Grain Corridors and Power Struggles: Ukraine, Russia, and African Food Security Diplomacy

By

Stephen Egwuatu Amadi, PhD.
Department of History and Diplomatic Studies
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt
stephen.amadi05@gmail.com
08032667347

Abstract

The Russia–Ukraine war has exposed the fragility of global food systems, particularly in Africa, where dependence on grain imports from the Black Sea region threatens food security and diplomatic stability. The problem lies in Africa's structural dependency on external food supplies, leaving it vulnerable to geopolitical conflicts. Existing literature emphasizes humanitarian responses but overlooks the diplomatic and strategic dimensions of food security. This study aims to examine how the grain corridor negotiations between Russia, Ukraine, and international actors reshape Africa's food security diplomacy. Grounded in Dependency Theory and Complex Interdependence Theory, it justifies the need to reimagine Africa's role in global food governance. The findings reveal that while the Black Sea Grain Initiative mitigated short-term crises, it reinforced Africa's peripheral status in global trade. The study concludes with recommendations for regional grain reserves, sustainable agriculture, and multilateral engagement to enhance Africa's food sovereignty and diplomatic leverage.

Keywords: food security, diplomacy, grain corridor, Russia-Ukraine war, Africa

Introduction

The ongoing Russia–Ukraine war has revealed the fragility and geopolitical interdependence of global food supply chains, particularly in Africa, where millions rely on grain imports from both countries. Before the conflict, Ukraine and Russia accounted for nearly 30% of global wheat exports, with substantial portions directed toward North and Sub-Saharan Africa (FAO, 2022). When the war disrupted grain exports through the Black Sea, food prices skyrocketed across

Africa, intensifying hunger and political instability in nations such as Egypt, Sudan, and Nigeria. This crisis underscored the continent's strategic vulnerability to global geopolitical events and highlighted the urgent need for a more resilient and autonomous food diplomacy framework.

The Black Sea Grain Initiative (BSGI), brokered in July 2022 by the United Nations and Turkey, temporarily reopened Ukrainian ports for agricultural exports, averting a full-blown food crisis in Africa. Yet, the suspension of the deal in 2023 by Russia illustrated the fragility of humanitarian corridors and the weaponization of food supplies in modern geopolitical conflicts (UNCTAD, 2023). For African nations, this episode was a sobering reminder of their marginal role in global trade negotiations and the limits of external dependency for essential commodities. Beyond humanitarian consequences, the disruption revealed a broader structural issue, the intersection of food security, diplomacy, and power politics in a multipolar international order.

This emerging reality situates food diplomacy as a strategic arena of global influence. Grain corridors have become not only channels of trade but also instruments of soft power and geopolitical leverage. Russia's use of grain exports as a diplomatic tool to engage African governments, through promises of free shipments or bilateral deals, contrasts with Ukraine's own outreach through summits like the "Grain from Ukraine" initiative (2023), which aimed to foster African solidarity and political support. Consequently, African states have found themselves navigating a delicate balance between conflicting global powers, seeking to safeguard national food interests while maintaining political neutrality. The African Union (AU) and regional bodies such as ECOWAS and COMESA have begun exploring new frameworks for food sovereignty, emphasizing intra-African trade, agricultural investment, and the creation of strategic grain reserves. However, these efforts remain constrained by structural inefficiencies, limited technological innovation, and weak regional coordination. The current food crisis, therefore, presents both a challenge and an opportunity for Africa to redefine its diplomatic posture and enhance agency in global food governance.

This study situates the debate within the broader context of African food security diplomacy, focusing on the interplay between global grain corridors and regional

resilience strategies. It aims to uncover how the Russia–Ukraine conflict reconfigures Africa's diplomatic options, and how the continent can transition from dependency to self-reliance through strategic engagement, agricultural reform, and multilateral collaboration. In essence, the grain crisis provides a lens through which to understand Africa's struggle for autonomy, dignity, and leadership in shaping the future of global food systems.

Conceptual Clarifications and Theoretical Foundations

The discourse on grain corridors, power struggles, and African food security diplomacy necessitates a conceptual and theoretical grounding to illuminate how global conflicts shape Africa's economic dependencies and diplomatic choices. The key concepts, food security, food diplomacy, and grain corridors, intersect within the broader framework of international political economy and soft power theory.

