

CHINA, INDIA, RUSSIA AND THE UNITED STATES
The Scramble for African Oil
and the Militarization of the Continent

Daniel Volman

INDEXING TERMS:

Petroleum resources

Natural resources

Geopolitics

Economic and social development

International relations

Foreign policy

Militarism

Africa

China

India

Russian Federation

United states

The opinions expressed in this volume are those of the author
and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Nordic Africa Institute.

Language checking: Elaine Almén

ISSN 0280-2171

ISBN 978-91-7106-658-9

© the author and Nordiska Afrikainstitutet 2009

Printed in Sweden by GML Print on Demand AB, Stockholm 2009

Grafisk form Elin Olsson, Today Press AB

CONTENTS

Foreword	5
Introduction	7
The Growing Military Involvement of China, India, and Other Emerging Powers in Africa	10
The Re-Emergence of Russia as an Economic and Military Power in Africa.....	12
The Response of the United States: The New US Military Command for Africa (Africom)	14
The Impact of the “New Scramble for Africa” on African Security, Political Reform, and Economic Development	23
Conclusions and Recommendations.....	24

FOREWORD

The present volume is one in a series of critical analyses being produced by the China and India in Africa Project of the Nordic Africa Institute. The author, Dr. Daniel Volman, Director of the African Security Research Project in Washington, DC, examines the evolving economic and military role of China, India, Russia and the United States in Africa and the status of Africa in the new global geopolitical order. The author discusses the reasons for the growing involvement of China and India in Africa – focusing in particular on their interest in gaining access to African supplies of oil and other strategic resources – and will then look at the use of military programs – arms sales, military training programs, and other security assistance programs – as a means of increasing their influence and pursuing their objectives. The paper will also examine the response of the United States and European powers to the activities of these new actors and the impact of the re-emergence of Russia as a major power in Africa with regard to both energy supplies and security issues. Finally, the paper will analyze the implications of these developments for African security, political reform, and economic development.

The growing involvement of China and India in Africa, along with great powers such as the United States and Russia that are keen to protect their long-term energy security, highlights the changing dynamics of security in contemporary Africa, and the effect this will have on the aspirations of the African people to consolidate democracy, prevent conflict, and create conditions for economic development and the reduction of poverty. The continued ‘securitization’ of Africa’s international relations, therefore, remains the greatest threat to the aspirations of Africans to chart an independent development path.

Professor Fantu Cheru
Research Director
The Nordic Africa Institute, Uppsala

INTRODUCTION

Since the end of the Cold War – and particularly over the past decade – Africa’s status in the international geopolitical order has risen dramatically. The continent was once treated as a convenient battlefield in the global rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union precisely because neither superpower had any vital interests at stake on the continent. Now, a number of developments – especially the continent’s increasing importance as a source of energy supplies and other raw materials – have radically altered the picture. They have led to the growing economic and military involvement of China, India, and other emerging industrial powers in Africa and to the re-emergence of Russia as an economic and military power on the continent. In response the United States has dramatically increased its military presence in Africa and created a new military command – the Africa Command or Africom – to protect what it has defined as its “strategic national interests” in Africa.¹ This has ignited what has come to be known as the “new scramble for Africa” and is transforming the security architecture of Africa.

‘Securitization and the new scramble for Africa’

The desire of China, India, Russia, the United States and other emerging powers to gain and expand their access to supplies of oil, natural gas, uranium, copper, cobalt, coltan, gold, platinum, diamonds, and other strategic resources is well known, so it is not necessary to repeat it here. What is needed is some perspective on the significance of this in the broader context of Africa’s economic relations with the rest of the world. For example, China’s growing role in oil production in Africa is often cited as the most important example of how these new powers are usurping the place of the United States and European countries and threatening to “expel” the West from Africa. But China still only gets less than 9% of sub-Saharan Africa’s total oil exports; 32% of Africa’s oil still goes to the United States and 33% still goes to Europe. China does obtain significant amounts of oil from African countries – some 30% of its total imports, primarily from Sudan, Angola, and Nigeria – but it actually gets more of its imported oil from the Middle East, specifically from Saudi Arabia where oil production is dominated by American firms. So the situation is a little more complicated than the picture that is often presented.

