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The purpose of this study is to examine the Sino-Soviet rivalry in Africa and quantify levels of Chinese and Soviet involvement in thirty-two African nations in order to determine if a correlation exists with United Nations voting. Africa in the 1970's has been an important focus of the Chinese and Soviet efforts to gain support in this dispute. Military involvement and trade, as well as aid programs, have been an integral part of this competition for support.

The results suggest that levels of involvement have little effect on UN voting. A regression analysis revealed a significant lack of correlation between these two variables. Large aid programs did not generally induce voting support. Neither levels of involvement nor voting records proved to be a satisfactory indicator of great power influence. In fact, the intangible nature of the concept may well preclude the effective quantification of "influence."
THE SINO-SOVIET DISPUTE IN AFRICA

1974-1978
My purpose in undertaking this particular study is to examine the relationship between Soviet and Chinese aid disbursements and voting in the United Nations. Africa, as an area of intense competition between these two communist powers, provides an interesting case study. By quantitatively assessing a wide variety of Soviet and Chinese resource allocations to the thirty-two nations under consideration, I will be able to establish a scale which will indicate the degree of involvement (the independent variable) of the communist powers in these countries. While these scales will not directly measure influence, they should serve as a rough indicator of the presence of potential influence.

While common sense leads us to expect a correlation between high levels of aid and General Assembly voting, this study will demonstrate conclusively that this was not the case in sub-Saharan Africa from 1974 to 1978. High levels of resource allocation did not necessarily correspond with high indices of voting agreement.

A number of studies have attempted to examine the relationship between aid receipts and UN voting. However, none of these has examined a broad range of issues and a
large number of recipient nations chosen on a regional basis. This study is therefore unique. While limited to a particular region, it utilizes a large number of subjects over an extended time frame. The years 1974 to 1978 were chosen because they comprised the most recent five year period for which the necessary data was available. It should be noted that the peculiar aspects of the region may make the results of this particular study inapplicable to other regions. The results are general; therefore specific cases may not conform to the norm. For example, China's aid and voting relationships with South-East Asian nations can be expected to vary from the general pattern found with nations of sub-Saharan Africa. It would seem that geographical proximity is an important factor in such relationships. Indeed, the remoteness of the region may be one reason why the correlation found in this study was so low.

My thesis, briefly stated, is that Chinese and Soviet aid to sub-Saharan Africa, donated in an often competitive fashion, was used in the hope of gaining some level of diplomatic support in the ongoing Sino-Soviet dispute. By establishing an empirical basis for quantifying aid relationships, I was able to demonstrate how successful, or unsuccessful, these resource allocations have been in terms of generating diplomatic support, which is measured by year to year analyses of General Assembly voting.

Tentatively, one is inclined to presume that a
correlation would naturally exist between aid received and diplomatic support generated. As seen in Chapter Five, recent literature implies this relationship but without confirming it. A correlation, in fact, cannot generally be found. For this reason, the "value" of resource allocations as a political or diplomatic tool in terms of generating influence would appear to be limited. United Nations voting may not be the proper measurement for influence because diplomatic support gained by the provision of aid may be expressed through other channels, such as non-aligned conferences.

The perceived relationship between resource outlays and diplomatic support seems to be a key feature of the Sino-Soviet rivalry in Africa because that rivalry is so often expressed in polemical terms. China and the Soviet Union have seemed to seek statements of support, which have occurred infrequently. The nations in question have seemed reluctant to openly express their support for either of the communist superpowers. Their attitude is similar to that often expressed towards the East-West ideological struggle: a desire to remain non-aligned and profit from relations with both parties. Major commitments to one side or the other have been extremely rare.

This thesis will examine Sino-Soviet relations with the region in a broader context as well as providing specific statistical data for the five-year period 1974-78. It will
indicate the levels of aid donated by the USSR and the PRC, as well as the benefits that seem to have been enjoyed as a result of that aid. It will examine the general history of Sino-Soviet relations with Africa and the specific events of the 1975-78 period in Chapters One and Two. The problem of measuring influence and a method for doing so are explained in Chapters Three and Four. The results and my conclusion are presented in Chapters Five and Six.
Chapter One
Chinese and Soviet Involvement
in Africa: The Setting

George T. Yu describes two levels of the Sino-Soviet rivalry in Africa. On one level, the communist powers attempt to "win friends and influence people" by formal and informal political interaction, economic aid, military assistance and other activities. On another level, the two attack one another's motives in Africa. These two levels of competition have been observable since the early 1960's when China began to denounce the Third World policies of the USSR, in addition to those of the US.(1)

Both the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China (PRC) have important objectives and goals in Africa, and these often lead to a subtle kind of conflict or competition. China's goals have tended to be more general, in that it was attempting to shed the isolation cast upon it largely under the leadership of the United States. China's main concern was to cultivate friendship with the newly independent states of Africa in an effort to gain diplomatic support in its ongoing attempt to achieve recognition as the legitimate representative of the Chinese people. Until 1971, when communist China finally received the necessary two-thirds vote to replace the Nationalist Chinese at the United
Nations, the cultivation of diplomatic support was its most important objective, as it may well still be.

Given the geographical distances involved, the PRC has had few strategic goals in Africa. Although trade and the importation of some strategic raw materials from Africa (for example, copper from Zambia) are important, China's economic interests, while steadily growing, are still fairly small in comparison to those of the West. The most important general objective of Chinese foreign policy in Africa has been the establishment of some type of "Third World brethren" relationship with the nations of the continent. By identifying strongly with African nations against the past exploitations of imperialism and the present injustices of neo-colonialism, the PRC has attempted to gain a leadership position in the Third World. In this effort it has enjoyed limited success, especially in the 1960's. African nations have been less inclined to support Peking's more recent pronouncements, which tend to identify the Soviet Union as the new ("social-imperialist") empire seeking world-wide hegemony.

In the 1960's, and to a lesser extent in the 1970's, China has also supported wars of liberation. This support was both an ideological measure designed to aid insurrections against colonialism as well as an attempt to gain influence in any future government should the
insurrection succeed. The Chinese favored the use of their model of peasant revolution, for it supported their ideological viewpoint against that of the USSR, and they were willing to support guerrilla organizations that were leftist-oriented. The objective of promoting armed struggle became more and more passe' as, throughout the 1960's, almost all of the colonies became independent. Also, this policy often had negative repercussions once the newly established nation-states began to view the continuation of such movements as destabilizing. The promotion of national liberation movements became increasingly less of a priority goal for the PRC.

While the objectives of China have changed in the past twenty years, a constantly recurring theme (although to a lesser extent in the period 1965-1968) has been the desire to establish and maintain good relations with as many African nations as possible. Initially this motivation was directed at the cold war enemy, the United States, but soon China began to seek support in her war of polemics with the Soviet Union. At the very least, China has sought a neutral position from these countries in terms of the Sino-Soviet dispute. Although Thomas Kanza sees China as attempting to "pave the way for a new alliance of the hungry nations and colored people,"(2) Chinese leaders are ultimately too pragmatic to envision this as a real possibility.

The goals of the Soviet Union in Africa have also varied
greatly. In the late 1950’s and early 1960’s Russia appeared bent on generously supporting regimes that seemed to be socialist or at least leftist. This policy was also aimed at maintaining friendly relations and gaining diplomatic support in the war of words with the US and later with the PRC. Instituted under the aegis of Khrushchev, this policy involved the implementation of large aid programs for “progressive” African regimes.

A realization that the return for such aid was often negligible led the Soviet Union in the late 1960’s to concentrate on aid designed to promote trade that would benefit the Soviet economy. This was a policy of greater pragmatism designed to maximize returns. One desired return continued to be support, or at least a neutral stance, in the Sino-Soviet conflict.

Another goal of Soviet foreign policy in Africa concerned strategic objectives. This seems to have become of primary interest in the late 1960’s and early 1970’s. Access to military facilities in Africa became important in the global struggle with the US. Kanza sees Soviet policy as preoccupied with combatting US and Chinese influence. He feels that the USSR maintains a “permanent vigilance to exploit in favor of the Soviet Union and the socialist ideology any situation which shows signs of opposition to Western imperialism, to Western influence in general, and to Chinese influence in particular.”(3)
Three objectives are paramount in describing or analyzing the goals of the Soviet Union in Africa: 1) ideological, 2) strategic, and 3) economic. Ideological considerations seem to have been of primary importance in the early 1960's. Economic factors were emphasized in the late 1960's and early 1970's, and since the early 1970's, strategic considerations have been paramount.

In the 1950's, the Sino-Soviet rivalry was not yet extended to Africa for several reasons. The rivalry was still in its early stages and had not yet been revealed to the world. China and the Soviet Union had not begun actively to seek supporters. Just as important is the fact that China had little in the way of relations with an Africa that was still ruled largely by Europeans. "Initially, a positive African policy was nonexistent. Apart from the question of geographical distance, the new regime was not yet strong enough to adopt any meaningful policy towards Africa."(4)

By the early 1960's, China had begun to establish a "positive African policy" that centered on her desire to break the diplomatic isolation in which she found herself. Ogunsanwo notes that "China sought the friendship of the new African states to counter the United States' efforts begun in the 1950's to isolate her."(5) Opportunities abounded for supporting liberation movements as well as newly independent regimes.
This period also witnessed a burst of Soviet activity in Africa. According to John Esseks, this activity was promoted by "optimism among some Soviet leaders that the new African states - with their grievances against the Western exmetropoles, their typically weak indigenous business classes, their traditions of communal land tenure, and related characteristics - would tend towards collaboration with Communist countries."(6) These hopes later proved to be short-sighted, but Khrushchev felt that so-called "national democratic states" like Ghana, Guinea, and Mali would eventually become full-fledged members of the socialist community. Such expectations were never fulfilled, and governments in both Ghana and Mali were soon toppled by military coups.

