadvantages, what would they do with the surplus manpower and land which would be released from agriculture as a result of the increased productivity of primary industries? Would the EEC countries be willing to absorb that excess manpower into their internal economies on an equal basis with European workers? If the answer to the second question was in the affirmative, would that benefit the African countries in their efforts to build up their national identity and African solidarity?<sup>(31)</sup>

(3) All of the African States seem to be hoping to establish an African common market. The associated States say their association with the E. E. C. constitutes no obstacle to the continent-wide efforts to create such a common market, while the non-Associates claim the E. E. C. is putting a stop to the movement in this direction.

It is interesting to see in this connection that the ECA, in one of its recent studies on the possibility of establishment of an African common market, has reached the conclusion that, given the uncertainty as to how the new Convention of Association will be interpreted with respect to the formation of customs

---

(30) ECA, Second session, *Summary Records of the Nineteen Meetings*, E/CN. 14/55-E/CN. 14/SR. 2/1-19, December 1960, p. 72.

(31) ECA, Third session, *Summary Records*, pp. 142-143.

unions or free trade areas among associated and non-associated African States, the problems raised by the associate membership of part of Africa in the E. E. C. should not be unsurmountable <sup>(32)</sup>. We shall make a closer examination of this point later on.

#### IV DOES ASSOCIATION MEAN A SUBJECTION TO EUROPE?

There are African States which, while admitting that maintenance of an economic link between the two continents is necessary, do not believe that this should be in the form of an association. It may be said that these States do find political elements in associate membership, at least in its present form.

According to those who criticize the E. E. C., including Mr. Mazrui, the African States, associated with the Community, are falling into a dependent position on its members as a unified political and economic entity. What is more, as long as the E. E. C. is, as it has often been said, an organization opposed to the encroachment of communism into Western Europe, association with the Community would go against the policy of non-alignment of the African countries.

(1) M. Mody Sory Barry of Guinea voiced his opinion as follows at the third session of the ECA :

For Guinea there could be no question of association. Guinea alone had appreciated the fact that unless a country severed all ties with former rulers it would continue in a state of subjection. Those countries that were associated with the Community should reflect that it was only by their own efforts that they could build up a healthy economy <sup>(33)</sup>.

At the fourth session of the ECA, Mr. El-Banna, who was quoted earlier in this article, said :

The aid and the funds promised to countries which opted for association

---

(32) ECA, *Background Paper on the Establishment of an African Common Market*, E/CN. 14/STC/20, 13 October 1963, p. 58.

(33) ECA, Third session, *Summary Records*, p. 155.

## The Character of the “Euro-African Community”

represented conditional assistance, the condition being integration with the bloc which offered such association <sup>(34)</sup>.

Now, with the exception of Guinea, why are the African States which were French territories agreeing to an association with the E. E. C. ? According to Mr. Mazrui, one of the reasons lies in the traditional colonial policy of France which was based substantially on the idea of the economic integration of the colonies with France. He further says that acceptance by the French-speaking Africans of dependent economic status “was facilitated psychologically by that side of French assimilationist policy which encouraged French subjects to identify themselves culturally with France.” <sup>(35)</sup> On the other hand, “the African in the Commonwealth has greater sovereign dignity than the African in the French Community, and thus does not have any special desire to associate himself with the E. E. C., which would only pull him down in an economically dependent position” <sup>(36)</sup>.

(2) It has been repeatedly asserted that since the E. E. C. is an anti-communist organization, association between it and the non-aligned African countries is not compatible. If the purpose of the Community is to further strengthen Western Europe against the Soviet bloc, the English-speaking African countries should consider this as the basic course of their opposition to associate membership.

At the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference of September 1962, Ghana's Representative, Mr. F. K. D. Goka, Minister of Finance and Trade of the Republic, made it clear that if the United Kingdom entered the E. E. C., Ghana would not submit to an association with it. As his reason for this statement, he pointed out, *inter alia*, that association would go against her policy of non-alignment (September 12). Nigeria's Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, Prime Minister of the Federation, said at the same conference that the E. E. C.'s policy of association would run counter to Nigeria's non-alignment policy and hinder

---

(34) ECA, Fourth session, *Summary Records of the Twenty-Five Meetings*, p. 95.

(35) Mazrui, “African Attitudes...,” p. 33.

(36) *Ibid.* To borrow the expressions employed by *The Times* (London), the French-speaking Africans are “empirical,” while the English-speaking Africans, “emotional” about this issue (“West African Reshuffle?” *The Times*, September 12, 1962).

her aim eventually to unite Africa. At a joint session of both houses of parliament, held on September 24 of the same year, Sir Abubakar expressed the same opinion. The Federation's Governor-General, Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, now President of the Federal Republic, said in a broadcast on September 30 of that year, on the eve of Nigeria's Independence Day, that Prime Minister Balewa had clarified the country's stand in regard to the E. E. C. at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference and thus increased the prestige of the Federation as a non-aligned State.

Nigeria, as was mentioned before, is trying to conclude a trade agreement with the E. E. C. In her particular way of thinking, then, conclusion of a trade pact with the Community will not involve her in any political implications, whereas association with it would. It should be remembered that Israel, which initially hoped for an association with the E. E. C. under the provisions of Article 238 of the Rome Treaty, had to alter her policy, because of the strong pressure exercised by the Arab nations on the E. E. C., and had to negotiate for a trade agreement <sup>(37)</sup>.