One of China’s smaller, but most noteworthy, endeavors is in Ethiopia, where the Chinese firm Zhongyuan Petroleum Exploration Bureau (part of the China Petroleum and Chemical Company [SINOPEC]) is conducting a seismic survey to explore for oil and gas deposits in the Ogaden region – which is populated mostly by Somalis – under a contract from the Malaysian firm Petronas and South-West Energy, an Ethiopian company licensed in Hong Kong. In April 2007, hundreds of members of the Ogaden National Liberation Front

1. Daniel Volman, “The Bush Administration and African Oil: The Security Implications of US Energy Policy,” *Review of African Political Economy*, Vol. 30, No. 98 (December 2003), pp. 573-584; Michael Klare and Daniel Volman, “Africa’s Oil and American National Security,” *Current History*, Vol. 103, No. 673 (May 2004), pp. 226-231; Daniel Volman, “The African ‘Oil Rush’ and the Scramble for Africa’s Oil,” *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 27, No. 4 (May 2006), pp. 609-628; and Michael Klare and Daniel Volman, “America, China and the Scramble for Africa’s Oil,” *Review of African Political Economy*, Vol. 33, No. 108 (June 2006), pp. 297-309; Daniel Volman, “US to Create New Regional Military Command for Africa: Africom,” *Review of African Political Economy*, Vol. 34, No. 114 (December 2007), pp. 737-744; Daniel Volman, “Why America Wants Military HQ in Africa,” *New African*, No. 469 (January 2008), pp. 36-40; and Daniel Volman, “Africom: What Is It and What Will It Do?” *Bulletin of the Association of Concerned Africa Scholars*, No. 78 (August 2008).

(the ONLF, which is fighting to make the region a part of Somalia) attacked the company's premises in Abole, overpowering 50 Ethiopian Army troops who were guarding the facility and killing 65 Ethiopians – mostly laborers – and nine Chinese technicians. Seven Chinese oil workers were kidnapped and then released to the Red Cross five days after the attack. The Ethiopian government launched a major military offensive against the ONLA in June 2007, but in November 2007, Zhongyuan announced that it would not return to resume work in the Ogaden. Petronas is now expecting to hire an Iranian firm named Oil Exploration Operation Company to continue exploration work in Ogaden. Pexco, another Malaysian firm, is also expected to begin gravity survey work in January 2008 on two exploration blocks in the Ogaden. American companies are also active in this volatile region. In August 2008, Titan Resources Corporation (owned by Nelson Bunker Hunt) announced that it had signed a twenty-five year production-sharing agreement with Ethiopia for the right to explore for oil and gas in two blocks in the Ogaden basin and the Blue Nile basin in the north of the country and that it expected to invest as much as \$60 million in the project.¹

China and India are also interested in acquiring access to uranium, copper, and other minerals. For example, Chinese and Indian firms are now exploring for uranium in Niger. In July 2007, Tuareg rebels kidnapped a Chinese executive of the China Nuclear International Uranium Corporation to protest Chinese operations in Niger and alleged Chinese arms sales to the government; he was later released unharmed. And in September 2008, China signed a deal with the Democratic Republic of Congo for a loan of \$5 billion to rehabilitate the mining industry, construct railways and roads, and build hospitals and other infrastructure projects. In exchange, China will receive copper, cobalt, nickel, gold, and timber.²

It is important to recognize that China, India, and other countries have other reasons for expanding their involvement in Africa besides economic self-interest. China and India have longstanding historic ties to Africa. They both have an ideological and political interest in contesting Western dominance of the global economic and political order and in countering American claims to hegemony based on its assertion that it is the “world's only remaining superpower.” They both have a genuine interest in promoting economic development and social progress on the continent. They both hope to use their relation-

1. “Scores die in Ethiopia oil attack,” BBC News, 24 April 2007, electronic version accessed at news.bbc.co.uk on 12 September 2008; “Chinese workers freed in Ethiopia,” BBC News, 29 April 2007, electronic version accessed at news.bbc.co.uk on 12 September 2008; Kaleyesus Bekele, “Chinese Oil Company Refuses to Resume Operation in Ogaden,” Reporter (Addis Ababa), 8 December 2007, electronic version accessed at www.allafrica.com on 12 September 2008; Human Rights Watch, *Collective Punishment: War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity in the Ogaden Area of Ethiopia's Somali Region*, 11 June 2008, electronic version accessed at www.hrw.org on 12 September 2008; and Jason McLure, “Ethiopia, US Billionaire's Titan Resources Signs Oil Accord,” Bloomberg, 21 August 2008, accessed at www.bloomberg.com on 12 September 2008. For information on India, see Vibhuti Hate, “India in Africa: Moving beyond Oil,” *C.S.I.S. South Asia Monitor*, No. 119 (10 June 2008), pp. 1-3.