While China's foreign policy, in Africa and elsewhere, was effectively curtailed in the years 1965-68 by the Cultural Revolution, the Soviet Union began to take a more pragmatic attitude toward Africa. Greater stress on economic and strategic considerations became prevalent. The Soviets increasingly disbursed resources only if they seemed likely to gain some definite return. What John D. Esseks calls "the apparent contracting of Soviet aid efforts in Africa"(7) resulted from the small return on prior Soviet investments. The late 1960's witnessed a cutback in Soviet aid, and a greater interest in economic and strategic returns seemed to dominate policy-making.
For various reasons, including Soviet disillusionment and Chinese isolationism, the communist powers de-emphasized their African programs in the latter half of the decade. In this period, both nations consolidated their efforts towards a few "target states," where it was felt that the rewards would be greater. Examples of this beginning in 1969 are Somalia for the USSR and Tanzania for the PRC.

The importance of trade and the procurement of mineral resources began to be more heavily emphasized. According to Ogunsanwo, "Although in absolute terms China's share of Africa's market was still very small, by the end of 1970 it had shown a significant expansion, which could be expected to continue in the future."(8) Soviet trade with Africa, and especially exports to the continent, also increased substantially in this period.(9)

By the beginning of the 1970's, China had regained much of the diplomatic initiative lost during its Cultural Revolution. Improved relations with Black Africa were essential as China finally gained admission to the United Nations. In 1971, six African nations recognized the PRC for the first time, bringing the number with which China had relations to twenty-three. The Third World vote in general, and the African vote in particular, assured gaining the two-thirds majority necessary in September 1971 for China's admission to and Taiwan's expulsion from the United Nations. Ogunsanwo notes that "in its political relations with the
African states, China adopted an attitude aimed at obtaining diplomatic recognition."(10)

If this was indeed the major goal of Chinese African policy in the 1960's (with the exception of the 1965-68 period), then that policy was successful by the end of 1971. The PRC continued to make progress in replacing the Taiwan regime as the single representative of China throughout the 1970's. Nineteen African nations recognized the PRC during the decade, bringing the total to forty-two.

George T. Yu maintains that the 1970's witnessed a great growth of Chinese activity in Africa, but the same can probably also be said about the USSR. This increased activity can be seen as a manifestation of the rivalry, although the Soviet Union seems to have more concrete goals than merely gaining support in the dispute. According to Yu, "Africa in the 1970's has emerged as an area of strong contention between China and the USSR, and China has managed to bolster its position on the continent considerably at least in terms of establishing an economic presence and increased formal acceptance."(11)

It would appear that whatever gains China may have made in terms of trade, aid and recognition, its second-class status was assured by the massive level of Soviet arms transfers to Africa. Whatever influence China may gain as the "chief Communist (economic) aid donor to African countries,"(12) would seem to be outweighed by the
substantial military presence the Soviet Union has maintained in Africa. China's activity in terms of arms transfers has been limited in the 1970's, with Zaire and Tanzania the principal recipients of Chinese military goods and supplies during the decade.

Richard Staar sees "much of what the Russians are doing in black Africa as being motivated by, and, indeed, remaining directly related to strategic military objectives."(13) He feels that the massive infusion of Soviet weaponry in Africa is designed to gain specific strategic objectives, although he also notes more generally the "growing rivalry between Moscow and Peking to 'win hearts and minds' throughout Asia, Africa, and Latin America."(14)

Also in the 1970's, the PRC began actively to protest Soviet involvement in the Third World in general and in Africa in particular. "Soviet pressure against vulnerable locations in Asia and Africa was interpreted as striving to create a situation to outflank Europe from the North and South."(15) China herself maintained very close relations with Tanzania, Zambia, and Zaire. Although suffering in the contest for influence from a lack of resources, the PRC, unlike the USSR, has benefited from policies that stress its identification with the Third World.

David Twining perceives a new, more dangerous pattern of Soviet activity in the Third World, and especially Africa,
that began in the mid-1970's. "The key feature of this new pattern which distinguishes it markedly from Soviet involvement of the past is the increased role and larger scale of involvement by Soviet, East European and Cuban military forces."(16) While Twining's own orientation is worth noting (he is a major in the US Army) he is correct in pointing out the greater use of military power, usually through proxies, by the USSR in Africa. Especially in Angola and Ethiopia, Soviet involvement has been instrumental in either the installation and/or the maintenance of a pro-Soviet regime.

In Angola, which achieved independence on November 11, 1975, the Soviet Union's intervention through Cuban proxies led directly to the victory of the MPLA, led by Augustinho Neto. An estimated 1,000 Soviet advisors, 20,000 Cuban troops and 10,000 Eastern Bloc technicians have continued to prop up the government, which has been unable to establish its authority over large sections of the countryside. While the contribution of the Soviet Union and Cuba in shoring up the regime is clear, it is important to note that economic and diplomatic contacts with the West are still of great importance to the regime of Jose Eduardo dos Santos, who became President after Neto's death in 1978.

In Ethiopia, the (eventually) Marxist government of Haile Mariam Mengistu deposed Emperor Haile Selassie in September of 1974. Enormous infusions of Soviet military aid,
including a force of some 10,000 Cubans, were instrumental in defeating Somalia in the Ogaden War of 1977-78. The Cubans have remained, and have been joined by 1,000 or more Soviet civilian and military advisors. In November, 1978, a Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation was signed between Ethiopia and the Soviet Union.

Since the late 1950's and the early 1960's, both China and the Soviet Union have attempted to translate the allocation of resources, usually in the form of aid or military transfers, into influence. With the development of the Sino-Soviet rivalry into an open ideological conflict, these attempts to gain influence received the added impetus of a need to find supporters or, at least, to attempt to limit support for the opposition.

More recently, both nations, and especially the USSR, have concentrated their efforts on a few "target states" where the risks and returns would presumably be proportionately lower and higher, respectively. Greater resources have given the Soviet Union an advantage in projecting its influence in Africa. Yu points out that "with the heavy internal demands on its scarce resources, its shortage of modern arms and its limited capacity to project its power abroad, China has found itself severely restricted in trying to fulfill what Africans regard as their requirements."(17)
What aids China is often the attitudes of the Africans, who tend to identify China with the Third World, while the USSR, as a European power and a developed nation, is more easily seen as imperialistic. African nations desire aid, but they do not want strings attached that may lead to any sort of dependent relationship. Hutchison notes that numerous governments have praised Chinese assistance as being completely free of political strings and also that "aid from China has been useful, apt, given on more generous terms than by any other donor - and it has been welcomed, and praised, by nearly every African nation that has received it." (18) Hutchison feels that China is able to do this because it is not always seeking tangible or specific goals. Besides the moral support China has received, he claims that the PRC has gained tangible benefits such as the African UN vote that led to its membership and the growth of a healthy two-way trade. "No nation has as yet provided what would, in Peking, be considered the ultimate political payoff: full endorsement of China's viewpoint in the Sino-Soviet dispute." (19)

Although the Soviet Union clearly holds most of the cards in terms of the resources it can apply to Africa, China, by pursuing good relations through careful, generous and largely unconditional aid, has been able to gain a large measure of goodwill on the continent. While enjoying no potential "client states" in Africa, China maintains excellent relations with a large number of nations and
receives intangible benefits that accrue from such relations. The Chinese have generally been successful in convincing Africans of their genuine desire for friendship and have largely avoided the temptation to apply pressure for specific benefits. This approach has served Chinese interests well over the long haul, and it is to be expected that it will be continued.

The Soviet Union's present policy of concentrating on a few major "target states" also seems destined to continue. The USSR will gain little from these relationships despite the enormous expenditures involved in supporting such regimes. This is because no African government, no matter how authoritarian it may be, can afford to be seen by its people as dependent on the USSR. In the long run, Angola and Ethiopia will perceive, as did Somalia in 1977, that their national interest is not congruent to that of the Soviet Union, and the result will be the end of that particular special relationship. Unlike Cuba, another Third World nation that has maintained its relationship over a long period with the Soviet Union, these African nations are not economically dependent on the USSR, nor do they seek protection from a powerful and hostile neighbor. Their national security is not directly tied to their relationship with the Soviet Union, as is the case with Cuba.
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Chapter Two

The Sino-Soviet Rivalry

in Sub-Saharan Africa,

1974-1978

During the 1974 to 1978 period, sub-Saharan Africa emerged as a flashpoint of the Sino-Soviet conflict. China and the Soviet Union had, largely for the same reasons, deemphasized this region in the late 1960's and early 1970's. The PRC found it necessary to curtail its diplomatic activities because of the Cultural Revolution and the chronic political instability that continued until after Mao's death in 1976. The Soviet Union, disappointed with the meagre results of extensive aid programs in the 1960's, began to make commitments on a far more rational and limited basis in the early 1970's. Kanet and Ipatov conclude:

"In the 1970's, Africa has re-emerged as an area of important Soviet interest...instruments employed by the Soviets in their attempt to accomplish their foreign policy goals in Africa...have been the provision of economic assistance and the expansion of trade relations with African countries, arms transfers and military aid, and a variety of forms of political support." (1)

The Soviets began to take a more pragmatic attitude toward Africa. A willingness to work with any type of government, regardless of ideological incompatibilities, appeared as the Soviets strove to gain concrete benefits in the region.
Attempts to promote "national-socialist" governments became largely a thing of the past, although ideology was still frequently used to justify Russian actions.

Strategic interests often seemed to guide Soviet actions, including a desire to gain and maintain logistical support bases for air and sea patrols in the Indian and South Atlantic Oceans. While the PRC appears to have few strategic interests in Africa, Africa is regarded as an important battleground against Soviet hegemonism. (2) Peking's interest in Africa seemed at times to be a response to Soviet activity in the region.

In the 1970's, China and the Soviet Union competed, especially in southern Africa, by backing rival factions of various liberation movements. Initially, China was quite successful in this regard. "From the Soviet standpoint, China has come to constitute a serious obstacle to the USSR's efforts to win recognition as the patron of the national liberation movement in Africa."(3) This situation changed as the Soviet Union dramatically increased its presence on the continent. According to Kanet and Ipatov, this change resulted from several events which increased the Soviet ability to play a major role in Africa.