It should be added here that in spite of this, the associated African States are free to break off association with the E. E. C. at any time. (This is clearly stipulated in Article 62 of the new Convention of Association.) They are, in that sense, completely free to decide their own external policies.

(3) There are countries who go so far as to claim that the system of association is a new means by which Western Europe will be able to penetrate and control Africa once again. For example, Guinea's Representative to the fourth session of the ECA, M. Siké Camara, remarked :

The establishment of economic groupings and monetary and military

---

(37) Israel sent a memorandum in July 1961 to the governments of the six member States of the E. E. C. and expressed her desire to enter into association with it. The negotiations between the E. E. C. and Israel opened in Brussels on November 26, 1962, and on that day the Representative of Israel, Mr. Levi Eshkol (Minister of Finance), insisted that it was necessary to enlarge the framework of a trade agreement "aux dimensions d'une formule qui équivaldrait en fait à une sorte d'association, sans que le mot fût prononcé" (*Le Monde*, 28 November 1962). It seems that the E. E. C. does not see it fit to conclude such an agreement with Israel.

## The Character of the “Euro-African Community”

zones by European imperial Powers was merely neo-colonialism or paternalism, a means of infiltration and control, and should be rejected forthwith <sup>(38)</sup>.

This kind of discussion, by far the most political in its nature, can be frequently heard not only in non-associated countries in Africa, like Guinea, but also in the Soviet bloc. The expression “neo-colonialism,” as employed by M. Camara, is defined by Mr. Dutt of the British Communist Party as being the “latest form of joint imperialist colonial exploitation.” <sup>(39)</sup> In other words, the nations of Western Europe, not individually as in former days, but as a combined unit, are trying to gain control over Africa. The E. E. C.’s system of association is regarded as their device to achieve that end.

## V NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES

When the E. E. C. Treaty was signed in Rome in the first half of 1957, some of the overseas territories, brought into association with the Community, were under the United Nations trusteeship system which aims, *inter alia*, at ensuring “equal treatment in social, economic, and commercial matters for all Members of the United Nations and their nationals” (Article 76, d. of the U. N. Charter).

Cameroun, Togo, Ruanda-Urundi and Somalia, the territories in question, are now all independent. Prior to their independence, however, there was naturally a question as to whether the association between the E. E. C. and these trust territories would go against the objectives of the U. N. trusteeship.

After the Second World War, France, under its Fourth Republic (promulgation of the Constitution in October 1946), instituted the French Union and made Cameroun and Togo—trust territories of France—associated territories of the Union. At the fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly in 1950,

---

(38) ECA, Fourth session, *Summary Records of the Twenty-Five Meetings*, p. 116.

(39) R. Palme Dutt, “The British Commonwealth and the Common Market,” *International Affairs* (Moscow), September 1962, p. 61.

the question of whether associating these territories would be compatible with their status as trust territories was brought up, but it was recognized that their participation in the French Union would not go against the basic objectives of the U. N. trusteeship <sup>(40)</sup>.

What, then, of the question of an association of trust territories with the E. E. C. ?

While the Rome Treaty, in its preamble, declares: “..... Intending to confirm the solidarity which binds Europe and overseas countries, and desiring to ensure the development of their prosperity, in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations,” the question could be raised and so was it, for the first time, at the 19th session of the U. N. Trusteeship Council, held from March 15 to May 15, 1957, during which period the Rome Treaty was signed. At that time, however, the Representatives of the Member States of the E. E. C. were not in a position to answer the questions raised, as the Treaty was not yet ratified <sup>(41)</sup>.

At the 20th session of the Trusteeship Council, which took place from May 20 to July 12 of the same year, the question was again brought up for discussion, in connection with the examination of an annual report on Somalia presented by the Italian Government. Mr. Lobanov of the U. S. S. R., in particular, stated that the problem was outside the scope of the Trusteeship Agreement and could not be solved without consulting the United Nations and the Somali people <sup>(42)</sup>.

We know that the regime of association established by the Rome Treaty extended not only to the trust territories under administration of some of the Member States, but also to the other territories dependent on them. At the eighth session of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, U. N. General Assembly, held from July 22 to August 15, 1957, the question was raised as to whether an association of these territories would

---

(40) François Borella, *L'Evolution Politique et Juridique de l'Union Française depuis 1946*, 1958, p. 155.

(41) U. N. Trusteeship Council (Nineteenth session), *Official Records*, p. 83, p. 89, pp. 131-132, pp. 137-138 and p. 278.

(42) Mr. Lobanov's intervention in U. N. Trusteeship Council (Twentieth session), *Official Records*, p. 42. Other interventions on the subject, p. 5, p. 19 and p. 22.

## The Character of the “Euro-African Community”

be compatible with the policy to be taken by Member States of the U. N., which should be based on the general principle of good-neighbourliness, due account being taken of the interests and well-being of the rest of the world, in social, economic, and commercial matters (Article 74 of the U. N. Charter). The Representatives of India, Iraq, Ceylon, Venezuela, Guatemala and the U. S. A. voiced their views, which were mostly skeptical. Speaking for the association regime were the Representatives of France and the Netherlands. Especially, on August 6, the French delegation observed that the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories had no right of control over the information communicated to it but only the right to consider it *a posteriori*. As their motion for closure of the debate was rejected, the French delegation withdrew from the Conference chamber <sup>(43)</sup>.