2. Abdoulaye Massalatchi, “Niger rebels free Chinese hostages in uranium firm,” Reuters, 10 July 2007, electronic version accessed at <http://www.alertnet.org/thenews/newsdesk/L10925088.htm> on 7 October 2007; Andrew McGregor, “Niger's Uranium Industry Threatened by Rebels,” *Terrorism Focus*, Vol. 4, No. 25 (31 July 2007), electronic version accessed at www.jamestown.org on 7 October 2007; Igor Khripunov, “Exploiting Africa: Securing the continent's uranium resources,” *Jane's Intelligence Review*, September 2007, pp. 51-53; “China opens coffers for mineral,” BBC News, 18 September 2007, electronic version accessed at news.bbc.co.uk on 19 September 2007; William Wallis, “China to invest \$5 billion in Congo,” *Financial Times*, 18 September 2007, electronic version accessed at http://us.ft.com/ftgateway/superpage.ft?news_id=fto091820072314184049 on 19 September 2008; and “Congo Kinshasa-China: Checking the assets,” *Africa-Asia Confidential*, Vol. 1, No. 3 (January 2008), pp. 3-4.

ships with Africa to enhance their global status as great powers in their own right. And they both seek to reduce internal economic, political, and social conflicts by providing new opportunities in Africa for their corporations and their citizens.

It is also important to recognize that China and India do invest in projects besides resource extraction and that many of these projects can or may contribute significantly to the economic development of African countries. The Chinese investment plan for the DR Congo, for instance, includes the rehabilitation of the mining industry and the construction of major infrastructure projects including transportation and power production projects. China's increasing willingness to fund these projects demonstrates that China has been sensitive to criticism of its initial focus on resource extraction and that China does respond to pressure for the reform of its investment practices in Africa.

THE GROWING MILITARY INVOLVEMENT OF CHINA, INDIA, AND OTHER EMERGING POWERS IN AFRICA

In order to enhance their global status as great powers in their own right, both China and India have used military programs – arms sales, military training programs, other security assistance programs, and a growing military presence in Africa – to bolster their ties with African countries and help them achieve their economic and political objectives in Africa.

China has used military programs to strengthen the military capacities of key African allies and to expand its influence in Africa, particularly in major oil-producing countries. Sudan has received F-6 and F-7 fighter aircraft, T-62 light tanks, anti-aircraft systems, trucks, and other weapons. Zimbabwe has received at least nine J-7 fighter aircraft, six K-8 trainer aircraft, 10 T-69 tanks, 30 T-59 tanks, and as many as 100 T-63 armored transport vehicles. Angola has ordered eight Su-77 fighter aircraft. China sold over \$1 billion worth of sophisticated weaponry to Ethiopia and Eritrea between 1998 and 2000 – including Su-77 fighter aircraft for Ethiopia – in violation of the U.N. arms embargo imposed during the bloody border war between the two countries. China has also supplied military equipment to Algeria, Zambia, Namibia, and Mauritania, including C-802 ship-to-ship missiles for Algeria as well as K-8 trainer aircraft for Zambia (which received eight) and Namibia (which received four).¹

Nigeria, another oil-exporting country facing massive resistance in the oil-rich Niger Delta, has significantly expanded its arms purchase from China, including 15 F-7 fighter aircraft from China in 2005 for a reported \$251 million. In addition, Chinese military ties with the Nigerian Government were significantly expanded in September 2004 when the Chinese arms producer Poly Technology announced that it would enter into a partnership with the government-owned Defense Industries Corporation of Nigeria (DICON) to modernize Nigeria's domestic arms industry. After years of neglect, the Nigerian government wants to revive DICON and expects to resume production of small arms, grenades, ammunition, and other light weapons for the Nigerian military.²

These actions have led to criticism of China's role in Africa, particularly from "alarmists" in the United States who emphasize China's ties with repressive regimes and its willingness to invest without imposing the types of conditions imposed by the World Bank and other international financial institutions or by Western governments. While these critiques are valid, China's practices are not unique. The United States has used the same means to build ties with repressive African regimes – particularly in oil producing countries like Algeria, Nigeria, Angola, Chad, and Equatorial Guinea – and has noticeably reduced its pressures for democratization, respect for human rights, and financial transparency in recent years.