"In recent years, the overthrow of the Portuguese colonial empire, the increasing instability of the white-ruled countries in southern Africa, and the coup that deposed Emperor Haile Selassie in Ethiopia have provided the Soviets with opportunities to expand their involvement in the affairs of the continent."(4)
China reacted to the increasing Soviet presence in Africa by turning toward anti-Soviet regimes and by backing insurgencies against Soviet-supported governments. This sort of "reactive" policy could conceivably have endangered China's diplomatic successes in the region. According to Warren Weinstein, "the intense preoccupation with Soviet and Cuban involvement in Africa may well prove to be a critical obstacle to continued Chinese successes in Africa." (5)

During the period in question, the Soviet presence in sub-Saharan Africa increased dramatically. By 1978, the Soviet Union, largely through intervention and arms transfers, had established a strong position on the continent. Kanet and Ipatov see this trend continuing into the foreseeable future, and they note that the USSR now has the ability to influence events in most areas of the continent. The future will probably witness continued efforts by the Russians to solidify and enlarge their role in the area. (6)

China was able to do significantly better than the USSR with respect to economic aid. Since 1970, the PRC has become the principal communist donor of economic aid to Africa. Soviet economic aid decreased as a greater emphasis began to be placed on military and political contacts. "The early 1970's witnessed a continuing decline in the relative position of Africa in Soviet assistance programs, with commitments to Africa representing only 7.5 percent of new
aid."(7) While Soviet economic aid allocations to Africa increased in the mid-1970's to about 40 percent of their total aid given, China's aid program was clearly superior to that of the Soviet Union. "Considering its limited resources, the PRC has dispensed aid widely and generously in Africa, especially in the form of grants and interest free loans repayable over extended time with long grace periods."(8)

There is little doubt that some political rewards, although these may have been limited, sprang from China's generous provision of economic aid to sub-Saharan Africa. George T. Yu describes China's excellent relations with Zambia and Tanzania as partially an outgrowth of China's financial and material support for the construction of the impressive Tanzam railway. This expensive project, involving over 10,000 Chinese laborers and technicians, was completed on July 14, 1976. Despite the success of the massive undertaking, Yu feels that the 1974-78 period witnessed an overall decline in Chinese aid commitments to Africa. In the future, "new commitments were certain to be fewer and more modest." Yu cites several reasons for this, including: 1) China's own development needs; 2) the 'four modernizations' program initiated by the Teng regime in China; 3) adverse experiences with aid given to Albania and Vietnam ($5 billion and $10 billion, respectively); and 4) a general questioning by China's elites of the return on economic aid. (9)
From 1974 to 1978, trade continued to be of relatively little importance in the relations between the communist powers and Africa. China's trade with Africa exceeded that of the Soviet Union, but both were limited, with the Soviet total being only about one percent of total Soviet world trade. While there were isolated cases of more important trade connections, Soviet and Chinese trade with Africa was generally of little importance. African nations continued to look to the Western industrial powers for technology and development materials.

Often, and especially in the Soviet case, the aid offered was designed to increase trade eventually. An example of this can be seen in Guinea, where extensive Soviet aid was instrumental in developing the mining of bauxite, which has since become one of the Soviet Union's major imports from Africa. Soviet trade patterns in the 1970's seem to be largely guided by economic needs. "In general, Soviet trade in recent years has been based on economic criteria of interest to the Soviets themselves, and not primarily on political considerations."(10)

It is in the area of military involvement that the USSR has far outstripped Chinese activities in Africa, and this is probably the major reason why the Soviet Union has enjoyed recent successes on the continent. Smaldone cites "...the ascendance of military aid as the premier instrument of Moscow's African policy."(11) While the Soviet Union has
embarked on a massive and unprecedented program of arms exports to Africa, the Chinese have also increased the size of their military aid commitments to Africa, although in relative terms their programs have been far less obtrusive than those of the USSR. The Chinese programs have not altered local military balances, nor have they attracted international attention, as have those of the Soviet Union. (12)

One important reason for the increase in this type of Soviet activity, according to Colin Legum, is that "some African nations, anxious to buttress their own weak power, have weakened their commitment to genuine nonalignment and Pan-Africanism and have enlisted the support of major extracontinental powers." (13) The Soviet Union has often been willing to make arms readily available to such African purchasers. The USSR's ability to respond promptly and often sympathetically to African arms orders, to undercut other sellers and offer convenient credit terms and to deliver quickly is appreciated by buyers. (14) Soviet arms sales provide an important source of hard currency for the beleaguered Russian economy, even when concessionary sales terms are offered, as they often are to African nations.

From 1974 to 1978, Soviet military involvement in sub-Saharan Africa increased dramatically. Several billion dollars worth of weapons systems were sent to the region, with the largest amounts going to Ethiopia and Angola. In
addition, thousands of Soviet advisors were stationed in the region while almost 40,000 Cuban troops saw action there. According to Smaldone, this policy of increasing military involvement seems to have been an unqualified success for the USSR. "It is clear that Soviet military aid diplomacy in Africa since the 1960's has made remarkable gains by competing against and displacing Western suppliers."(15)

The Soviet Union obviously feels that its interests are best served by military rather than economic involvement in the region. While economic aid exceeded military aid until 1970, the reverse has since been true. Kanet and Ipatov note that "the (recent) expansion of Soviet involvement in Africa has been carried out far more through the provision of military assistance and political support than through a significant expansion of Soviet economic involvement."(16)

The Soviet military commitment in general, and arms transfers in particular, has easily overshadowed that of the PRC during this period. According to the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, in the period 1975-1979 the USSR sent almost a third of its $34 billion worth of total world arms transfers to Africa. In stark contrast, the PRC sent $150 million of its $750 million total to Africa. (17) Tanzania and Zaire have been the principal recipients of Chinese arms. In terms of acquiring arms, looking to Peking "is not as promising, because of China's inability to produce the kind of military logistical support that either
of the superpowers can provide."(18)

According to Smaldone, there is a definite limit to the advantages the Soviet Union can achieve from its policies of military involvement in Africa. "That Moscow's military assistance program has yielded privileges and advantages cannot be disputed, but the Kremlin's position in Africa has proven to be only as strong as its clients, none of which have, or are likely to, become satellites."(19) As we shall see in the case of Somalia, and as was also readily observable in Egypt, military involvement in no way guarantees long term benefits.

In several regions of sub-Saharan Africa, during the period 1974-78, Soviet successes were met with Chinese resistance. It is important to examine more closely events in these areas and Chinese and Soviet involvement in these events. The areas where the Sino-Soviet dispute in Africa took its most violent form were southern Africa and the Horn.

In southern Africa, the Angolan Civil War of 1975-76 led to a reduction of Chinese influence in the area. Daniel S. Papp emphasizes "that China's position in southern Africa was very strong prior to the Angolan War."(20) The Chinese supported all three liberation groups that were fighting the Portuguese -- the FNLA, MPLA and UNITA -- although the most support went to the FNLA followed by UNITA. As the MPLA, under Augusthino Neto, moved closer to the USSR, China
increasingly opposed it. "The victory of the MPLA weakened the Chinese position in southern Africa and led guerrilla organizations in Zimbabwe-Rhodesia, Namibia, and South Africa to turn increasingly toward the Soviet Union for material and financial support."(21) One exception proved to be Robert Mugabe's ZANU, supported by China, which was able to gain ascendancy in Zimbabwe in 1980.

Henriksen points out that the central reason the Soviet Union was able to involve itself militarily in the area was the local threat presented by the white minority regimes in Rhodesia and South Africa. "Peace and majority rule in southern Africa would remove much of the MPLA's and FRELIMO's need for common ground with the Soviet Union."(22) If Angola and Mozambique had not felt threatened by South Africa and Rhodesia, they would have been far less inclined to accept a close relationship with the USSR. The fear of military attack from South Africa and Rhodesia, and South Africa's support for insurgent groups, led Angola and Mozambique to desire continued Soviet military support.

In the case of Mozambique, which gained independence in 1975, expectations concerning Soviet military and economic assistance were not fulfilled. Papp indicates that Mozambique probably expected a greater Soviet commitment militarily as a protection against Rhodesian security forces, which routinely attacked guerrilla camps within Mozambique. (23) Machel felt that his country needed Soviet
weapons to defend against these frequent invasions. This need undoubtedly contributed to the close relations that developed between the two states. Still, Mozambique under Machel has proven to be less dependent on Moscow than has Angola. (24) This was largely because Mozambique had far less of a military threat with which to contend, and did not need Cuban troops, as did the Angolans. Although a Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation was signed in February of 1977 with the Soviet Union, it by no means stopped Mozambique from enjoying important diplomatic and economic relations with other nations, including the PRC.

It is important to note that before independence China was the principal arms supplier to FRELIMO. Relations between China and Mozambique have generally been very good. Chinese construction workers built roads in Mozambique and the PRC provided economic aid. But China's inability, or refusal, to provide the desired arms package meant that Machel had little choice except to go to the USSR. The stronger relationship that developed with Russia was a result of the threat posed by the white-minority regimes in the region.

The Angolan Civil War of 1975-76 proved in some ways to be a local manifestation of the Sino-Soviet dispute. Of the three factions vying for political control in this war, China supported two: Holden Roberto's FNLA and, to a lesser extent, Jonas Savimbi's UNITA. Following the massive
intervention of Cuban troops, the third organization, Neto's MPLA, achieved victory militarily in 1976. The PRC strongly protested the introduction of Cuban troops into Angola, as well as Soviet arms transfers to the MPLA.

China was not the only nation to complain about Soviet interventionism in the area. Locally, a number of nations (including, of course, South Africa and Rhodesia) saw the Soviet move as a threat to their own stability. Zambia's Kenneth Kaunda described the situation as "a plundering tiger with its deadly cubs now coming in through the back door." (25) Zambia supported the FNLA, and Chinese advisors trained FNLA recruits on Zambian soil. Zaire also strongly protested the Soviet involvement and continued to train UNITA guerrillas in Zaire, with Chinese instruction and assistance.

Legum feels that Soviet actions were taken partially in response to perceptions that the Chinese-backed FNLA and UNITA had formed an alliance to defeat the MPLA. (26) For their part, the Chinese responded to the MPLA's victory by forming closer ties with Zaire, which may well be the antithesis of a progressively governed nation. President Mobuto of Zaire was strongly anti-Soviet as well as anti-MPLA. Close relations with Zaire were uncharacteristic for Chinese foreign policy because of the nature of Mobuto's regime. Weinstein notes that "The Sino-Soviet competition for third world support has become the key political element
in China's central African policy, and this has allowed for the narrowing of the policy differences between China and the United States in these countries."(27)

Angola, like Mozambique, has not become a Soviet satellite. If the Soviet Union intervened in Angola in the hope of monopolizing its abundant natural resources, than the Kremlin has been disappointed. Angola has continued to maintain important economic ties with the West. While the US did not recognize Neto's government, Gulf Oil continued to operate an important offshore concession near Cabinda. In October of 1976, Angola signed a Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation with the Soviet Union. There has been little doubt that the MPLA is dependent on continued Soviet and Cuban support to maintain control of Angola. Although the degree of dependency is undoubtedly greater than that found in Mozambique, Angola should not be characterized as a satellite of the USSR.