All of the associated territories which were under the U. N. trusteeship system and most of the other associated territories having gained their independence, the relationship between the trusteeship system and the E. E. C.'s association can hardly become a problem now, at least as far as those former U. N. trust territories are concerned. We would not deny, however, that the problem could possibly recur in the future. For example, when the United Kingdom joins the E. E. C., and the member nations of the Commonwealth are, in some form or another, linked with it, the British dependencies as well as the trust territories of Nauru, administered jointly by the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand, and that part of New Guinea, administered by Australia, will naturally present a problem, as long as the administering powers want these territories associated to the E. E. C. For the moment, it is, fortunately, a problem of the past.

---

(43) U. N. General Assembly, Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (Eighth session), *Summary Records*, A/AC. 35/SR. 156, p. 11, A/AC. 35/SR. 158, p. 7, A/AC. 35/SR. 161, p. 8, A/AC. 35/SR. 162/pp. 4-5, A/AC. 35/SR. 163, pp. 3-5, A/AC. 35/SR. 166, pp. 22-23.

## VI A UNIFIED APPROACH TO THE E. E. C.

(1) It is said that the “relationship maintained by certain African countries with the European Economic Community is the nucleus of the problem of African integration.”<sup>(44)</sup> It is, then, essential that the opposition of the French-speaking and the English-speaking countries in Africa be made less violent. One way to do so must be to make the system of association accessible to all of the African States which for the moment are not associated with the E. E. C.

In June 1961, the Parliament members of the associated African States of the Brazzaville group, assembled at Ouagadougou (from 5 to 7), asked that “l’association soit, en principe, une association ouverte à tous” and that “le choix de l’aide de la C. E. E. soit assorti de clauses permettant d’éviter qu’un Etat ne soit à cheval sur deux groupements économiques.”<sup>(45)</sup>

In the same month of June, the Euro-African Parliamentary Conference, gathered in Strasbourg (from 19 to 24), in a recommendation said also that it “estime que la nouvelle association...devra être ouverte à tous les Etats africains, étant entendu qu’aucun d’entre eux ne pourra appartenir à un autre groupement économique poursuivant des objectifs incompatibles avec ceux de l’association.”<sup>(46)</sup>

In the new Convention of Association, provision has been made that other States with economies comparable to those of the present associated States are eligible for associate membership (Article 58). An ECA document says that this provision “may be used to accommodate Commonwealth associates.”<sup>(47)</sup> This will also naturally apply to the other developing nations in Africa.

(2) If to the African States, which are not in association with the E. E. C.,

---

(44) ECA, *Background Paper on the Establishment...*, p. 27.

(45) *Les Formes Politiques et Institutionnelles...* (See Note 6).

(46) Assemblée Parlementaire Européenne, *Recommandation adoptée par la Conférence de l’Assemblée Parlementaire Européenne avec les Parlements d’Etats Africains et de Madagascar le 24 juin 1961 sur les Questions Politiques et Institutionnelles*, Document 38, 26 June 1961, 1-6.

(47) ECA, *Information Paper on Recent Developments...*, p. 10.

## The Character of the “Euro-African Community”

associate membership is not acceptable for one reason or another, then other means of access to the Community should be sought for.

Herr Willi Birkelbach, member of the European Parliament, carefully examines in his report of January 15, 1962, presented to the Parliament <sup>(48)</sup>, the various possibilities for a third country to establish closer ties with the E. E. C. Admission to the Community is, for an African State, not conceivable, since only European States may apply to become members of the Community (Article 237, Alinea 1 of the Rome Treaty). Association, as is stipulated in Article 238, would be difficult for most of the African States to consider, since it will be “an association embodying reciprocal rights and obligations, joint actions and special procedures” (Article 238, 1.) <sup>(49)</sup>. If the other type of association, provided for in Part IV of the Rome Treaty, should be set aside, then let us ask ourselves with Herr Birkelbach : “la conclusion de larges accords commerciaux, tels ceux prévus à l'article 113 du traité de la C. E. E., n'offrirait-elle pas une possibilité supplémentaire ?” <sup>(50)</sup> As Article 113 provides for the E. E. C.'s common commercial policy at the end of the transitional period, the Community should refer, for the time being, to Article 111, which has been inserted to provide for the co-ordination of commercial relations of the Member States with third

---

(48) Assemblée Parlementaire Européenne, *Rapport fait au nom de la Commission Politique sur les Aspects Politiques et Institutionnels de l'Adhésion ou de l'Association à la Communauté par M. Willi Birkelbach*, Document 122, 15 January 1962.

(49) Herr Birkelbach distinguishes three forms of association under the provisions of Article 238 : (1) association based on a customs union, (2) association based on a free-trade area, and (3) special agreements of economic cooperation (Assemblée Parlementaire Européenne, Doc. 122 (See Note 48), pp. 17-19). Since the association between the E. E. C. and the OCT's, as stipulated in Part IV of the Rome Treaty, is based on a free-trade area, the second form of association, under Article 238, may well be sought for in favour of the non-Associates of Africa. There would, however, be little sense in instituting association with the same contents under different provisions of the Rome Treaty. As to the third form of association, which consists of concluding an agreement of economic cooperation between the E. E. C. and a third country, it is said that, “étant donné que l'article 24 du G. A. T. T. dispose que seules l'union douanière et la zone de libre-échange peuvent échapper à l'application de la clause de la nation la plus favorisée, les avantages douaniers qui découleraient d'un pareil accord devraient être étendus à tous les partenaires du G. A. T. T.” (p. 19). It is further said that this formula “approche déjà de très près ce qui pourrait être convenu dans un accord commercial conforme à l'article 113” (p. 20).