India has also begun to dramatically expand its military presence in Africa (particularly its naval presence) and also in the Indian Ocean, through which the oil tankers that carry nearly all of India's oil imports – along with those of China, Japan, Malaysia, Korea, and other developed and developing industrial powers in Asia – must travel. India

1. Andrei Chang, "Chinese arms and African oil," United Press International, 5 November 2007, electronic version accessed at www.upi.com on 2 January 2008 and Joshua Eisenman and Joshua Kurlantzick, "China's Africa Strategy," *Current History*, May 2008, pp. 219-224.

2. Seygun Adeyemi, *Jane's Defense Weekly*, 29 September 2004, electronic version accessed at www:jiaa.janes.com on 24 October 2004.

has announced that it intends to build up its naval forces in the Indian Ocean in order to protect the flow of oil and expects to acquire a fleet of modern aircraft carriers and nuclear submarines over the next decade. In addition to the purchase of a refurbished Russian aircraft carrier in 2008, India also bought a refurbished American warship, the 17,000-ton amphibious transport dock USS Trenton.¹

In October 2008, Indian warships began conducting patrols off the Somali coast to protect ships from pirate attacks. On 11 November, helicopter-borne Indian marine commandos prevented pirates from hijacking an Indian merchant vessel in the Gulf of Aden.² On 19 November, an Indian warship sank what was described as a “pirate mother ship” after the pirates fired on it.³ And on 20 November, Indian naval sources told the BBC that India had been given formal approval by the United Nations to enter Somali waters in “hot pursuit” of pirate ships.⁴

India established a listening post in northern Madagascar in July 2007, which consists of a radar surveillance station equipped with a high-tech digital communications system and which is intended, at least in part, to monitor Chinese activities. In 2003, India signed a defense cooperation agreement with Seychelles; and, in 2006, it signed a defense agreement with Mozambique to provide arms and to conduct regular naval patrols off Mozambique’s coast. According to a recent report by Chatham House, India’s new military policy toward Africa is motivated, to a certain extent, by “concerns about Chinese expansionism” and “this shift in policy comes in part because of India’s desire to compete with China’s growing influence in the region.”⁵

1. See also “India, US should prepare for joint military operations,” *The Hindu*, 20 April 2008, electronic version accessed at <http://www.thehindu.com/2008/04/20/stories/2008042055410800.htm> on 9 May 2008; Admiral (Rtd.) Dennis C. Blair, US Navy, “India’s Defense Diplomacy,” International Institute for Strategic Studies-Citi India Global Forum on India as a Rising Great Power: Challenges and Opportunities, New Delhi, 18-20 April 2008, Third Plenary Session, electronic version accessed at <http://www.iiss.org/conferences/iiss-citi-india-global-forum/igf-plenary-sessions-2008/third-plenary-session-indias-defence-diplomacy/third-plenary-session-admiral-ret-dennis-c-blair-usn> on 14 April 2008; and Anand Giridharadas, “Land of Gandhi Asserts Itself as Global Military Power,” *New York Times*, 22 September 2008, electronic version accessed at www.nytimes.com on 25 September 2008.

2. “Indian navy ‘stops pirate attack,’” BBC News, 11 November 2008, electronic version accessed at news.bbc.co.uk on 11 November 2008.

3. “Indian Navy Destroys Pirate Boat, More Ships Taken,” Reuters, 19 November 2008, electronic version accessed at www.nytimes.com on 19 November 2008; Hari Kumar and Alan Cowell, “Indian Navy Sinks Pirate Ship,” *New York Times*, 20 November 2008, electronic version accessed at www.nytimes.com on 19 November 2008; and Emily Wax and Ann Scott Tyson, “Indian Naval Warship Destroys Pirate Vessel,” *Washington Post*, 20 November 2008, electronic version accessed at www.washingtonpost.com on 20 November 2008.

4. Geeta Panday, “India navy ‘to go after pirates,’” BBC News, 21 November 2008, electronic version accessed at www.bbc.co.uk on 21 November 2008.

5. Alex Vines and Bereni Oruitemeka, *India’s Engagement with the African Indian Ocean Rim States*, Chatham House Africa Programme Paper AFP P1/08, 4 April 2008, pp. 2 and 13, electronic version accessed at http://www.chathamhouse.org/uk/files/11293_india_africa0408.pdf on 6 September 2008.