The Angolan Civil War and the general state of tension that continued to exist in southern Africa contributed to a growth of the Soviet presence in the region. Simultaneously, China's position in the area worsened. The peaceful resolution of the Zimbabwe conflict under British auspices lessened the possibility of the Soviet Union gaining influence in that country, but the USSR still retained a dominant position in the area vis-a'-vis the Chinese.
Conflict in the Horn of Africa was the eventual result of Soviet arms transfers to the Somali Republic, which had every intention of using those arms to make good on irredentist claims to the Ogaden region of Ethiopia. The Soviet-Somali relationship deteriorated steadily as Soviet relations with Ethiopia improved in the wake of the coup that toppled Emperor Haile Selassie in 1974. The Soviet-Somali relationship had included important concessions of a strategic nature, consisting of support facilities for Soviet air and naval forces. In return, large Soviet arms shipments went to Somalia. But in the mid-1970's, the relationship began to sour.

In February of 1977, Lt. Colonel Haile Mariam Mengistu came to power in Ethiopia and, soon after, Ethiopia announced that it would turn to the Soviet Union for arms. In March, Fidel Castro visited both Ethiopia and Somalia in an attempt to establish a "Pax Sovietica" in the region, but Somalia's Siad Barre was not interested. As the Soviet involvement with Ethiopia became more apparent, Somalia became more intransigent about her territorial claims. In July of 1977, Somali irregulars invaded the Ogaden province of Ethiopia. The USSR responded by cutting off arms shipments to Somalia.

As economic and diplomatic relations deteriorated with the USSR, the Chinese, who had maintained healthy relations with Somalia for some time, sought to increase their
prestige at Moscow's expense. It was not difficult to condemn the Soviet Union under such circumstances; Barre was incensed with the Russian sellout. Henriksen takes note of a general policy of the PRC which applies in this instance. "China has been most active in winning friends among former pro-Soviet states." (28) A situation where the Soviets have been expelled provides an excellent opportunity for the PRC to attempt to improve its own standing.

On November 15, 1977, President Barre expelled the Soviet advisors from Somalia. Meanwhile, Ethiopia was moving closer to the USSR as Somali forces continued to occupy the Ogaden. In the same month, 400 Cuban advisors arrived in Ethiopia. By February, 1978, there were some 10,000 Cuban troops in Ethiopia. Soviet General Vasily Petrov was directing Cuban and Ethiopian forces in the field, and the USSR was flying in massive amounts of weaponry. By March of 1978, the Ogaden had been retaken.

Why did the Soviet Union abandon Somalia to form an alliance with Ethiopia? The Soviets probably distrusted Somali irredentism and did not want to be caught in a position of supporting an "unjust" war. The Somali invasion of the Ogaden clearly violated the Organization of African Unity's principle of the inviolability of African borders. The opportunity to gain influence in Ethiopia seemed to be too good to miss. As a potential ally, Ethiopia had a great deal more to offer despite Somalia's naval facilities.
Notwithstanding recent internal difficulties and instability, Ethiopia is a much larger and potentially more powerful nation than is Somalia.

From 1974 to 1978, the Sino-Soviet rivalry in Africa was altered dramatically as the Soviet Union improved its position substantially and as that of the PRC declined. To a large extent, these changes occurred as a direct result of the introduction of Soviet arms and advisors, as well as Cuban troops, into southern Africa and the Horn. It would be incorrect, however, to assume that the USSR maintains a vastly superior position in sub-Saharan Africa. China still has relations with more than forty African nations, and its prestige remains high. A number of nations that are anti-Soviet have looked to the PRC for aid. Chinese aid programs continued to draw praise, and trade with Africa easily exceeded that of the USSR.

Soviet "victories" in Africa may not be as important, in the long run, as China's steady establishment of strong bilateral relations with African states. The ideological affinity that nations like Mozambique and Ethiopia have with the Soviet Union may be less important than the Third-World ties that exist between China and Africa. "Mozambique, and Ethiopia to a lesser extent, developed their Marxist-Leninist ideology independent of Moscow, and it is therefore by no means a symbol of subservience or subjugation to the USSR."(29) It seems plausible to conjecture that African
socialism may some day be as independent of Moscow as Yugoslav or Chinese communism is today. Soviet achievements in sub-Saharan Africa in the mid-1970's may well be reduced in the 1980's, especially if southern Africa is stabilized.
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The difficulty of measuring the influence that one nation has over another has been a long standing problem in the assessment of international relations. This difficulty arises in part from the impossibility of defining certain elements of influence in a quantitative fashion. Often political scientists have formulated theories of influence but have made no effort to make them quantitative. Levgold comments that "foreign policy specialists have rarely wrestled with the problem of devising a conceptual scheme for analyzing or criteria for evaluating one nation's influence over another."(1) Rubinstein feels that "A universally applicable system for assessing influence is beyond reach, given the wide variations existing between nation-states.(2) The greatest problem lies in finding a means of determining what constitutes the evidence of influence. After this, a means of evaluating these various types of evidence is necessary so that "levels of influence" can be established that provide us with an accurate measure of intergovernmental influence.

The main problem, that of determining the evidence or the
bases of influence, has proven to be quite difficult. Of further difficulty is the establishment of quantitative values for these bases. Many of these have proven hard to discern as well as to quantify. One example would be the "prestige" that one particular nation enjoys in the eyes of another, for this concept is difficult to define in a narrow sense as well as being impossible to quantify.

Before reviewing attempts to establish the bases of influence, it is important to define and operationalize the term. Numerous definitions of influence have been constructed, some of which indirectly deal with the term, judging it to be a function of national power. Others establish influence conceptually but acknowledge the difficulty of applying such definitions. Levgold points out that "To define influence as the art of and success in affecting, altering, or controlling the action and attitudes of others immediately betrays the difficulty of giving the concept practical application."(3)

This problem is present in the definition provided by Rubinstein: "Influence is manifested when A affects through non-military means, directly or indirectly, the behavior of B so that it redounds to the policy advantage of A."(4) This strong definition of influence introduces a criterion that precludes military pressure or dominance, or its threat, as bases of influence, something that the Hungarians and other East Europeans would probably disagree with, for Soviet
military strength is an important component of Soviet domination of that region. The application of military power, or the threat of its application, seems to be an often-used means of gaining influence.

Felix Oppenheim provides us with a two-part definition of influence. The first defines influence in a negative sense. "P has influence over R's not doing x means that P performs some action y so that, were R to intend to do x, y would cause R not to do so x." (5) In this definition, the application of influence dissuades R from taking a particular action, x. It has a negative sense because it effectively negates R's ability or desire to take x, whatever it may be.

The second half of this definition involves the application of influence in a positive sense, designed to promote, rather than stop, an action. "P influences R to do x means that P performs some action y involving a communication which causes R to choose x." (6) Oppenheim's definition is admirable because it outlines two forms of influence in a simple, concise fashion that appears to be applicable to the study of international relations. The difficulty lies in establishing that, with the negative application of influence, P's y causes R to refrain from x. The similar difficulty with the positive application of influence involves proving that P's y causes R to do x. Unfortunately, these problems are not only found in this
particular definition; they consistently appear when one is trying to ascertain the presence of influence.

Since influence is fundamentally related to national power, some political scientists utilize power as a basis for defining influence. This unfortunately raises an additional problem, for if power cannot be applied, than it cannot produce influence. The bases of power are, however, strongly linked to the bases of influence, and for this reason it is important to understand influence as defined through national power. "Influence becomes both the application of power and the return from the application of power." (7)

P.H. Partridge considers power to be a highly inclusive term, incorporating an infinite number of levels sandwiched between the two poles of influence and domination. (8) Anthony de Crespigny asserts that "power" can be adequately substituted for "influence" and suggests seven forms of power, several of which seem pertinent to this discussion. Coercive and inducive power are defined as follows: "Coercive power is the capacity of A to get B to act in conformity with his intentions, and contrary to B's wishes, by making things unpleasant for B in order to secure his compliance or by threatening to make things unpleasant for B if he doesn't comply." (9) This is similar to the power that we would expect the PRC and the USSR to exercise in Africa, through the manipulation of economic or military programs. Inducive power is similar in that B acts in compliance with
A's desires as a result of A's provision of some sort of reward. (10)

Also of interest is de Crespigny's sixth form of power, attrahent power, "which A is able to exercise because B loves him, is impressed by his personality, or desires to be like him." (11) Persuasive power, which precludes the use of threats or incentives, and attrahent power are important forms of power for the PRC because of its inability to provide high levels of material incentives.

Russett utilizes an inventory of the bases of influence and power to ascertain the influence potential of a nation, although he recognizes that such a list must be very broad in nature, which presents problems. His "checklist of the bases of influence is meant to be exhaustive, on which any specific instrument of influence could be placed."(12) Influence is defined on the basis of national power, compounded by adding many factors, including military power, wealth, distance, population and quality of human resources, to name a few. Russett's inclusion of military power contrasts with Rubinstein's deliberate exclusion of this most important resource.

In World Power Trends, Cline provides us with a "comprehensive assessment of national power that integrates the major geographic, economic, military and political factors in accordance with the leverage they are commonly perceived to exert in international affairs."(13) This
"leverage" is equivalent to influence. Cline presents a formula that combines five variables to create a unique power rating. This formula can be applied to any nation. Unfortunately, its use of numerical values to describe several variables, strategic purpose and the will to pursue national objectives, is highly suspect. As an example of the results of Cline's formula, it finds the People's Republic of China (83) to be almost four times as powerful as Nigeria (22).