(50) *Ibid* (See Note 48), p. 2.

countries during the transitional period.

(3) The new Convention of Association has opened possibilities to maintain or establish customs unions or free-trade areas not only among associated countries (Article 8), but among associated and non-associated States, “if this is not incompatible with the principles and provisions of the Convention” (Article 9).

On this point, Togo's Representative to the fifth session of the ECA, M. Herman Messavussu, had the following to say :

Togo appreciated the spirit of understanding with which the leaders of EEC had agreed that the African countries should enter into other regional agreements with their neighbours <sup>(51)</sup>.

At the same ECA session, Mr. J. H. Mensah of Ghana made the following remark :

... it was still not clear whether the European Common Market would allow African countries to accord preferential tariffs not only one another, but also to non-African countries. If it did allow that, the problems of the European Common Market would to a large extent be solved <sup>(52)</sup>.

It is interesting to note that the representative of Ghana, known as the most intransigent of all African States in regard to the E. E. C., had this to say at a United Nations meeting.

According to an ECA document, it was possible, even under the old Convention of Association, to conclude arrangements with a view to establishing customs unions or free-trade areas among associated and non-associated countries, and the customs agreements agreed upon between Ghana and the Upper Volta in 1961 and the agreement between Ghana and Niger in 1963 are quoted as concrete examples of such arrangements <sup>(53)</sup>.

If conclusion of arrangements of this kind is permitted under the association

---

(51) ECA, Fifth session, *Provisional Summary Record of the Eighty Eighth Meeting*, E/CN. 14/SR. 88 (V), 21 February 1963, p. 3.

(52) ECA, Fifth session, *Provisional Summary Record of the Fourth Meeting*, E/CN. 14/C. 1/SR. 4 (V), 23 February 1963, p. 8.

## The Character of the “Euro-African Community”

regime among associated and non-associated African countries, it will mean that the effect of the E. E. C.'s common external tariff will considerably be diminished<sup>(54)</sup>. There is a possibility of thus enlarging *de facto* the association regime to cover even those African countries which are against it without hurting their prestige.

(4) It has been maintained not only by the non-Associates of Africa and many of the countries third to the Euro-African Community, but also by some of the States party to the E. E. C. (Germany and the Netherlands, in particular, having close economic relationships with Commonwealth Africa), that the trade preferences given by the E. E. C. to its associated territories be reduced or abolished in favour of the primary goods producers outside the Community. This is, in my opinion, by far the best way to have the association of benefit to all of the developing countries. Mr. Beshir El Bakri, Representative of the Sudan to the fifth session of the ECA, was right to say at that session :

The European economic groupings would delay the economic development of the African countries unless they adopted a liberal policy in a broadened perspective<sup>(55)</sup>.

---

(53) ECA, *Background Paper on the Establishment...*, p. 29. See also p. 55. It seems that the idea of forming an African common market as put forward by the Casablanca Group—including an E. E. C. Associate, Mali—has been shelved. However, the same idea, but this time involving a different group of powers, has been expressed recently by President Tubman of Liberia. Speaking on the occasion of his fifth inauguration, January 6, 1964, the President advocated, before an audience which included Sir Milton Margai, Prime Minister of Sierra Leone, M. Sekou Touré, President of Guinea, and M. Philippe Yace, President of the Ivory Coast National Assembly, the establishment of a free-trade area whose members would consist of Sierra Leone, Guinea, Liberia and another E. E. C. Associate, the Ivory Coast.

(54) “... Concern is felt in Paris at the formation of a Customs union between Ghana and Upper Volta, which also belongs to the franc area and the French West African Customs Union,” wrote an influential British newspaper in early July 1961, that is, immediately after the initiation of the Ghana-Upper Volta Customs Union in June that year. The newspaper went on to say : “... Quite apart from the incompatibility of Upper Volta's simultaneous membership of two different Customs unions, there is the danger that it will be attracted into the neutralist political union of Ghana, Guinea and Mali, which has just been set up... But, by and large, it is clear that Ghana and the other ‘Casablanca’ Powers are determined to try to attract the newly independent African States away from what they regard as the undue political influence exercised in Africa by the Common Market” (*The Financial Times*, July 6, 1961).

(55) ECA, Fifth session, *Provisional Summary Record of the Eighty Sixth Meeting*, E/CN. 14/SR. 86 (V), 21 February 1963, p. 3.

The European Six and the African Eighteen have decided to lower substantially the E. E. C.'s common external tariffs on a number of important tropical products under the new Convention of Association. This means that the preferential margins on these products have been reduced to a considerable extent in favour of third countries, which is, needless to say, a desirable thing from the viewpoint of trade liberalization. If the E. E. C. declines to have its commercial policy liberal with respect to third countries, in particular to developing ones, it will not only be a blow to them economically, but will deepen their feeling of isolation. However, it will be necessary that liberalization of trade in respect to developing countries be carried out on a worldwide scale, that is, not only by the E. E. C. countries but also by the developed States at large. There are indications that the situation has of recent times been moving in this direction <sup>(56)</sup>.

(5) What is, then, the attitude of the 18 associated countries in regard to the Euro-African Community becoming open to other African States? They claimed during the June, 1961, Euro-African Parliamentary Conference, as previously mentioned, that the new association be open to all African countries, and further, they agreed to insert in the new Convention of Association an article whereby a third developing country has been given access to the Convention.