THE RE-EMERGENCE OF RUSSIA AS AN ECONOMIC AND MILITARY POWER IN AFRICA

While considerable attention has been paid to the emerging role of China, India, and other new powers in Africa, far less notice has been taken of the re-emergence of Russia as a significant power in Africa and the implications that this has with regard to both energy supplies and security. Russia essentially withdrew from Africa at the end of the Cold War, but under President Putin and the new administration headed by President Medvedev, Russia has undertaken major new initiatives in Africa. Russia, as a major producer and exporter of oil and natural gas, does not need new supplies of energy from Africa. Instead, it is trying to increase its control over energy sources throughout the world to strengthen its own economic and political power. Russia is particularly interested in gaining control over the supply of oil and natural gas from Africa to European countries.

In September 2008, Russia's state natural gas company, Gazprom, signed a memorandum of understanding with the state-owned Nigeria National Petroleum Corporation for oil and gas exploration, production, and transportation, processing of gas, and construction of power plants in Nigeria; Gazprom expects to spend between \$1 billion and \$2.5 billion on these projects in the coming years.¹ In addition, Russia held preliminary talks with Nigeria about a multi-million dollar pipeline that will run for 2,850 miles (4,128 kilometers) across the Sahara and will be used to transport Nigerian gas across Niger and Algeria to Algerian export terminals for delivery to Europe by way of Spain. The proposed deal is expected to cost \$10 billion for the pipeline and \$3 billion for other installations, and will be capable of delivering up to 30 billion cubic meters of gas to Europe annually.² In September 2008, however, the energy commissioner of the European Union (EU) Andris Piebalgs visited Nigeria and presented a counter-offer to the Nigerian Government; he proposed that the EU develop the pipeline instead, thus preventing Russia from gaining control over what Europe hopes will become an alternative to Russian supplies of natural gas.³

During President Putin's visit to Libya in April 2008, the two countries signed deals on energy cooperation, military assistance, and construction of a 310-mile (500-kilometer) railway line between Sirte and Benghazi. The railway line is expected to cost \$3.8 billion. Gazprom plans large-scale exploration and production projects in cooperation with Libya's national energy company, including the construction of liq-

1. "Gazprom Eyes Region's Energy Assets," *Vanguard* (Lagos), 2 November 2007, electronic version accessed at www.allafrica.com on 22 September 2008; Chika Amanze-Nwachuku, "NNPC, Gazprom Sign MOU on Oil, Gas Exploration," *This Day* (Lagos), 4 September 2008, electronic version accessed at www.allafrica.com on 11 September 2008; and "Countries Reach Energy Co-Operation Deal," *Vanguard*, 4 September 2008, accessed at www.allafrica.com on 11 September 2008.

2. Mathew Green and Catherine Belton, "Gazprom plans Africa gas grab with Nigeria infrastructure talks," *Financial Times*, 5-6 January 2008, p. 3; Mathew Green, "Russia promises fairer reward for African riches," *Financial Times*, 5-6 January 2008, p. 4; Uchenna Izundu, "Gazprom seeks Nigerian gas development," *Oil and Gas Journal*, 9 January 2008, electronic version accessed at www.ogi.com on 15 January 2008; "Russian Gas Firm Eyes Local Gas for Investment," *Leadership* (Abuja), 29 April 2008, electronic version accessed at www.allafrica.com on 1 May 2008; and Hector Gonzalez, "Russia-Africa: Moscow grabs at Big Oil's prize assets," *Africa Report*, No. 11 (June-July 2008), pp. 24-26.

3. Alex Last, "EU to help Nigeria with pipeline," BBC News, 17 September 2008, electronic version accessed at news.bbc.co.uk on 17 September 2008.

uefied natural gas installations and gas-fired electricity plants in Libya. Russia has also cancelled Libya's \$4.5 billion debt for arms purchases from the Soviet Union and announced plans to sell Libya \$3 billion worth of new weaponry, including fighter aircraft, attack helicopters, and submarines.¹

In March 2006, Russia signed a \$8 billion deal with Algeria to cancel that country's debt for past arms sales in exchange for a commitment to buy Russian military equipment, including 32 MiG-29 SMT fighter aircraft, 28 Su-30MK fighter aircraft, 16 Yak-130 trainer aircraft, four S-300PMU2 anti-aircraft systems, 38 Pantsir-S1 air defense missile-and-gun systems, 185 T-90S tanks, and 216 Komet-E anti-tank missiles. In March 2008, Algeria announced that it intended to return the 12 MiG-29s delivered the previous year to Russia because they did not meet Algeria's technical expectations and it is still unclear exactly what aircraft Russia will deliver in the future to complete the contract. Deliveries of the Yak-130 trainer aircraft to Algeria are expected to begin in January 2009.² And in November 2008, Sudan announced that Russia had sold it 12 MiG-29 fighter aircraft.³