Conceptual Clarifications

Food Security refers to a situation where all people, always, have physical, social, and economic access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food (FAO, 1996). In the African context, food security is a multidimensional issue tied not only to agricultural productivity but also to trade systems, infrastructure, and global supply chains. Disruptions such as the Russia–Ukraine war directly threaten this equilibrium, revealing the continent's vulnerability to external shocks.

Food Diplomacy involves the use of food and agricultural commodities as tools of international engagement, negotiation, and influence (Cull, 2022). It encompasses both the humanitarian and strategic dimensions of international relations, where states deploy food aid, trade agreements, or logistical corridors to advance foreign policy objectives. For Africa, food diplomacy operates at the intersection of dependency and agency, as the continent negotiates between donor assistance and self-sufficiency.

Grain Corridors are trade and transport routes established to facilitate the export and import of grains and other agricultural products across borders. The Black Sea Grain Initiative (BSGI) exemplifies this, having allowed Ukrainian grain exports to flow through designated maritime channels during wartime disruptions

(UNCTAD, 2023). However, such corridors are not merely logistical mechanisms; they are geopolitical spaces where competing interests between global powers, international organizations, and recipient states play out.

Theoretical Foundations

The analysis of Africa's engagement in grain diplomacy draws on two major theoretical frameworks: Dependency Theory and Complex Interdependence Theory.

Dependency Theory, rooted in the works of Andre Gunder Frank (1967) and Samir Amin (1976), posits that the global economic system perpetuates inequalities between core (developed) and periphery (developing) states. Africa's heavy reliance on external grain imports exemplifies this dynamic, where structural dependency on Northern producers and exporters constrains autonomous policymaking. The grain corridor negotiations, dominated by non-African powers, mirror this asymmetry. Dependency theorists argue that Africa's underdevelopment is systematically reproduced through these unequal exchanges, leaving little room for economic sovereignty.

In contrast, Complex Interdependence Theory, developed by Keohane and Nye (1977), offers a more nuanced interpretation of global relations. It suggests that states are interconnected through multiple channels—economic, social, and environmental, and that power is exercised through soft mechanisms such as trade, diplomacy, and cooperation rather than coercion alone. In the context of food diplomacy, both Russia and Ukraine use grain as soft power, a non-military means to gain political goodwill and influence. African states, in turn, navigate this interdependence strategically, balancing short-term needs with long-term resilience.

This dual theoretical framing helps explain the paradox of Africa's position: while global interdependence offers opportunities for diplomatic maneuvering, structural dependency perpetuates vulnerability. The grain corridor crisis thus becomes a prism through which to examine Africa's broader struggle for agency within a multipolar order.

Analytical Implications

Integrating these theories reveals that food diplomacy is not a neutral humanitarian practice but a strategic negotiation of power and dependency. It highlights how the continent's reliance on external food supplies creates a diplomatic vulnerability that external actors exploit for influence. Simultaneously, it underscores Africa's potential to transform interdependence into empowerment through regional cooperation, agricultural innovation, and assertive diplomacy.

Hence, the theoretical foundation underscores the urgent need for Africa to transition from a position of reactive dependence to one of proactive resilience, where grain diplomacy becomes a tool not of survival, but of strategic leverage in global politics.

The Geopolitical Context and Historical Evolution of Grain Corridors

The Russia–Ukraine war has redefined global food systems and exposed the fragility of supply chains linking Eastern Europe to Africa. To understand the contemporary dynamics of grain diplomacy, it is vital to situate the issue within its historical and geopolitical evolution. Grain corridors, though often presented as humanitarian or logistical responses, have long been instruments of strategic influence and economic control in global affairs.

Historical Evolution of Grain Diplomacy:

Historically, food and grain have served as instruments of both cooperation and coercion. During the Cold War, the United States and the Soviet Union used food aid as a diplomatic weapon to win ideological allies in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The U.S. Food for Peace program, initiated in the 1950s, linked surplus grain exports with geopolitical interests, promoting American soft power under the guise of humanitarianism (Shaw, 2007). Similarly, the Soviet Union provided grain and agricultural assistance to sympathetic regimes, embedding food within the logic of political alignment.