But let us recall that on November 10, 1961, M. Momar Gueye, Senegalese Ambassador to the E. E. C., representing all the member States of the OAMCE, spoke to the E. E. C. authorities, saying : "Ne négligez pas les associés de la première heure." <sup>(57)</sup>

Lady Barbara Jackson also noted :

Some of their [African associated States'] leaders are pressing for even

---

(56) Mr. Kitzinger suggested, when the United Kingdom was about to apply for full membership of the E. E. C., that both Britain and the Community should abolish all duties on tropical products from whatever source (Uwe Kitzinger, "Britain and the Common Market : the State of the Debate," *The World Today*, June 1961, p. 251). In this connection, it is important that the E. E. C. and the United Kingdom did agree, on September 10, 1963, to eliminate or reduce their respective tariffs on tea, mate and tropical woods starting from January 1, 1964 until December 31, 1965.

(57) Pierre Drouin, *Le Monde*, 5 December 1961.

## The Character of the “Euro-African Community”

more exclusive advantages and some governments, notably the Ivory Coast, seem very reluctant to water down the very real gains they derive from trade discrimination by admitting other African competitors to the charmed circle. Nor do all relish the idea of FEDOM having more clients<sup>(58)</sup>.

If the African associated countries make the profits and benefits offered by the association with the E. E. C. available to other African States and expand the free-trade area, being established among the original Associates, to the rest of Africa, it would accelerate the development of trade within the Continent. It would be, furthermore, one way of uniting Africa not only economically but also politically<sup>(59)</sup>.

### VIII POLITICS OF ASSOCIATION

Among the recent movements of the associated States of Africa, there are several which can be considered as political in nature. But before taking a closer look at these, let us reflect on the question of whether the association has had anything to do with the political groupings of Africa.

(1) One thing which draws our attention is that, at the first glance at least, whether an African State is associated with the E. E. C. or not has little bearing on the question of to which political group the State belongs.

At the Addis Ababa Summit Conference in May 1963, it was decided to establish an Organization of African Unity (OAU), thereby laying the foundation stone for the realization of a united Africa. Up to that time, there existed the Casablanca group, the Monrovia group and the Brazzaville group, in addition to

---

(58) Jackson, “Free Africa...,” p. 424. ECA, *Recent Developments in Western European Economic Groupings as far as They concern African Countries*, E/CN. 14/139, 15 November 1961, states, in connection with the implications for African countries and territories of the entry of the United Kingdom into the E. E. C.: “On the basis of population or national income the contribution of the country [the U. K.] to a European Development Fund should be around 30 per cent. Commonwealth Africa on the other hand would account for approximately 60 per cent of the population of the African associated countries. A proportionate distribution of the total aid available after an association of the Commonwealth countries may be resented by the presently associated members” (p. 26).

(59) “The Six and the Eighteen,” *The Economist*, July 27, 1963, p. 346.

several other groups of minor importance. Most of the African States were members of one or two of these three groups, and all of the members of the Brazzaville group, with the exception of Rwanda, were also members of the Monrovia group. It can safely be assumed that the Casablanca group and the Monrovia group, together with smaller groups such as the Union of African States, composed of Ghana, Guinea and Mali, virtually ceased to exist after the Addis Ababa Conference. But the Brazzaville group members have turned a deaf ear to the demands of the other African countries to dissolve the group, and, furthermore, have invited Togo to join them after the Summit Conference. They have, moreover, formed such organizations as the UAM, the OAMCE, the UAMPT, etc.

The following is a chart showing which of the eighteen associated States belong or have belonged to which political group (See next page).

A glance at the chart reveals that the fourteen States of the Brazzaville group are *all* associated to the E. E. C., but that the States which formed the Casablanca group and those which belonged to the Monrovia group but not to the Brazzaville group are not of the same status vis-à-vis the Community.

The case of the Casablanca group is particularly interesting. In this group, only Mali has continued in her status of association. (We neglect, for the moment, the special links Algeria has had so far, as she gained her independence only in July 1962, when the Casablanca group was already on the ebb.)

When the *ad hoc* Committee of Government Representatives on the Impact of Western European Economic Groupings on African Economies had its meeting at Addis Ababa, January 23-27, 1961, the Representative of Mali declared that his Government had not yet decided on association with the E. E. C. and that “the implicit continuation of Mali's association does not mean a one-sided orientation of its trade relations.”<sup>(60)</sup>

In *The Economist*, the following was once written about that country :

---

(60) ECA, Third session, *Report of the ad hoc Committee of Government Representatives on the Impact of Western European Economic Groupings on African Economies*, E/CN, 14/100, 1 February 1961, p. 3.

## The Character of the "Euro-African Community"

Countries	Membership in	Association with E. E. C.
Algeria	Casablanca group	( ○ )
Ghana	"	×
Guinea	"	( × )
Mali	"	○
Morocco	"	( × )
United Arab Republic	"	×
Cameroun	Brazzaville group, Monrovia group	○
Central African Republic	"	○
Chad	"	○
Congo (Brazzaville)	"	○
Dahomey	"	○
Gabon	"	○
Ivory Coast	"	○
Madagascar	"	○
Mauritania	"	○
Niger	"	○
Rwanda	Brazzaville group	○
Senegal	Brazzaville group, Monrovia group	○
Togo	"	○
Upper Volta	"	○
Congo (Léopoldville)	Monrovia group	○
Ethiopia	"	×
Liberia	"	×
Nigeria	"	×
Sierra Leone	"	×
Somalia	"	○
Burundi		○
Kenya		×
Libya		( × )
South Africa		×
Sudan		×
Tanganyika		×
Tunisia		( × )
Uganda		×
Zanzibar		×

*Notes* : (x) indicates those nations which were either formerly associated with the E. E. C. (Guinea) or which are being offered association by the Community.