1. Pavel Felgenhauer, "Putin Makes Sweetheart Arms Deals to Benefit His Cronies," *Eurasia Daily Monitor*, Vol. 4, issue 91 (9 May 2007), electronic version accessed at www.jamestown.org on 9 May 2007; "Russia swaps Libya debt for deals," BBC News, 18 April 2008, electronic version accessed at news.bbc.co.uk on 19 April 2008; and Hector Gonzalez, "Russia-Africa: Moscow grabs at Big Oil's prize assets," *Africa Report*, No. 11 (June-July 2008), pp. 24-26.

2. "Algeria: US and Russia in Armaments Scramble," *Maghreb Confidential*, No. 643 (1 April 2004), electronic version accessed at www.africaintelligence.com on 7 July 2008; "Algeria, Russia: A Handful of MiGs," *Stratfor*, 18 February 2008, electronic version accessed at http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/algeria_russia_handful_migs on 11 September 2008; Nabi Abdullaev, "Algeria Wants To Return MiGs," *Defense News*, 25 February 2008, electronic version accessed at www.defensenews.com on 11 September 2008; "No threat to Russian-Algerian deal after MiG-29 flop – official," *Novosti Russian News and Information Agency*, 24 March 2008, electronic version accessed at <http://www.en.rian.ru/world/20080324/102050610-print.html> on 11 September 2008; "Russia freezes Su-30 fighter jet deliveries to Algeria," *Novosti Russian News and Information Agency*, 28 March 2008, electronic version accessed at <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20080328/102337799-print.html> on 11 September 2008; "Russia continues deliveries of Su-30 fighters to Algeria," *Novosti Russian News and Information Agency*, 31 March 2008, electronic version accessed at <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20080331/102580722-print.html> on 11 September 2008; "Algeria asks Russia to swap MiG-29s for Su-30 fighters – paper," *Novosti Russian News and Information Agency*, 15 May 2008, electronic version accessed at <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20080515/107429570-print.html> on 11 September 2008; and "Russia to start Yak-130 trainer deliveries to Algeria in 2009," *Novosti Russian News and Information Agency*, 28 May 2008, electronic version accessed at <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20080528/108687898-print.html> on 11 September 2008.

3. "Sudan: Russian Fighter Jets Purchased," *Agence France-Presse*, 15 November 2008, electronic version accessed at www.nytimes.com on 19 November 2008.

THE RESPONSE OF THE UNITED STATES: THE NEW US MILITARY COMMAND FOR AFRICA (AFRICOM)

US foreign policymakers view the activities of these new and re-emerging powers in Africa as a serious challenge to American interests on the continent. The United States currently gets about 20% of its imported oil from Africa – more than it gets from the Middle East – and this figure is expected to rise to about 25% of US imports in the next few years. And in 2002, American officials announced that African oil would now be defined as a “strategic national interest” of the United States.¹ This means that – just as in the case of oil supplies from the Persian Gulf – the United States is now committed to the use of all necessary means, including military force, to ensure the free flow of oil from Africa onto world markets.

Most foreign policymakers in Washington – including leading members of the Bush administration – remained convinced that China’s actions in Africa do not threaten vital US national security interests and that the United States and China can cooperate in developing the continent’s natural resources in a way that is mutually beneficial.² But a growing and increasingly vocal group of legislators, and influential think tanks insist that China has become a strategic global rival to the United States and that its actions – especially in Africa – represent a direct challenge to the United States.

These “alarmists” point to the considerable resources that China is devoting to Africa and to the engagement of Chinese officials at the highest level – including President Hu Jintao and Premier Wen Jiabao, both of whom have made tours of the continent and have hosted high-level meetings in Beijing with African heads of state – as evidence of a “grand strategy” on the part of China that jeopardizes vital US national security interests and that is aimed, ultimately, at usurping the West’s position on the continent. “Amidst all of this hoopla over China’s rapidly growing economy, there is a dark side to [that] country’s economic expansion,” Congressman Christopher Smith (Republican of New Jersey) told the House International Relations Committee hearing on “China’s Influence in Africa” in July 2005. “China is playing an increasingly influential role on the continent of Africa, and there is concern that the Chinese intend to aid and abet African dictators, gain a stranglehold on precious African natural resources, and undo much of the progress that has been made on democracy and governance in the last 15 years in African nations.”³

Although the “non-alarmist” view of China continues to guide US policy toward Africa, the Bush administration had pursued a strategy in Africa that relied on the use of military force to protect US interests on the continent – particularly its interest in the

1. Statement by Walter Kansteiner, US Assistant Secretary of State for Africa, quoted in Mike Crawley, “With Mideast Uncertainty, US Turns to Africa for Oil,” *Christian Science Monitor*, May 23, 2003, electronic version accessed at <http://www.csmonitor.com/2002/0523/p07s01-woaf.html> on 25 May 2002.