In post-colonial Africa, the legacies of this food diplomacy persisted. Many African countries, burdened with structural adjustment programs (SAPs) and weak agricultural sectors, became dependent on grain imports from external powers. Food became a tool of diplomacy, used to maintain international alliances or

secure favorable trade conditions. The globalization of food systems in the 1990s further reinforced these dependencies as African markets opened to subsidized imports, undermining local production capacities (Clapp, 2012).

The Russia–Ukraine War and the Black Sea Grain Initiative:

The outbreak of the Russia–Ukraine war in 2022 disrupted one of the world's most critical food supply chains. Russia and Ukraine together account for nearly 30% of global wheat exports, with substantial shares of maize and sunflower oil (FAO, 2023). The conflict effectively blocked Ukrainian grain exports through the Black Sea, triggering food price spikes across Africa and Asia.

In response, the Black Sea Grain Initiative (BSGI) was established in July 2022, brokered by the United Nations and Turkey, to facilitate safe grain exports from Ukrainian ports. While the initiative temporarily stabilized global food prices, its fragility became evident when Russia withdrew in mid-2023, citing Western sanctions and logistical restrictions (UNCTAD, 2023). For Africa, the suspension of this corridor translated into higher food insecurity, inflation, and renewed dependency on external assistance.

Russia, seeking to counter Western narratives, launched its own grain diplomacy campaign, offering free or discounted wheat to African nations and promising to replace Ukrainian supplies (Reuters, 2023). This gesture, while welcomed by some African leaders, underscored the political instrumentalization of food in global diplomacy. Both Kyiv and Moscow sought African sympathy and diplomatic alignment in international forums, including the United Nations General Assembly.

Africa's Geoeconomics Vulnerabilities:

Africa's reliance on imported grain, especially from Russia and Ukraine, reveals deep-seated structural vulnerabilities in the continent's agricultural and trade systems. Countries like Egypt, Sudan, Kenya, and Nigeria import over 40% of their wheat from the Black Sea region (World Bank, 2023). This dependence has made African economies acutely sensitive to global price fluctuations, transport blockades, and political tensions.

The war thus magnified a longstanding asymmetry: while Africa possesses vast arable land, its agricultural output remains insufficient due to inadequate infrastructure, investment gaps, and weak policy coordination. Efforts to promote intra-African trade through frameworks like the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA) have yet to translate into substantial agricultural integration. Consequently, Africa remains at the periphery of global grain trade, a consumer rather than a producer in the food power hierarchy.

The Strategic Role of Grain Corridors:

Grain corridors are not only conduits for trade; they are geopolitical lifelines that define alignments and dependencies. For Russia and Ukraine, controlling these corridors extends influence over African and Middle Eastern markets. For Western nations, supporting Ukrainian exports is both a humanitarian and strategic act aimed at countering Russian leverage. Meanwhile, African nations find themselves navigating between these competing powers, balancing immediate food security concerns with broader diplomatic interests.

The reopening, suspension, or rerouting of grain corridors has repeatedly served as a bargaining chip in peace negotiations, sanctions debates, and international aid diplomacy. African countries, though often portrayed as passive recipients, have begun to leverage this situation to diversify partnerships, strengthening ties with alternative suppliers such as India, Brazil, and Turkey. This diversification signals an emerging African pragmatism in food diplomacy, where states seek autonomy within an interdependent world.

Implications for African Food Security Diplomacy:

The historical and geopolitical evolution of grain corridors reveals that Africa's food diplomacy cannot be separated from broader global power shifts. The continent's vulnerability is not merely a consequence of conflict but of systemic exclusion from global agricultural value chains. To transform this dependency, African diplomacy must evolve from reactive crisis management to strategic resilience building, emphasizing regional cooperation, sustainable production, and innovation in logistics.

In summary, the geopolitics of grain corridors reflect the intersection of conflict, commerce, and diplomacy. For Africa, they present both a challenge and an opportunity: a challenge to overcome historical dependencies, and an opportunity to assert a more proactive and self-determined role in shaping the global food order.