Algeria's (○) shows that her relationship with the E. E. C. is something of association.

Mali, though inside the association, has stood out for the Casablanca point of view by pressing for true economic independence for associates and a liberalisation of the franc zone <sup>(61)</sup>.

Mali's association with the E. E. C. was certainly the cause of much heart searching by the entire Casablanca group. As a matter of fact, Mali should have felt embarrassed and isolated within the group as far as the E. E. C. problem was concerned, and the group itself should have frequently been out of step and could not take a concerted policy toward the Community.

Mali, until recently, made up with Ghana and Guinea the Union of African States. Here also, the three member nations obviously could not agree on the E. E. C. policy. For example, on June 25, 1961, the leaders of the Union member countries gathered at Bamako, capital of Mali, to have a three-day conference. According to the joint communiqué released on the 27th, the three countries reconfirmed their respective stands on the E. E. C. issue and it was decided that they, in order to set up an African common market, would continue to co-operate each other toward that end. This means, in fact, that the three member nations could not come to an agreement on the E. E. C. policy.

On September 22, 1963, that is to say, after the signature of the new Convention of Association had taken place (Mali joined the Convention.), M. Modibo Diallo, Mali's Ambassador to the United Arab Republic, spoke to the press, picking his words carefully, as follows :

... la participation du Mali [à la C. E. E.] ne peut revêtir aucun caractère politique et qu'elle n'est susceptible de gêner en rien l'adhésion du Mali à l'unité africaine <sup>(62)</sup>.

It is clear that Mali, although she belonged to the Casablanca group, was in an embarrassing position <sup>(63)</sup>. M. Pierre Drouin indicated in *Le Monde* of February 16, 1962 that M. Ben Bella, the then Prime Minister of Algeria, "suit à peu près le même chemin que les leaders des pays d'Afrique noire." If Algeria officially enters into association with the E. E. C., Mali would no longer be

---

(61) "Eurafrica and Their Africa," *The Economist*, November 25, 1961, p. 735.

(62) *Bulletin de l'Agence-Dahomey-Pressé*, 23 September 1963.

## The Character of the “Euro-African Community”

shunned by the other members of the Casablanca group, even if the group were in existence today.

In contrast to this, all 14 of the Brazzaville countries are associated with the E. E. C. These represent the majority of the eighteen Associates, and it is clear that the future of the association regime will depend primarily upon the attitudes of the Brazzaville group <sup>(64)</sup>.

But it is important to note the attitude of the associated countries not belonging to this group. Such countries are, at present, Burundi, the Congo (Léopoldville), Mali and Somalia. It is believed that Togo, the Congo, Mali and Somalia, during the Euro-African talks with a view to agreeing on the new Convention of Association, pointed out their special positions of non-alignment <sup>(65)</sup>, non-alignment meaning in this case that these countries are not Brazzaville group members.

For the Monrovia group, agreement on the policy to be taken vis-à-vis the E. E. C. may well also have been difficult. For one thing, the heads of the member countries, gathered at Lagos from 25 to 30 January 1962, adopted a resolution on the effects of the E. E. C. on the economies of African States, but it simply stated that “the Ministers of African and Malagasy States responsible for financial and economic planning problems be requested to study the possible effects of the E. E. C. on the economies of African States as well as the consequences of the association of certain African and Malagasy States with the

---

(63) With the exception of Mali, the associated States of Africa all send diplomatic representatives, at ambassadorial rank, to the seat of the E. E. C. The reason for Mali's not accrediting an ambassador to the Community up until now clearly shows her political considerations for the other members of the Casablanca group. Since the group has virtually disappeared, Mali will certainly set up, in the near future, a diplomatic mission to the E. E. C.

(64) The Brazzaville States defined at conferences at Ouagadougou in June and Tananarive in September 1961 their common position with respect to the new Convention of Association, prior to the opening of the Ministerial talks between the Six and the Eighteen. See ECA, *Recent Developments in Western European Economic Groupings...*, p. 5. Mr. Goncharov writes: “[The UAM] has been created by the European colonialists as an appendage to that aggressive imperialist grouping, the European Economic Community” (A. Goncharov, “Colonialism behind the screen of the Common Market,” *International Affairs* (Moscow), June 1961, p. 44).

(65) ECA, *Information Paper on Recent Developments in Western European Economic Groupings*, E/CN. 14/139/Add. 1, 6 February 1962, p. 4. Togo was not a member of the Brazzaville group at that time, while Burundi was still a dependent territory.

E. E. C. and to report to all Governments before the next Conference.”

(2) The possibility of the E. E. C. States and those countries associated with the Community using the association regime for political purposes has been hinted.