2. See, for example, James Swan, US Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, and Tom Christensen, US Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, “Testimony,” US Congress, Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, *China in Africa: Implications for US Policy*, Hearings, 110th Congress, 2nd session, 4 July 2008, electronic version accessed at <http://foreign.senate.gov/hearings/2008/hr080604a.html> on 30 June 2008.

3. US Congress, House, Committee on International Relations, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Human Rights and International Operations, *China’s Influence in Africa*, Hearings, 109th Congress, 1st session, July 28, 2005, p. 1, electronic version accessed at <http://www.foreignaffairs.house.gov/archives/109/22658.pdf> on 24 September 2005.

free flow of African oil to world markets – and to counter the growing involvement of potential global competitors – and in particular the one country that could realistically become a rival global peer in Africa. Based on this strategy, the Bush administration radically increased US military activities in Africa and, in February 2006, announced that it would create a new US military command for Africa – Africa Command or Africom – to oversee America’s growing military presence on the continent. While the principal missions of Africom will be to protect access to strategic raw materials in Africa and to make the continent a major front in the Global War on Terrorism, the creation of Africom should also be seen in part as one element of a broad effort by the Bush administration to develop a “grand strategy” of its own that will contain China’s efforts. It should also be understood as a measure that is intended to demonstrate to Beijing that Washington will match China’s actions, thus serving as a warning to the Chinese leadership that they should restrain themselves or face possible consequences to their relationship with America as well as to their interests in Africa.

So, what will Africom actually do when it becomes fully operational? Basically, it will take over the implementation of a host of military, security cooperation, and security assistance programs, which are funded through either the State Department or the Defense Department. In the following section, we present a list of US military training and surplus military equipment sales programs that are designed to strengthen the African military as part of an American global war on terror.

Bilateral and Multilateral Joint Training Programs and Military Exercises

The United States provides military training to African military personnel through a wide variety of training and education programs. In addition, it conducts military exercises in Africa jointly with African troops and also with the troops of its European allies to provide training to others and also to train its own forces for possible deployment to Africa in the future. These include the following:

Flintlock 2005 and 2007

These are Joint Combined Exchange Training (JCET) exercises conducted by units of the US Army Special Forces and the US Army Rangers, along with contingents from other units, to provide training experience both for American troops and for the troops of African countries (small numbers of European troops are also involved in these exercises). Flintlock 2005 was held in June 2005, when more than one thousand US personnel were sent to North and West Africa for counter-terrorism exercises in Algeria, Senegal, Mauritania, Mali, Niger, and Chad that involved more than three thousand local service members. In April 2007, US Army Special Forces went to Niger for the first part of Flintlock 2007 and in late August 2007, some 350 American troops arrived in Mali for three weeks of Flintlock 2007 exercises with forces from Algeria, Chad, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Tunisia, Burkina Faso, France, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom.

Trans-Saharan Counter-Terrorism Partnership (TSCTP)

The Flintlock exercises were conducted as part of Operation Enduring Freedom – Trans-Saharan Counter-Terrorism Partnership (TSCTP) which now links the United States with

eight African countries: Mali, Chad, Niger, Mauritania, Nigeria, Tunisia, Morocco, and Algeria. In 2004, the TSCTP was created to replace the Pan-Sahel Counter-Terrorism Initiative, which was initiated in 2002. The TSCTP also involves smaller, regular training exercises conducted by US Army Special Forces throughout the region. Although changing budgetary methodology makes it difficult to be certain, it appears that the TSCTP received some \$31 million in FY 2006, nearly \$82 million in FY 2007, and \$10 million in FY 2008.

East Africa Counter-Terrorism Initiative (EACTI)

The East Africa Counter-Terrorism Initiative is a training program similar to the TSCTP. Established in 2003 as a multi-year program with \$100 million in funding, the EACTI has provided training to Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Djibouti, Eritrea, and Ethiopia.