Food Security, Soft Power, and African Diplomatic Alignments

The intersection of food security and diplomacy has emerged as a defining feature of 21st-century international relations. In the context of the Russia–Ukraine war, food has become both a humanitarian necessity and a strategic instrument of soft power. The competition for influence in Africa, framed through the language of food assistance, trade partnerships, and humanitarian support, reflects a deeper struggle over political loyalty and global governance norms.

Food Security as a Tool of Soft Power:

Food security, traditionally seen as a domestic concern, has evolved into a foreign policy tool used to project power and influence. Joseph Nye's (2004) notion of soft power, the ability to shape others' preferences through attraction rather than coercion, provides an analytical framework for understanding how nations use food aid and trade to gain strategic advantages. In this sense, food diplomacy becomes a subtle form of persuasion, linking moral legitimacy with material dependency.

For Russia, the post-2022 period has witnessed an assertive deployment of food diplomacy aimed at consolidating African support amid Western sanctions. Moscow's Russia-Africa Summits (2019, 2023) framed grain donations as symbols of partnership, solidarity, and anti-colonial rhetoric. At the 2023 St. Petersburg summit, President Putin promised free grain shipments to countries such as Mali, Zimbabwe, and Burkina Faso, reinforcing Russia's image as a benevolent partner standing against Western domination (Reuters, 2023). This gesture, though modest in scale, carried immense symbolic value in African diplomatic circles.

Ukraine, conversely, launched the "Grain from Ukraine" initiative in late 2022, supplying grain to food-insecure nations in the Horn of Africa, including Ethiopia and Somalia. Backed by Western partners, the program sought to demonstrate

Kyiv's commitment to global solidarity even amid war. The competition between Moscow and Kyiv thus transcends the battlefield, extending into the moral economy of aid and influence.

Africa's Diplomatic Calculus and Balancing Acts:

African states have responded to these developments with calculated pragmatism. The continent's historical memory of colonial extraction and conditional aid has made leaders wary of alignment with any single bloc. Consequently, many countries have adopted strategic non-alignment, engaging with both Russia and the West based on immediate food security needs.

For instance, Egypt, Africa's largest wheat importer, has diversified its import sources, engaging simultaneously with Russia, France, and India. Similarly, Kenya and Nigeria have pursued new partnerships with Turkey and Brazil to hedge against future disruptions. These actions illustrate Africa's agency in navigating food geopolitics, using food diplomacy as a bargaining tool to extract concessions, aid, and investments from competing powers.

However, this balancing act is constrained by structural realities. Most African economies lack storage capacity, logistics infrastructure, and access to agricultural technology. As such, dependence on external suppliers continues to shape Africa's diplomatic positions in global forums, including votes at the United Nations General Assembly on resolutions concerning the Russia–Ukraine war.

The African Union and Collective Food Diplomacy:

The African Union (AU) and regional bodies such as ECOWAS and SADC have attempted to articulate collective strategies on food security, yet with limited coherence. The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), launched in 2003, sought to promote agricultural productivity and reduce import dependency. Despite its ambitious goals, implementation has been uneven, and many member states continue to rely on external food assistance (UNECA, 2021).

In the wake of the Ukraine war, the AU's diplomatic engagements with both Moscow and Brussels underscored Africa's emerging awareness of its bargaining

power. During the AU–EU Summit (2022), African leaders pressed for exemptions from sanctions affecting fertilizer and grain imports, arguing that humanitarian needs should override geopolitical considerations. Similarly, at the Russia–Africa Summit (2023), the AU advocated for predictable trade routes and equitable access to food resources. These moves reflect a growing continental consciousness about food sovereignty and negotiation power in global supply chains.

Food Diplomacy and Global Governance Structures:

The strategic manipulation of food flows during the Russia–Ukraine conflict has exposed the fragility of global food governance institutions. Bodies such as the World Food Programme (WFP), the FAO, and the World Trade Organization (WTO) have struggled to coordinate responses that balance humanitarian urgency with political neutrality. The WFP, for instance, has had to divert grain purchases from conflict-affected zones, thereby reducing supplies to African markets most in need (FAO, 2023).