Problems arise not only with Cline's method, but with the larger difficulty of translating power into influence. While China is clearly more powerful than Nigeria, the application of that power, resulting in influence, cannot be taken for granted. Other factors must be considered. Despite Cline's results, the idea that China has the ability to strongly exert influence on Nigeria is clearly nonsensical, and Cline refrains from making any such claim. The additional factor that precludes China's ability in this sense is the enormous distance between the two nations. Clearly China is less able to bring its greater power to bear on Nigeria, than it is, for example, on Tibet. Cline's point may be that, all other things being equal, China has four times the ability of Nigeria to influence other nations. As noted earlier, Russett wisely includes distance as a basis of influence to avoid this problem.

Another problem with the means of defining influence
provided by both Russett and Cline involves other, less tangible, bases. Factors such as respect, bonds of community and "rightness" are difficult to quantify, to say the least. These less tangible aspects can be important in terms of influence. Russett notes that "nations or leaders who are widely perceived as following right norms of behavior can exert important influence as a result."(14)

Another extremely important variable that must be considered when analyzing influence relationships between nation-states involves the diplomatic ability, or talent, that a nation displays in applying its influence or power bases to another nation. A number of political scientists have noted the importance of this factor in the extension of influence. Morgenthau calls this factor the "quality of diplomacy" and describes it as "the art of bringing the different elements of national power to bear with maximum effect upon those points in the international situation which concern the national interest most directly."(15) Quality diplomacy serves to focus national power and increase its ability to gain influence or other objectives.

In a similar vein, Russett sees the ability to change and adapt as crucial to the achievement of policy goals. "The ability to learn" is the key element of influence. Nations like individuals must ultimately be able to change their methods, and even their goals, when earlier ones have outlived their usefulness."(16)
The importance of such talents is so great that they can outweigh other, more tangible, resources or lack thereof. "By using the power potentialities of a nation to best advantage, a competent diplomacy can increase the power, and influence, of a nation beyond what one would expect it to be in view of all the other factors combined."(17) The importance of this component can be seen in Africa, where, according to Levgold, "China has outperformed the Soviet Union in applying its influence, at least in the basic sense of matching means to ends."(18) Overall, the quality of Chinese application of its more meagre resource base to Africa has successfully countered the Soviet emphasis on quantity.

In the same context as his positive and negative brands of influence, Oppenheim identifies two main methods of gaining, or attempting to gain, influence. These are punishments and threats of punishment, and rewards. Aid can be seen as both a reward and a threat, for it can surely be curtailed at any time. Russett notes several applicable means of threatening or applying pressure as a means of forcing a certain action. "A developed nation may withhold foreign aid from a poor one; one state may withdraw support from another's position on a pet issue at the United Nations."(19)

Punishment, or coercion, has been little used as a technique for gaining influence by either the USSR or China
in Africa. Both nations recognize the difficulty of effectively applying pressure in Africa. "For either to begin throwing its weight around would complicate the celebration each makes of the natural alliance between socialism and these former, sometimes continuing victims of colonialism."(20)

It has already been mentioned that rewards automatically provide a potential means of punishment, although this may not be totally applicable in the African context. Rewards can be granted in a variety of ways besides through the provision of aid. Diplomatic support, military support and beneficial trade arrangements are three other types of rewards that have commonly been distributed. The provision of rewards by the PRC and the Soviet Union to Africa has been well documented since the late 1950's.

In order to measure satisfactorily the influence attained, it is important to understand the level of influence, or, to use Russett's term, the "scope of influence." He points out that "without carefully specifying what it is we want to obtain, the scope of influence, it is impossible to measure the amount of weight of influence."(21) If a specific goal is easily obtained and necessitates relatively little resource allocation, then its attainment is not a reliable means of gauging influence. For example, if the USSR wants to promote a certain vote in the UN General Assembly, and if Algeria feels inclined to
support that vote also, then the Soviet Union could hardly be said to have exercised influence in this particular case. That which the USSR wanted, Algerian support on a particular vote, was easily attainable, and its attainment does not signal the presence of Soviet influence.

The importance of historical factors in terms of varying the possibility of gaining and maintaining influence is unquestioned. One such factor of great importance to Sino-Soviet influence in Africa is the continuation of strong ties between many African nations and the West. These ties preclude or minimize the ability of the Communist powers to gain or exercise influence in Africa. Both Great Britain and France maintain a residual influence on the continent. Their economic ties with Africa are such that they have retained the power to severely punish by cutting off essential aid, trade and services. While this power has been reduced since the 1960’s, it is still important. Neither China nor the USSR has been able to exert influence comparable to that of the West, and neither has possessed the power to punish African nations severely as have Great Britain and France.

African animosity towards perceived neo-colonialism and an affinity with the East that stems from a dislike of imperialism would seem to be factors that would promote the influence of the Communist powers. This has not proven to be the case. While some ideological agreement has occasionally been expressed, and bitterness towards the West seems to be
everpresent, strong ties with the ex-colonial powers have continued.

In sum, Africa does not seem to be fertile ground for the growth of Chinese and Soviet influence, especially not on any grand scale. Levgold feels that "attempts to influence basic foreign policy orientations, domestic political transformations, or the status of third parties only promise failure." (22) The successes and failures both nations have experienced in Africa bear testimony to this statement. Rubinstein draws on the American experience in Vietnam to question the utility of expending resources through aid as a means of gaining influence. "Judging from the American experience, neither money nor its deprivation necessarily brings influence or benefits when these are most desired."(23) An important goal of both the Soviet and Chinese in Africa has been to gain diplomatic support. Over the past 20 years, their desire for support against the West has shifted to a desire for support against one another.

To identify influence, it is necessary to recognize the goals and rewards desired in return for resource allocations. The overriding goal of both Soviet and Chinese policy in Africa has been to gain diplomatic support. Over the past 20 years, their desire for support against the West has shifted to a desire for support against one another.

The difficulty of measuring influence may well rule out the possibility of establishing precise quantitative values
for one nation's influence over another. "Because of the
multidimensionality of the concept, influence may more
readily be inferred or identified than measured with any
precision."(24) Nevertheless, various means of identifying
influence do exist, some of which are more valuable than
others.

To identify and assess the strength of influence, one
must determine exactly what changes in the actual foreign
policy or internal behavior of a state were a result of the
exercising of influence by another state. It is necessary
to isolate and enumerate instances and issues where
influence has been applied. By analyzing such information,
we can gain a concrete indication of the presence of
influence in a particular relationship. For this purpose, it
is imperative that we determine relatively effective
indicators of influence. "These indicators will not be
direct measurements of Soviet or Chinese influence itself;
they are measurements which are presumed to correlate
significantly with such influence. Ideally, they should
indicate the likelihood that influence is present."(25) One
such indicator that will be discussed at greater length is
United Nations voting patterns.

Rubinstein enumerates a number of means of identifying
the existence of influence. The most pertinent one to this
thesis is the presence of a "sharp and sustained increase in
the quantity, quality and variety of resources committed by
to be." (26) The commitment of resources is a measure of influence as well as an indicator of influence, but it is not actual influence. The importance of aid disbursements in terms of gaining political influence has often been overly emphasized, but there is little doubt that it has some effect. The question to be answered is how much influence, specifically demonstrated through diplomatic support, redounds from the provision of aid.
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There are a number of difficulties inherent in any attempt to collect empirical data that will substantiate the existence of a relationship between aid received and diplomatic support given. One of the most obvious of these is the possible unreliability of aid data, since neither the USSR nor the PRC publish aid figures. It is necessary to use US government intelligence reports, published by the State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency. While such publications are not perfect, they undoubtedly provide the best estimates available. My confidence in using these figures is based on their use in other reputable studies.

This study by its very nature necessitates a high degree of subjectivity, especially when weighting various input variables. While such decisions may well be subject to criticism, justification will be offered. The unfortunate necessity for some degree of subjectivity stems from the variety of data that must be examined. While other authors have circumvented this difficulty by concentrating on more simplistic data analysis, I feel that it is necessary to gain the broadest possible perspective, and therefore have
introduced a far wider range of variables. Weighting is necessary because some of these variables (for example, the provision of troops) are obviously of greater importance than others (for example, trade imports). As stated earlier, these subjective decisions will be justified later in this paper.

Aid has often been seen as a political weapon, especially in its fullest context, incorporating the whole range of resource allocations into underdeveloped nations. "Although several objectives, including humanitarianism, are attributed to the giving of foreign aid, use of foreign aid as an instrument of political influence for promoting national interest is considered one of the most important objectives by political leaders as well as by academic experts." (3) Morgenthau sees the provision of aid by the US as a crucial component of American foreign policy. For the United States has interests abroad which cannot be secured by military means and for the support of which the traditional methods of diplomacy are only in part appropriate. If foreign aid is not available they will not be supported at all." (4)

During the past decade, there have been a number of academic efforts directed at the possible existence of a relationship between "foreign aid" (generally in the more
narrow sense of only economic aid) and UN voting. These efforts have, in my opinion, been lacking in certain areas, and have consequently been unable to find a definite and irrefutable correlation, or lack thereof, between these two variables.

Kul B. Rai's study focuses on US and Soviet aid to Third World nations. He hypothesizes that foreign aid is given either as an inducement to produce pro-donor voting, or it is given to reward those nations which have maintained a pro-donor voting stance. Some of the difficulties with Rai's study arise as a result of his use of all General Assembly roll call votes. "All the roll call votes taken in a particular session (with the exception of unanimous votes) are included in the analysis and no attempt is made to identify those votes which may be considered important to the donors or the recipients of foreign aid."(5) Examination of a select number of votes, where the recipient nation is faced with two clear choices, would more readily indicate the provision of diplomatic support on issues where the nation's vote is actually tantamount to a declaration of support or opposition. By examining essentially all votes for a particular year, Rai confuses the issue and makes his results more difficult to interpret.