On November 14, 1962, the Representative of West Germany said, at an E. E. C. Council of Ministers, that if one of the associated African countries were to recognise East Germany, his country would not ratify the new Convention of Association (See Article 57, 1. of the Convention). It was the West German Government's reaction to rumours that Mali was ready to recognise *de jure* East Germany and to establish diplomatic relations with her. Moreover, according to *Le Monde* of December 19 of that year, the same problem was brought up again by West Germany at the Council of Ministers of December 17, and “une formule de compromis a été trouvée au terme de laquelle l'Allemagne [occidentale] pourrait compter sur la solidarité communautaire sans que cette disposition apparaisse noir sur blanc.”

According to an ADN (East German News Agency) dispatch of September 17, 1963, Ghana opened a trade mission in East Germany and Mr. J. Mensa-Bonsu, Chief of the Mission, paid an official visit to Herr Yulius Baklow, Minister of Trade of the East German Government, on September 16. The West Germans had repeatedly warned the Ghanaians against this eventuality. (In Ghana, a trade mission from Pankow had already been established.) When they concluded an agreement on May 15 of the same year whereby West Germany promised a loan of 20,000,000 DM to Ghana for the construction of a bridge over the Volta River near Tefle, a paragraph was inserted in the preamble of the agreement to the effect that it had as its basis the traditionally friendly relations existing between the two countries concerned <sup>(66)</sup>.

(3) The East German delegation to the fifth session of the ECA, held in the Congo (Léopoldville) early in 1963, was turned away by the Congolese Government when they arrived at Léopoldville airport and could not attend the session <sup>(67)</sup>. According to a letter of explanation dated March 1, addressed to U Thant, Secretary-General of the United Nations, the following reasons

## The Character of the “Euro-African Community”

for not accepting East Germany into the Congo were noted by M. J. -B. Alves, the then Chargé d'Affaires a. i. of that country to the U. N. :

... it [the Congolese Ministry of Foreign Affairs] wishes to point out that it sent an invitation to the E. E. C. Only full or associate members of the Community and persons who have received prior authorization to take part are admitted to the proceedings of the fifth session of the ECA and enjoy diplomatic immunity. Everyone else must fulfil the usual requirements laid down in the Congolese Immigration Act.

The representatives of the German Democratic Republic are neither full nor associated members of the E. E. C. They were not admitted as observers and they did not fulfil the requirements of the Congolese Immigration Act...

However, a host country of a U. N. meeting making a distinction of this sort between the E. E. C. member countries and Associates and those other non-associated nations is a questionable point.

(4) More recent developments have produced a further unprecedented

---

(66) The West Germans were mindful of the fact that President Nkrumah had paid an official visit to East Germany as early as August 1961. On January 18, 1963, closer relations between Ghana and the Pankow regime were indicated when President Nkrumah, in his capacity as General Secretary of the Convention People's Party, sent a message of greetings to the sixth congress of the East German Socialist Unity Party (*Daily Graphic*, January 19, 1963). Rumours that the East German relations with Ghana were becoming closer were also expressed in the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* of May 13, 1963, when it was suggested that the Ghanians would shortly establish a trade mission in East Berlin. In April of the same year, an East German delegation had paid a visit to Ghana headed by Herr Otto Winzer, State Secretary and First Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of East Germany. Following this visit, the Ghanaian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Kojo Botsio, “assured the Chargé d'Affaires of the Federal German Republic that the conversation which took place between the Ghana Government and Mr. Winzer...merely concerned economic questions,” according to *The Ghanaian Times* of May 4. “A statement from the Foreign Ministry today said Mr. Botsio affirmed that the visit of Mr. Winzer to Ghana did not affect in any way the traditional friendly diplomatic relations existing between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Republic of Ghana.” After this assurance from the Ghanaian Government, West Germany signed the above-mentioned loan agreement on May 15. The establishment of Ghana's trade mission to East Germany might have diminished the possibility of that country's making access to the E. E. C.

(67) East Germany has no status at ECA sessions. (West Germany, in response to the ECA's invitation, has been sending observers ever since the third session in 1961.)

situation in relations between African countries and the E. E. C.

During his tour of Africa, from December 1963 to February 1964, Mr. Chou En-Lai of the People's Republic of China received confirmation that France had recognised the Peking Government on January 27, 1964<sup>(68)</sup>. On the same day, it was announced that Nationalist China intended to set up a diplomatic mission to the E. E. C. headed by Dr. Hiong-Fei Tchen, Ambassador in Brussels and Minister Plenipotentiary (Chargé d'Affaires a. i.) in Paris<sup>(69)</sup>. This move may be taken as an indication of Taiwan's desire to exclude Peking from any official relations with the E. E. C. and also as an effort to dissuade other Common Market governments (though the Netherlands has already done so) and the other African Associates, at present not recognising Peking, from following the French Government's lead<sup>(70)</sup>.

(5) It is the Council of Ministers of the E. E. C. who decides whether to accept or reject a State when it seeks admission into, or association with, the Community. But the Council of Association, composed on the one hand of the E. E. C. Member States and the Commission of the Community and on the other of the Associated States (Article 40 of the new Convention of Association), “est informé de toute demande d'adhésion ou d'association d'un Etat à la Communauté” (Article 58, 1. of the new Convention<sup>(71)</sup>), and, as to the eventual association of States with economies comparable to those of the original Associates, “toute demande d'association à la Communauté... qui, après examen par la Communauté, a été portée par celle-ci devant le Conseil d'association, y fait l'objet de consultation” (Article 58, 2. of the new Convention).