This situation has prompted calls for restructuring global food governance, emphasizing resilience, transparency, and equity. Scholars such as Clapp and Moseley (2020) argue that the concentration of grain exports in a few countries renders the system vulnerable to geopolitical shocks. For Africa, this means that food security must become a pillar of foreign policy, not just a developmental goal. Integrating agricultural resilience into diplomatic strategies can help African nations move from being passive recipients of aid to active participants in global negotiations.

Reimagining African Food Diplomacy:

Africa's response to the geopolitics of grain corridors offers a crucial opportunity for redefining its diplomatic identity. Rather than perceiving food diplomacy solely as a reaction to external disruptions, African nations can utilize it as an avenue for asserting economic independence and regional solidarity.

Initiatives like the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA) can serve as frameworks for fostering intra-African food trade, reducing overreliance on external suppliers. Furthermore, collaborative research on sustainable agriculture, investment in food storage and processing, and the creation of a continental food

reserve system could transform Africa into a more resilient player in the global food system.

In essence, food diplomacy is not merely about aid or trade—it is about power, partnership, and positioning. The Russia–Ukraine war has illuminated the vulnerabilities of Africa's food systems but also revealed opportunities for strategic realignment. If harnessed effectively, food diplomacy can evolve from a symbol of dependency to a platform for continental empowerment and soft power projection.

Findings and Analytical Reflections

The analysis of grain corridors and African food diplomacy amid the Russia–Ukraine conflict reveals deep-seated intersections between food security, geopolitics, and strategic realignment. The findings underscore how the control of food routes and supply chains has evolved into a modern form of power projection, shaping alliances and redefining Africa's global engagements.

Key Findings

The Weaponization of Food Supply Chains:

The study finds that food and grain exports have become potent tools of geopolitical influence. Both Russia and Ukraine have leveraged food diplomacy to consolidate international legitimacy and political alliances in Africa. Russia's grain donations and Ukraine's "Grain from Ukraine" initiative reflect competing narratives—Moscow's anti-Western solidarity versus Kyiv's humanitarian partnership, both directed at African audiences. This rivalry illustrates the politicization of humanitarian aid and the transformation of food into a diplomatic bargaining chip.

Africa's Structural Vulnerability and Dependence:

Despite the continent's vast agricultural potential, Africa remains highly dependent on imported grains. The reliance on Black Sea wheat and maize underscores structural weaknesses in domestic production, logistics, and policy coherence. Many African nations import over 40% of their grain needs from Russia and Ukraine, leaving them exposed to global shocks (World Bank, 2023). The

disruption caused by the war has not only heightened food insecurity but also revealed the fragility of Africa's integration into global value chains.

Strategic Pragmatism in African Diplomacy:

African nations have displayed remarkable pragmatism in navigating this complex food-security landscape. By maintaining relations with both Russia and the West, many countries have adopted non-aligned but strategic postures, balancing food needs with political neutrality. For instance, Egypt, Kenya, and Nigeria have diversified their food import portfolios while engaging with new partners such as India, Turkey, and Brazil. This reflects a shift from passive dependence to assertive engagement within the global food order.

Emergence of Food Security Diplomacy:

The findings highlight an emerging food security diplomacy in Africa, an evolving framework that integrates agricultural self-reliance, trade diversification, and diplomatic negotiation. Institutions like the African Union (AU) are beginning to recognize food as a pillar of peace and development policy. This transformation signals the gradual reframing of food from a humanitarian concern to a strategic asset, with implications for future regional cooperation.

Reconfiguration of Global Power Structures:

The Russia–Ukraine war has accelerated the reconfiguration of global food governance. Western sanctions on Russia, disruptions in maritime logistics, and the fragility of the Black Sea Grain Initiative have exposed the vulnerabilities of current multilateral systems. Consequently, new corridors and alliances are emerging, linking Africa with alternative suppliers in Asia and Latin America. These shifts suggest that the continent's food diplomacy will increasingly occur in a multipolar environment, where multiple actors compete for influence and market share.

Analytical Reflections

The findings demonstrate that Africa's engagement in grain diplomacy is not merely reactive but strategically adaptive. African nations are learning to convert dependency into diplomacy, leveraging their import needs to negotiate better trade terms, debt relief, and investment commitments. This aligns with the

broader theoretical notion of asymmetric interdependence, where even weaker actors can exert influence by exploiting their indispensability in global systems (Keohane & Nye, 2012).