I will also take issue with Rai's consideration of only a limited number of variables as a representation of "foreign aid." He uses three measures of foreign aid to find the
relationship between foreign aid and UN voting: "total amount of aid received by a country from a donor in a certain year, per capita aid, and aid as a percentage of a recipient's total Gross Domestic Product."(6) These measures fail to incorporate certain aspects of economic aid which should be included. The provision of technicians and economic advisors, for example, is of great importance. In any case, while Rai's categories are helpful in accounting for economic aid, they neglect other important resource allocations that undoubtedly are relevant to the inducement of diplomatic support. Military aid, especially in the 1970's, has become increasingly important and must be considered. Trade in the African context, often on terms favorable to the African nations, must also be considered. In sum, Rai's analysis of resource input factors is far too narrow and limited and his findings may be a result of the simplicity of his conceptual scheme: "There is very little relationship between total foreign aid and agreement index of the aid recipients with either of the superpowers."(7)

Eugene J. Alpert and Samuel Bernstein, in their several studies of the effects of aid on UN voting, focus on one issue, Communist China's admission into the United Nations. Their findings indicate that the provision of American aid was somewhat successful in gaining "no" votes in the General Assembly.

"A strong relationship between foreign aid and voting behavior clearly emerges on the admission issue. Countries that receive aid from both the
United States and the USSR are more likely to vote in favor of the Soviet position, while most of those receiving no aid vote in opposition to the resolution. The results...show that these countries follow a set of rational decision rules by favoring voting with the nation that supplies it with foreign aid."(8)

A major difficulty with these studies by Alpert and Bernstein is a result of their reliance on rather simplistic data. Aid either exists or does not exist, and no effort is made to differentiate between levels or amount of aid donated. This surely causes inconsistencies in the results of such a study, for it implies that all levels of aid are equal and will therefore result in similar levels of diplomatic support. This assumption is false, for common sense dictates that, all other things being equal, nations which are heavily dependent on US aid will be much more likely to hold a pro-US position than nations that are not, regardless of the fact that both nations receive some quantity of American aid.

Alpert and Bernstein's results suffer from their decision not to take into account the different sizes of aid programs. Like Rai's study, these scholars do not consider other types of aid. Also, by concentrating only on one highly volatile issue, the applicability of their results to other issues becomes questionable. While Rai's study is too broad in its scope, focusing on practically all votes, Alpert and Bernstein's is too limited in this respect. Nevertheless, the authors conclude that "although we do not
provide any statistical evidence of a causal relationship between foreign aid and UN voting, the associations revealed by the framework presented here tempt one to make the transition to a cause and effect explanation." (9)

The importance of employing a broad range of variables to account for resource allocations and thereby gain a better realization of the elements of influence can be seen from the inconclusive results of the above studies. The statistical base must be sufficiently broad to allow us to have the most realistic results. For this reason, my study will concentrate on thirty-two African nations and their comprehensive relations with both China and the Soviet Union. Similarities, in terms of the level of political and economic development, will be one means of explaining similarities in levels of influence. Using a longitudinal study, I will be better able to correlate changes in "aid" (in the broader context) with levels of diplomatic support. By focusing on a limited variety of UN issues where the Sino-Soviet vote split, I will be better able to analyze voting patterns on a pro-Soviet or pro-Chinese basis.

The elements of influence to be examined consist of a variety of resources that China and/or the USSR have allocated to these African nations. I have divided these into three broad categories: economic aid, trade, and military involvement. These in turn are broken down into a
variety of components. By examining all three of these categories, my study is designed to measure more carefully the level of great power involvement than have other recent studies.

Economic aid involves the allocation of resources for economic development in these African nations. This aid can be in the form of concessionary loans, grants, gifts of equipment and the services of technical advisors. Economic aid has traditionally been seen as a political lever. All of the major powers -- the US, the USSR, China, Great Britain and France -- have provided substantial amounts of economic aid to assist in Africa's development. The involvement of the West European powers reflects the long period when they essentially administered and exploited the continent. According to John White, aid is often one result of a colonial relationship.

"Not surprisingly, the countries which receive most aid, in relation to the size of the population, are those which have had in the past, and perhaps still have, a special relationship with some particular rich country, as a colonial dependency..." (10)

Trade ties are probably less important in the context of great power influence in Africa, because African nations are limited in their absorptive capacity, and although some development and export of raw materials has occurred, exports to the communist powers have been limited in both size and importance. However, both exports and imports can serve to gain some level of influence for China and the
Soviet Union. Exports from Africa are accepted in China and the USSR as a means of strengthening ties and establishing some measure of influence. Sometimes trade arrangements are really a form of subsidies, as higher prices are paid for goods than what can be had on the open market. By serving as a market for a limited number of African goods, China and the USSR heighten whatever level of economic reliance may exist. In much the same fashion, the import of goods into African nations serves to bind these countries to the USSR and China. Admittedly, such a relationship can, and has been, easily broken. But if, for example, the USSR provides 800 tractors to Nigeria, then Nigeria will presumably need spare parts and maintenance equipment. The potential establishment of some level of dependency is clear. While trade ties are obviously of less importance than the other two categories of elements of influence, they still must be included in this study.

The third, and most important, element of influence is military involvement. This has especially proven to be the case in the 1970's, as military aid has tended to exceed economic aid. Morgenthau sees military aid as being more purely political in its aims, for it "obligates the recipient towards the giver. The latter expects the former to abstain from a political course which might put in jeopardy the continuation of military aid. Military aid is here in the nature of a bribe." (11)
While military involvement in African nations may to some extent reflect a desire to gain strategic goals, it seems to have also been translated into a relationship of influence for the communist powers. African nations to whom military support is vital are obviously indebted to the donor nation, and the relationship is stronger than those that exist as a result of trade ties or purely economic aid. The various components of military involvement are discussed below.

In order to formulate a fairly comprehensive rating system for one nation's resource allocations to another, it is necessary in each case to examine several "sub-elements" of the three major groupings: economic aid, trade ties, and military involvement. First, these sub-elements must each be ranked on a scale of zero to ten. (For example, in 1977 a score of nine or ten would be granted to Ethiopia for the Soviet sub-element "troops provided," because of the large numbers of Cuban troops in Ethiopia at that time.) They must then be weighted by multiplying each by a set coefficient. Then, by summing all the individual numerical scores (which will all be between zero and ten) after they have been multiplied by the proper coefficient, we will have a single score that can be used to rank that particular nation among its peers in terms of the receipt of Soviet or Chinese resources.

The most important major input category is military involvement. Alpert and Bernstein imply that military
expenditures are perhaps the decisive factors in gaining influence. Its sub-elements are: a) arms transfers (score multiplied by a coefficient of 1.0); b) the provision of military advisors (.5); and c) the provision of combat troops to perform combat duties (1.5). Each ranking is first determined on a scale of zero to ten and then multiplied by the proper coefficient. A score of zero represents no involvement while ten represents the greatest involvement that occurred in that year. The coefficients, which afford us with our system of weighting, are determined on a subjective basis, justified by common sense.

The provision of combat troops is quite obviously the most important single means of gaining influence. This is especially true in a case where the contingent is large and/or serves a crucial security function. For this reason, it has received the highest coefficient, 1.5. The provision of troops is also probably the most difficult commitment for a great power to make, even with the "leasing" of Cuban troops.

Arms transfers have been of considerable importance as a means of attempting to gain influence in Africa, especially for the Soviet Union. Large amounts of weaponry of differing levels of sophistication and cost have been sent to Africa. Such transfers have occurred with far greater regularity than has the provision of troops. Arms transfers represent a means of attempting to increase influence that
is not as dangerous politically as providing troops. Arms transfers have been assigned a coefficient of 1.0.

The provision of advisors is of less significance than either the provision of troops or arms transfers. Advisors represent a less expensive investment and are more acceptable in a political sense than are combat troops. The provision of advisors is the simplest means for a great power to become involved militarily with a Third World nation, and this is recognized by these nations. Advisors have been expelled from Third World nations time and again. The function they perform is often realized to be less than essential to the recipient nation. For that reason, I have assigned this sub-category, the provision of military advisors, a coefficient of .5.

To ascertain a "score" for the communist powers' military involvement in a particular nation, one must only multiply each of the three individual scores by its proper coefficient and then add the results. The sum of the coefficients will be 3.0, compared to 1.0 for trade and 2.5 for economic aid. Thus the relatively greater importance of military involvement will be reflected in the total input score.

A second major element of influence, trade, is of considerably less importance than military involvement. Trade relationships with the USSR and China have rarely been strong, and economic ties with the West have remained very
close. Imports from the communist nations are probably slightly more important than exports to them. The PRC and the Soviet Union in some cases provide goods and services that may be very important to the individual economies of these nations. The provision of essential goods and services is very important to these developing nations. Influence derived from exports would result from agreements through which the USSR or China purchases commodities at higher than market prices at which the African nation would not have been able to unload them otherwise. An extreme example, and one that is not matched in Africa, is Cuba’s sugar exports to the Soviet Union. A ranking will be established from the percentage of imports and exports that are from/to China and Russia and this will be multiplied by the coefficients .6 and .4, respectively.

Economic aid has been of central importance in the past in terms of gaining influence, primarily because of the desperate economic straits in which these nations generally find themselves. In the 1970’s, it appears that a greater emphasis has been placed on military involvement. With the notable exception of the PRC, the major powers have all curtailed their economic aid programs to Africa. In any case, I will use several different measures of economic aid to ascertain its value. The first measure is the total dollar value of aid provided in a given year, and the second is per capita economic aid. The third and fourth measures are aid as percentage of Gross National Product per capita
and economic advisors. The advantage of having a large number of measures is that different levels of aid become more readily apparent. Also, a large number of factors is helpful in reducing whatever small error may result from a subjective weighting system.

Of these four factors of economic aid, the total dollar value of the aid seems to be the single most important, largely because of the propaganda value associated with aid disbursements. The other three factors are largely concerned with the impact of the aid and its actual importance to a particular nation's economy. Each of the three has been assigned a coefficient of .5. Significantly, these three combined are more important than the dollar-value sub-element (1.5 to 1.0). This reflects the fact that the greatest significance of aid in terms of influence is its importance to the economy. These three sub-elements more nearly measure the real importance of the aid given to the recipient nation.

Thus we have a formula, although admittedly imperfect, to measure each of the major elements of influence individually as well as a means of gaining a numerical value for the total involvement of either of the two communist powers in any one of thirty-two nations in any given year. Although perhaps incomplete, this scheme is a great deal more comprehensive than most. In any case, for a final annual resource input score, the formula that I have devised is as
follows:

\[ X = AT(1.0) + PT(1.5) + Ad(0.5) + Im(0.6) + Ex(0.4) + Ec(1.0) + PC(0.5) + PGC(0.5) + EA(0.5). \]

These variables represent the individual scores compiled for the following: \( AT = \) arms transfers, \( PT = \) provision of troops, \( Ad = \) advisors, \( Im = \) imports from, \( Ex = \) exports to, \( Ec = \) economic aid, \( PC = \) per capita economic aid, \( PGC = \) aid per GNP per capita and \( EA = \) economic advisors.