It is to be presumed, therefore, that the African Associates try to hinder

---

(68) During his visit to Africa, Mr. Chou En-Lai visited one E. E. C. Associate, Mali, and made a point of sending greetings to five others, namely Niger, the Upper Volta, Dahomey, Togo and Chad, whilst flying over these countries.

(69) A UPI dispatch from Brussels, dated January 27, 1964.

(70) The Peking Government has already gained recognition from four E. E. C. Associates: Mali, the Congo (Léopoldville), Somalia, and Burundi.

(71) It could be interpreted that the association referred to in Article 58, 1. of the new Convention is that which is stipulated in Article 238 of the Rome Treaty, seeing that in Article 58, 2., the special type of association with developing countries is provided for.

## The Character of the "Euro-African Community"

certain third countries from becoming full or associated members of the Community because of political or economic reasons. This is also true when third countries attempt to conclude trade agreements with the Community since the African States, now in association with it, could put moral pressure on the Council of Ministers of the E. E. C. If, for instance, Portugal or the Republic of South Africa tries to secure access to the Community, the associated African States would oppose it, making a pretext of the colonial or racial policy being practised by these countries <sup>(72)</sup>. It would have also been the case with the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, which is now dissolved into three different territories, since it was under a white-supremacist federal government <sup>(73)</sup>.

## CONCLUSION

Whether or not the Euro-African Community is political in nature is a very interesting but complex problem. A definite answer to this can only be attained by waiting an appropriate length of time to see what will happen.

We all know that the signing of the new Convention of Association took place after a considerable delay, owing partly to the lengthy and trying negotiations between the European and African Ministers to agree upon the new Convention, and partly to the failure at the beginning of 1963, that is, shortly after the initialing of the Convention, of the Brussels talks with a view

---

(72) The Africa Institute's *Bulletin*, published in Pretoria, in its April 1, 1962, issue (vol. II, No. 6), says that any sort of South Africa's association with the E. E. C. would have to be based on the provisions of Article 238 of the Rome Treaty, but that, apart from the economic and social obligations entailed in this kind of association, "there are political considerations which stand in the way. The existing relations between E. E. C. and the newly independent nations in Africa would, in all likelihood, be an obstacle to the establishment of special arrangements with South Africa" (p. 178). See also *Common Market* (A monthly review of European integration and economic development), March 1962, pp. 48-49.

(73) *The Rhodesia Herald* of July 9, 1962 wrote: "In the past week there have been disturbing rumours from Brussels that there is opposition to the idea of the Federation's becoming an AOT (associated overseas territory). The reports suggest that the opposition is political and comes from the present 'anti-colonial' AOT bloc." As to the reaction of the local population against the Federal Government's E. E. C. policy, see Note 17.

of Britain's entry into the E. E. C. It is said that some of the E. E. C. member States (especially Italy and the Netherlands) tried to punish de Gaulle's France by postponing the signing of the new Convention of Association, since France has the closest relationship with associated Africa of all the E. E. C. members. If this is true, then the new Convention was utilized for political reasons by some E. E. C. States even before its formal signing.

What is more, as M. Philippe Decraere pointed out in *Le Monde* of March 9, 1963, while referring to the Heads of State Conference of the Afro-Malagasy Union which was to be held in Ouagadougou on March 10 of that year, the UAM members thought to be “en position ‘inconfortable’ vis-à-vis de certains de leurs voisins, qui, tel le Ghana, n'ont jamais ménagé leurs critiques à l'égard du ‘neo-colonialisme européen.’”

Whether the Euro-African Community is a political instrument or not will depend largely upon the attitude of the member countries of the E. E. C. and the African States associated with it.

Summary

## The Character of the “Euro-African Community”

—An Aspect of the Political Situation in Africa in the Early 1960's—

Seiro KAWASAKI

In the early 1960's, opinion was sharply divided between the French-speaking countries of Black Africa and the Commonwealth countries on the Continent with regard to their relations with the European Economic Community (EEC ; it has been called the “European Community” since November 1993 when the European Union was formed). The French-speaking part of Africa remained “associated” with the EEC, together with the ex-Belgian and Italian territories, even after their independence either in 1960 or in 1962.

It was decided that negotiations to conclude a new convention replacing the second Yaoundé Convention of Association of 29 July 1969 would start in August 1973 (The United Kingdom had joined the EEC in January of that year.), and the Commonwealth members situated in Africa, Caribbean and the Pacific (ACP States) were invited to the negotiations. The 41 member countries of the Organization of African Unity (OAU; it is now called the African Union), pledged in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, that “an organized Africa” would “speak with one voice to an organized Europe,” but it is said that some of the associated ex-French countries opposed the pledge, fearing that such an arrangement might jeopardize their long-held position with the EEC (*The New York Times*, 29 May 1973, p. 9).

The negotiations between the Community and 46 ACP States resulted in the signature of the first Lomé Convention on 28 February 1975. As far as sub-Saharan Africa is concerned, the Commonwealth countries as well as those not belonging to the Commonwealth, including Ethiopia, Guinea, Liberia, and Sudan, were signatories of the Convention. Thus, practically all of Africa

established relations of cooperation with the EEC in 1975, relations which have been born to date with three successive Lomé Conventions. And as many as 77 ACP countries, of which 48 African, signed the new Partnership Agreement in Cotonou, Benin, on 23 June 2000, with the 15 members of the European Union.

The article is, then, a brief description of the situation in Africa in the early 1960's, that is, before it began to “speak with one voice” to the EEC.

(August 2008)