Moreover, the study reveals the ethical tensions inherent in food diplomacy. The use of humanitarian aid for political ends undermines principles of neutrality and justice in international relations. The deliberate manipulation of grain exports as a coercive tool raises moral questions about the global governance of essential commodities. African countries, often caught in the crossfire of these rivalries, must navigate these ethical and political dilemmas with prudence.

From a theoretical lens, the situation reflects a synthesis of constructivist and dependency perspectives. Constructivism explains how narratives, such as solidarity, humanitarianism, or sovereignty, shape state behavior and influence diplomatic alignments. Meanwhile, dependency theory elucidates Africa's continued structural subordination in global trade systems dominated by the Global North and emerging powers.

Finally, the analysis suggests that Africa's future food diplomacy must move beyond short-term relief toward long-term resilience. Building sustainable agricultural systems, investing in regional logistics, and fostering intra-African trade through AfCFTA are crucial pathways toward autonomy. Only by transforming food from a symbol of dependency into an instrument of collective empowerment can Africa redefine its role in the evolving global order.

In essence, the findings reflect that grain corridors are not merely supply chains—they are geopolitical fault lines. The ongoing contest over Africa's food security demonstrates how control over essential resources continues to shape the balance of power in a multipolar world.

Conclusion

The dynamics of grain corridors and African food security diplomacy in the wake of the Russia–Ukraine war reveal how essential commodities have become instruments of strategic competition and soft power. The war exposed the fragility of global food systems and demonstrated how control over agricultural exports

could shift political alignments, particularly in food-dependent regions like Sub-Saharan Africa.

The analysis indicates that both Russia and Ukraine have used grain diplomacy as a tool of influence, crafting distinct narratives to attract African goodwill—Russia emphasizing anti-Western solidarity and Ukraine framing its efforts in humanitarian terms. African nations, though vulnerable, have shown increasing diplomatic agency by balancing these relationships to meet domestic food security needs while preserving autonomy in foreign policy.

At a structural level, the crisis underscores Africa's persistent dependency on external food sources and the limitations of its agricultural capacity. The continent's vulnerability stems from decades of underinvestment in agricultural infrastructure, weak regional integration, and policy incoherence. However, the disruption has also spurred a renewed continental consciousness around food sovereignty, resilience, and regional self-reliance.

From a theoretical standpoint, the situation affirms that food diplomacy is a site of both contestation and cooperation, situated at the intersection of constructivist identity politics and dependency structures. It also highlights the urgent need for Africa to redefine food as a strategic asset, central to both national security and international relations. In the evolving multipolar world order, Africa's capacity to transform food diplomacy into a vehicle for empowerment will determine its geopolitical standing.

Strategic Policy Recommendations

Enhance Agricultural Self-Reliance through Regional Cooperation:

African governments should prioritize the development of domestic agricultural value chains, leveraging frameworks such as the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA). By improving cross-border food trade, investing in irrigation, storage, and mechanization, Africa can reduce reliance on volatile global grain markets.

Institutionalize Food Security Diplomacy within the African Union:
The African Union (AU) should establish a Food Diplomacy Council tasked with coordinating negotiations on food aid, trade, and agricultural partnerships. This would strengthen Africa's bargaining power in global forums and prevent fragmented engagements with external actors.

Diversify Food Import Sources and Strategic Partnerships:
African states should expand food sourcing beyond Russia and Ukraine by engaging alternative suppliers such as India, Brazil, Argentina, and Turkey. This diversification will mitigate risks from geopolitical disruptions and enhance resilience in supply chains.

Invest in Technological and Predictive Agricultural Systems:
Leveraging AI, data analytics, and satellite monitoring can enhance agricultural planning, anticipate supply shocks, and improve food distribution logistics. Partnerships with technology firms and research institutions should focus on predictive modeling to ensure proactive responses to disruptions.

Promote Food Sovereignty and Ethical Governance:
Governments must resist the politicization of food aid and uphold ethical standards in food diplomacy. Policies should ensure transparency, equitable distribution, and the alignment of external food assistance with national development goals, rather than donor-driven interests.