After the first stage of this study, each nation has received two comprehensive scores for each year, one for Soviet involvement and one for Chinese involvement. These calculations have produced the independent variable.

The next stage of this study involves the examination of UN voting, also on an annual basis. Once again, two tables will be necessary for each year, one for voting agreement with the USSR on issues where the Sino-Soviet vote differs, the other for voting agreement with the PRC on these issues. It is important to note that the only issues examined will be those where the Chinese and Soviet votes differed. This allows us to view an African nation's votes in terms of either a pro-Soviet or a pro-Chinese position as well as making it possible to establish an annual voting support score, based on the voting support given on each issue, for both China and the USSR.

For this purpose, it is necessary to quantify carefully the support given on a particular issue. Each issue will be worth ten points total, and the level of support will
therefore be on a ten point scale. All issue scores for a particular year can then be summed and divided by the number of issues to provide a score of voting agreement for that year. To get an annual numerical value for voting support, we will take the average score for that year for each relationship. Each African nation will, therefore, again have two scores: one for diplomatic support for the USSR, the other for the PRC. Necessarily, these two scores will together equal 10.00, for support given one of these countries is taken away from the other since we are only examining issues in which the two differed in their position. Each nation's deviation from the mean can then be computed to allow us to see which nations had higher indices of agreement with China or the Soviet Union.

One last point of some potential consequence involves my treatment of absences and abstentions. I have determined that an absence from a roll call vote will in practice be considered a no vote. An absence would therefore reduce a nation's number of votes on a particular issue. An abstention, however, indicates that a nation, while not desiring to support an issue, has no desire to oppose it either. An abstention, therefore, will be considered as half of a vote each way. If a particular issue is only voted on once, and an abstention results, the issue scores would necessarily be 5 and 5 for the nation that abstained.

Formation of a composite annual score for voting support
for both the USSR and the PRC completed the second stage of this project. The third and final stage involves comparing each nation's two annual resource allocation scores with the deviation from the mean of their two annual voting support scores. Relationships should be observable. Input scores should correlate roughly with voting scores.

Finally, this comparison may produce some results where, for example, diplomatic support relative to input is far below the mean. Some results may not fit the general pattern, and it may be necessary to examine these more closely in order to explain these differences by preparing a short case study.

In conclusion, this study is not expected to provide final proof in the continuing debate about the relationship between UN voting and the provision of aid. However, it will serve a useful function as it more carefully and completely prescribes the elements of aid. In essence, this study is more broadly based and more comprehensive than that done by Rai, but it does not suffer from the use of generalities as do those by Alpert and Bernstein. My results will presumably be more conclusive than theirs have been.

The People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union, active competitors for diplomatic support in Africa, have extended numerous resources to nations of that continent. Have such commitments been successful in generating
diplomatic support? The answer should become clear in the following pages.
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Chapter Five
Results of
Quantitative Research

For several reasons, a number of nations were excluded from the statistical survey of Sino-Soviet resource allocations to sub-Saharan Africa during the 1974-78 period. I had to exclude Angola because of a lack of trade statistics and also because of its later entry into the United Nations. Botswana was excluded largely because of its great dependency on South Africa, which may well affect its relations with the communist powers. Guinea and Equatorial Guinea had to be removed from quantitative consideration because of highly questionable trade statistics.

My quantitative research revealed significant levels of Soviet and Chinese resource allocations to the sub-Saharan region of Africa. However, these resource inputs did not necessarily affect the African nation's General Assembly voting on issues contested between the Soviet Union and China. A regression analysis indicated that there is an extremely low correlation between material relationships and United Nations' voting in this case. The data from my research is presented in an appendix.
Despite the lack of correlation, there are a few nations that consistently displayed above-average support for one of the communist power's positions. Zambia is a case in point. The Zambian voting index of agreement with the PRC is consistently higher than the average. While this may be a reflection of similar viewpoints, it should be pointed out that Zambia and China maintained excellent diplomatic and economic relations during this period. The most consistent supporter of the Soviet position was Rwanda, although relations between the two nations appear to have been limited.

Somalia provides an interesting case which may indicate that voting support stems not from resource inputs but rather from the status of bilateral relations. Somalia voted largely in support of the Soviet position from 1974 to 1976. But as relations deteriorated in 1977, Somalia began to adopt a less pro-Soviet voting stance. This pattern continued into 1978, and has been fully described in Chapter Two.

It seems best to review each year of the five year period to gain a better perspective on Chinese and Soviet resource allocations to the region. Because of the significantly low correlation these allocations have with voting, I will refrain from discussing the voting support scores and will concentrate on economic and military contacts only. Principal sources for trade and aid statistics were,
respectively, the UN Yearbook of International Trade and the CIA publications on Communist activities in the Third World. The SIPRI Disarmament Yearbooks were my principal source of information on arms transfers and military involvement. These publications are generally considered reliable and have often been used in similar studies. A full tabulation of the various allocation and voting scores can be found in an appendix.

Soviet and Chinese involvement in sub-Saharan Africa in 1974 was limited in comparison to later years of the period under study, but both nations committed an impressive level of resources to the region. While there were no Cuban troops in Africa at the time, the Soviet Union provided advisors to a number of countries, as did the Chinese. The USSR made large deliveries of arms to Somalia, Uganda, and newly-independent Guinea-Bissau. For the most part, these deliveries consisted of jet fighters (MIG-17's and MIG-21's) although Somalia also received SA-2 surface-to-air missiles and 100 T-54 tanks. Chinese arms transfers to the region were limited to nine MIG-17's for Sudan and eight MIG-19's for Tanzania.

In terms of economic aid, Chinese commitments were far larger than those of the USSR. The principal recipients of Chinese aid were Mauritania ($57 m.), Niger ($50 m.), Tanzania ($75 m.) and Zambia ($51m.). In contrast, the most important recipient of Soviet economic aid was Mali ($12
m. No other Soviet beneficiary was given more than $2 million.

In terms of trading relationships, China was also more important in the region. China was an important trading partner for a number of African nations, including Benin (11% of exports), Gambia (10% of imports), Madagascar (11% of imports), Mali (9% of imports and 17% of exports), Sudan (9% and 8%) and Tanzania (12% of imports). In addition, China had economic relations with a larger number of African nations than did the USSR.

The Soviet Union was an important economic partner for Guinea only, and this was partially a reflection of that nation's exports of bauxite to the USSR. Guinea received approximately 15% of its imports from the Soviet Union while sending 6% of its exports to that nation. In no other African nation included in this study did the percentage of imports from and exports to combine to equal 10 or more.

As was often the case, 1974 was a year in which Soviet military involvement in the region was far greater than that of the PRC. The Chinese, however, were far more involved in the region economically. In terms of trade and economic aid, the PRC easily outdistanced the USSR in 1974.

The next year, 1975, again witnessed large Soviet arms transfers to sub-Saharan Africa. Uganda received a large number and variety of Russian weapons, including MIG-21's,
T-54 tanks, AT-Sagger anti-tank missiles and K-13 air-to-air missiles for the MIG's. Somalia received ship-to-ship missiles (SSN-2) and Nigeria acquired a squadron of MIG-21's equipped with K-13 missiles and an unknown quantity of older MIG-17's. In stark contrast, the PRC's military transfers to the region consisted of four "Shanghai" patrol boats, two each for Cameroon and Equatorial Guinea.

Chinese aid commitments fell off slightly but were still impressive. Principal recipients were Mozambique ($59 m.), Madagascar ($55 m.), Gambia and Guinea-Bissau (both receiving $17 m.). Soviet aid commitments were again limited, with Somalia acquiring the lion's share ($63 m.) and Chad granted almost all of the remainder ($9 m.).

China also continued to maintain a more impressive trading record with sub-Saharan Africa. While of greatest importance to Mali (14% of imports, 18% of exports), the China trade was also significant for Gambia (12% of imports) and Tanzania (11% of imports). Soviet trade again focused on Guinea (17% of Guinean imports, 14% of exports), although newly-independent Guinea-Bissau established important economic ties (16% of imports) with the USSR. Cameroon increased its exports to the Soviet Union (11% of total) and Somalia too became increasingly involved (8% of imports, 6% of exports).

The following year, 1976, witnessed an enormous increase in the Soviet Union's military involvement in the region,
while the PRC maintained its commitments at close to the same level as 1975. In addition to sending 500 military advisors to Angola and subsidizing an expeditionary force of some 10,000 Cuban troops, the USSR transferred 30 ancient T-34 tanks and eight more modern T-54's plus a large number of SA-7 surface-to-air missiles to the MPLA. As well as this major commitment to Angola, more than 100 T-34 and T-54 tanks were sent to Mozambique. Nigeria received 12 more MIG-21's equipped with the K-13 system; Uganda acquired 12 MIG-21's and Zambia purchased six MI-5 helicopters. In contrast, China made no significant arms deliveries to the region in 1976.

In terms of aid, the PRC continued to outshine the Soviet Union, although both nations limited their commitments significantly. Principal recipients of Chinese aid were Tanzania and Zambia ($28 m. each) as they acquired the final credits extended in connection with the Tanzam railway construction project. The most important recipients of Soviet economic aid were Guinea-Bissau ($13 m.) and Angola ($10 m.). The third major ex-Portuguese colony, Mozambique, received a mere pittance in Soviet aid ($3 m.).

Chinese trade relations remained of importance to Gambia (13% of imports) and Mali (7% of imports, 10% of exports), despite a marked decline in trade with the latter. Of significance was an improving trade relationship with Somalia. Tanzanian (and Zambian) imports from China dropped
precipitously, a result of the completion of the Tanzam railway. For the USSR, Guinea continued to be the closest thing to a dependency the region had to offer (23% of imports, 17% of exports). Ghana increased her exports to the USSR (11% of total) and Somalia's imports from the Soviet Union increased substantially (to 12% of total) as well.

In 1977, while Soviet military support for Angola was maintained at a high level, massive deliveries were also made to Ethiopia. Angola received 55 more aged T-34 tanks as well as SA-7 surface-to-air missile systems, and the Cuban presence was increased substantially to an estimated 19,000. A truly phenomenal package was sent to Ethiopia in reaction to Somalia's invasion of the Ogaden. Five hundred Soviet advisors and a few Cubans arrived in 1977, but most of the Cuban troops arrived in early 1978. Included in the weapons sent to Ethiopia were 24 MIG-21's, six MIG-23's, 50 T-54 tanks and 100 T-55's. These weapons systems were unparalleled in the region in terms of their numbers and sophistication. To some extent, their operation required expertise that Ethiopian troops did not possess. Mozambique also was sent 12 MIG-21's. The PRC sent two patrol boats to Cameroon and 20 T-62 tanks to Zaire. This latter transfer is an indication of the development of closer relations between Zaire and the PRC in response to the perceived Soviet gains in southern Africa.

Chinese economic aid to the region decreased dramatically
from 1976 to 1977. Liberia was the major recipient ($10 m.), but no other nation received a substantial commitment. The decrease in Chinese aid allowed the USSR to briefly take the lead. Of interest was a major commitment to Tanzania ($19 m.), often considered to be China's greatest friend in the area. Angola and Mozambique also received Soviet economic aid ($6 m. and $5 m., respectively).

Both Chinese and Soviet trade to sub-Saharan Africa continued to be of relatively little importance to the region as a whole. Important relations with the PRC continued for Gambia (12% of imports) and Mali (5% of imports, 12% of exports). Tanzania continued to reduce its imports from China (to less than 2% of total). The Soviet Union continued to be an important trading partner for Guinea (20% of imports, 15% of exports), Ghana (10% of exports), and Somalia (12% of imports).

Soviet military deliveries to Angola and Ethiopia continued on a large scale in 1978. Angola received 2000 SA-7 portable surface-to-air missiles that had been ordered in 1976. Ethiopia acquired an additional 25 T-54 tanks as well as 30 of the newer T-70's. Both nations also retained large numbers of Soviet advisors as well as Cuban troops. In addition, the number of Soviet advisors in Mozambique was increased to more than 1000. China's military role in the region was limited to a small number of advisors in several countries, including Equatorial Guinea and Mozambique.
Chinese aid commitments increased somewhat, but did not approach the levels of 1974-76. Somalia, no longer allied with the USSR, received a substantial amount ($18 m.) of Chinese aid, while Liberia received the largest amount ($23 m.) for the second straight year. Liberia also received aid from the Soviet Union ($6 m.). In addition, the Russians sent significant amounts of aid to Mozambique ($5 m.) and again to Tanzania ($18 m.)

The PRC become an important trading partner for Mozambique (22% of exports) in 1978. In addition, important trade relations were maintained between Gambia (10% of exports) and Mali (12% of exports) and the PRC. China also became a more important trading partner again for Somalia (6% of imports, 11% of exports). Soviet trade relations decreased slightly in 1978, but remained of importance to Guinea (figures not available) and Ghana (11% of exports). Somalia's trade relations with the USSR totally bottomed out in the wake of Barre's November 1977 expulsion of all Soviet advisors (.6% of imports, 0% of exports).

The period witnessed Soviet domination over the PRC in terms of military involvement in the region of sub-Saharan Africa. This is largely a reflection of each nation's capabilities. China does not have the ability, militarily or logistically, to act as the Soviet Union did in Angola or Ethiopia. For that matter, she may not desire to do so.
In terms of economic aid, China's program was clearly of consistent superiority. More nations received more substantial amounts of Chinese aid. Although Chinese commitments seemed to be decreasing (as did those of the USSR), they continued to be qualitatively and quantitatively superior to those of the Soviet Union.

In terms of trade, neither the PRC nor the USSR are of great importance to the region as a whole. Sub-Saharan Africa continued to trade largely with the western industrial nations, often with the ex-colonial powers. On a relative scale, however, Chinese trade seemed to be somewhat more important to these nations than did that of the USSR. Consistently throughout this period, China was an important trading partner for Gambia and Mali. The Soviet Union was of greatest importance in this respect for Guinea.
This study has been conclusive in a number of ways. It has demonstrated that either 1) voting agreement is not an accurate indicator of influence, or 2) neither the Soviet Union nor China have gained much influence despite major resource allocations to sub-Saharan Africa. My assumption is that China and the Soviet Union do possess influence in Africa, although that influence is not only a result of the three types of resources allocated. A number of less tangible factors, discussed at greater length in Chapter Three, are also of importance in this regard.

The implication is that the index of voting agreement is not an accurate means of establishing the presence of influence. There are several reasons for this. First of all, the resolutions voted on during the period in question were not of intense significance to either the USSR or the PRC, and it seems doubtful that Moscow or Peking would have applied much pressure in an attempt to gain votes for their respective positions. Second, most of the thirty-two nations, regardless of their relations with the communist powers, would probably vote according to their own national interest. The national interest in such cases often does not
correspond to that of China or Russia. The level of dependency necessary to make one country's national interest coincide with another's must indeed be high. Sovereign nations vote independently of one another, and it seems questionable whether Moscow or Peking would normally expect extensive support from their aid recipients in the General Assembly.

On a particular issue of far greater significance than those debated during the 1974-78 period, the results may well be more positive. This is why Alpert and Bernstein's study is so interesting. The single issue under recurring discussion -- the admission of the PRC to the UN -- had a number of important political ramifications (for instance, the expulsion of Chiang's Republic of China) and it was therefore the focus of far more intense political pressure. Under such circumstances, it seems logical to assume that nations that possessed the capability would be much more likely to exert their influence. Significantly, Alpert and Bernstein did find a correlation between US aid and votes against China's admission in the 1960's. That correlation was gradually reduced as nations came to realize the stupidity of keeping a nation comprising one quarter of the world's population out of the United Nations.

The three elements which combined to make up the quantity "resource inputs" -- military involvement, economic aid and trade -- all serve to some extent as a potential basis of
influence. Influence does not truly exist unless pressure is applied to cause or change an action. By itself, a high level of resource allocation is not an indication of influence, although it can be a partial indicator of potential influence. Influence is only brought to bear when a request is made, with the inference being that non-acquiescence will result in some unpleasant manipulation of the bases of potential influence. This however is influence in its most negative sense. Because of the many difficulties involved, quantitative studies cannot concern themselves with the type of influence that stems from admiration and respect. In any case, diplomatic decisions are not often based on emotion.

The difficulty of measuring influence continues to be a problem. Without extensive insights into the political decision-making process of a given country, it would seem be very difficult to accurately gauge what influences decision-makers feel they must satisfy. Alvin Z. Rubinstein makes this point and says that to gain an accurate estimate of the influence generated by aid, "we need to trace the aid into the political system and see its relevance for (the country's) domestic political conflicts and outcomes." (1) In other words, the importance of Soviet or Chinese involvement to a particular nation is not necessarily a function of the level of involvement but is related to its impact on the decision-making leaders or process in that country. "Instead of analyzing aggregate data on aid and trade, we need to
know into which ministries and sectors of the economy the aid is channeled, how it affects not the economy but the political position of the ruling elite..."(2) What Rubinstein suggests is quite a difficult task. While the value of such a study is unquestioned, the impracticality of actually conducting it seems to have dissuaded the profession from such attempts.

If aggregate data analysis is not sufficient to measure influence, and neither is General Assembly voting, what realistic options remain for the researcher? Precious few, it would seem. Influence, because of the large number of intangible factors involved in the concept, may be impossible to quantify. Rubinstein's idea, involving penetration of the upper levels of a bureaucracy, seems more suited to an intelligence operation than to an academic effort.

By concluding that influence as a concept is intangible, the idea of realistically measuring it seems to be precluded. Perhaps an amalgamation involving data accumulation, personal interviews (polls of ministry officials), and the solicitation of a variety of expert viewpoints would serve to provide a more realistic "measure" of influence, but this is questionable. As seen time and again, "expert" opinions often vary widely. In any case, such a massive project would be most difficult to undertake. The "measurement" of influence, I fear, will continue to be
largely a misnomer.

Africa has been an important ideological battlefield for the Sino-Soviet rivalry since its outward manifestations began in the early 1960's. Both nations have sought to gain some measure of political support in Africa. Colin Legum, in an article entitled "The Soviet Union, China and the West in Southern Africa," contends that China's approach has generally been more successful than that of the USSR:

"The Chinese profited more quickly from their mistakes than did the Russians... avoiding blatant bids for political domination, and tailoring their programs to meet the particular requests of the Africans themselves, they imparted a sense of both generosity and disinterest to their aid role which has led to their steadily widening their sphere of influence on the African continent."(3)

To a large extent, both nations have been unsuccessful in their quest for support, for most African nations desire to maintain a nonaligned stance regarding this dispute as well as the East-West struggle. Firm commitments of political support are rare and often do not last for very long.

Although China and the Soviet Union have at times enjoyed very close relations with individual African states, their position is fundamentally weaker than that of the Western ex-colonial powers. Although Africa may identify more closely with the USSR and the PRC in an ideological sense, material necessities virtually demand continued close ties
with the West. This fact is a reflection of these nations' colonial heritage as well as the West's greater ability to provide technological and development assistance. In sum, while China and the Soviet Union may find a degree of compatibility with African nations on an anti-imperialist basis, African nations will largely refrain from extensive economic ties with the communist powers. In the realm of military procurements, however, the Soviet Union will continue to have many customers as long as its prices and terms of sale compete effectively with those of the West.
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**Involvement and Voting Scores**

**Abbreviations for Scores:**

MI = military involvement

TR = trade

Aid = economic aid

Tot = total

Vote = voting
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>PRC MI</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>Aid</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>USSR MI</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>Aid</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cen. Afr. Rep.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Volta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Aid</td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Aid</td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cen. Afr. Rep.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Volta</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaire</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Aid</td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Aid</td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cen. Afr. Rep.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Volta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Aid</td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Aid</td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cen. Afr. Rep.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Volta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaire</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Aid</td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Aid</td>
<td>Tot</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cen. Afr. Rep.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Volta</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaire</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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