Strengthen Regional Food Reserves and Crisis Mechanisms:
Establishing continental and sub-regional grain reserves under bodies such as ECOWAS and SADC can serve as buffers during crises. These reserves would function as a collective insurance mechanism, reducing dependence on external emergency supplies.

Integrate Food Security into Peace and Security Frameworks:
The AU Peace and Security Council should recognize food insecurity as a conflict risk factor. Integrating agricultural stability into peacebuilding and post-conflict recovery plans can prevent the escalation of food-related unrest and migration pressures.

Engage in Multilateral Food Governance Reform:
Africa should push for equitable reform of global food governance institutions—FAO, WFP, WTO—to ensure fair representation, pricing mechanisms, and inclusion of developing nations in decision-making on trade and humanitarian policies.

Public-Private Partnership (PPP) Models for Agribusiness:
Governments should foster PPPs to finance agricultural infrastructure, improve market access, and attract sustainable investments. Such collaborations can stimulate job creation and rural development, contributing to long-term food stability.

Develop a Pan-African Food Diplomacy Strategy:
Ultimately, Africa must articulate a unified food diplomacy strategy that harmonizes national policies with continental aspirations. This strategy should balance immediate food security imperatives with broader objectives of economic independence, diplomatic credibility, and soft power projection.

In conclusion, grain diplomacy has become a defining arena of global power politics, with Africa positioned at a crossroads of dependency and opportunity. By transforming its vulnerabilities into leverage, investing in agricultural sovereignty, and engaging assertively in global food governance, Africa can reposition itself as a strategic actor rather than a spectator in the evolving global food order.

References

Alden, C., & Alves, A. C. (2017). China's engagement in Africa: Transforming supply chains and infrastructure. Third World Quarterly, 38(10), 2295–2312.

Amin, S. (1976). Unequal development: An essay on the social formations of peripheral capitalism. Monthly Review Press.

Brautigam, D. (2009). The dragon's gift: The real story of China in Africa. Oxford University Press.

Clapp, J. (2017). Food self-sufficiency: Making sense of it, and when it makes sense (FAO Policy Brief). Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Clapp, J., & Moseley, W. G. (2020). This food crisis is different: COVID-19 and the fragility of the neoliberal food security order. The Journal of Peasant Studies, 47(7), 1393–1417.

Diven, J. (2001). Food aid and foreign policy: The political economy of PL 480. University Press.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (2022). The state of food security and nutrition in the world 2022: Building resilience for peace and food security. FAO.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (2023). FAO monitoring report: Impacts of the Russia–Ukraine crisis on global agricultural markets and food security. FAO.

Frank, A. G. (1967). Capitalism and underdevelopment in Latin America: Historical studies of Chile and Brazil. Monthly Review Press.

International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). (2022). Global food policy report 2022: Food systems transformation in times of crisis. IFPRI.

Keohane, R. O., & Nye, J. S. (1977). Power and interdependence: World politics in transition. Little, Brown.

Margulis, M. E. (2013). The regime complex for food security: Implications for the global hunger challenge. Global Governance, 19(1), 53–67.

Reuters. (2023, August 24). Russia offers free grain shipments to some African states amid Ukraine conflict. Reuters.

Sergunin, A., & Karasov, O. (2023). Grain diplomacy and the politics of food security: Russia, Ukraine and the Black Sea corridor. Journal of International Affairs, 76(2), 115–132.

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). (2023). Impact of the war in Ukraine on global food security and trade: Policy brief. UNCTAD.

United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). (2022). Humanitarian implications of the Ukraine crisis for food security. OCHA.

United Nations World Food Programme (WFP). (2022). WFP operational report: Global food assistance needs and the impact of the Ukraine crisis. WFP.

von Braun, J., & Torero, M. (2022). Food crises and geopolitics: Challenges of grain markets and global governance. Annual Review of Resource Economics, 14, 1–21.

World Bank. (2023). Global economic prospects and food security: The effects of the Russia–Ukraine war on food-importing countries. World Bank Group.

World Trade Organization (WTO). (2022). Trade disruptions and food security: Report on recent developments and policy responses. WTO.

Zhang, Y., & Rickett, C. (2020). China's agricultural diplomacy in Africa: Development or domination? Third World Quarterly, 41(5), 857–875.