Africa Contingency Operations Training and Assistance Program (ACOTA)

This program, which began operating in 2002, replaces the African Crisis Response Initiative launched in 1997 by the Clinton administration. In 2004, it became part of the Global Peace Operations Initiative. ACOTA is officially designed to provide training to African military forces to improve their ability to conduct peacekeeping operations, even if they take place in hostile environments. But since the training includes both defensive and offensive military operations, it also enhances the ability of participating forces to engage in police operations against unarmed civilians, counter-insurgency operations, and even conventional military operations against the military forces of other countries.

By FY 2007, nineteen African countries were participating in the ACOTA program (Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia). In 2004, ACOTA became a part of the Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI) and the Bush Administration's FY 2008 budget included a request for a little more than \$40 million for ACOTA activities. The GPOI itself, a multilateral, five-year program that aims to train 75,000 troops – mostly from African countries – by 2010, will receive more than \$92 million under the president's FY 2008 budget, which also provides \$5 million to reorganize the armed forces of the Democratic Republic of Congo, \$16 million to reorganize the Liberian military, and \$41 million to help integrate the Sudan People's Liberation Army into the national army as part of the peace process for southern Sudan.

International Military Education and Training Program (IMET)

The IMET program brings African military officers to military academies and other military educational institutions in the United States for professional training. Nearly all African countries participate in the program – including Libya for the first time in FY 2008 – and in FY 2006 (the last year for which country figures are available – it trained 14,731 students from the African continent (excluding Egypt) at a cost of \$14.7 million.

In addition, the United States supports capacity development of the African military through the transfer of needed equipment under its foreign military sales program as well as direct commercial sales program. The *Foreign Military Sales Program (FMS)*, which is conducted by the Defense Security Cooperation Agency of the Defense Department,

provides loans to finance the purchase of virtually all of this equipment through the Foreign Military Financing Program (FMF), but repayment of these loans by African governments is almost always waived, so that they amount to free grants. In FY 2006, sub-Saharan African countries received a total of nearly \$14 million in FMF funding, and the Maghrebi countries of Morocco and Tunisia received almost another \$21 million; for FY 2007, the Bush administration requested nearly \$15 million for sub-Saharan Africa and \$21 million for the Morocco and Tunisia; and for FY 2008, the administration requested nearly \$8 million for sub-Saharan Africa and nearly \$6 million for the Maghreb.

In recent years, US private military contractors, such as DynCorp and Pacific Architects and Engineers, have been awarded contracts to train and equip the Southern Sudanese military as part of the implementation of the peace agreement for Southern Sudan as well as the training of African troops all over the continent on peacekeeping operations. In February 2008, the State Department announced that it would be awarding more than \$1 billion worth of contracts in Africa for the next five-year period (2009-2013) to as many as four private military contractors (Walsh, 2008; US Congress, 2008).¹

Under the *Direct Commercial Sales Program (DCS)*, the Office of Defense Trade Controls of the Department of State licenses the sale of police equipment (including pistols, revolvers, shotguns, rifles, and crowd control chemicals) by private US companies to foreign military forces, paramilitary units, police, and other government agencies. In FY 2008, American firms are expected to deliver more than \$175 million worth of this kind of hardware to Algeria through the DCS program, along with \$2 million worth for Botswana, \$3 million worth for Kenya, \$19 million worth for Morocco, \$17 million worth for Nigeria, and \$61 million worth for South Africa. In addition, ad hoc transfers of surplus US military equipment are made under the Excessive Defense Articles Program (EDA). Transfers to African recipients have included the transfer of C-130 transport planes to South Africa and Botswana, trucks to Uganda, M-16 rifles to Senegal, and coastal patrol vessels to Nigeria. Citing the commercial nature of these sales, the State Department refuses to release any further information on these transactions to the public on the grounds that this is “proprietary information,” i.e. this information is the private property of the companies involved.

Anti-Terrorism Assistance Program (ATA)

Since September 11, 2001, however, the overwhelming majority of US military-related programs with African nations have primarily been focused on providing training, equipment, and technology to support their participation in America’s global war on terrorism. The largest ATA program in Africa is targeted at countries of the Horn of Africa. The *East Africa Counter-Terrorism Initiative (EACTI)* helped Kenya to create the Kenyan Antiterrorism Police Unit (KAPU) in 2004 and to conduct anti-terrorism operations by East African armed forces. The program is now training and equipping members of a multi-agency, coast guard-type unit to patrol Kenya’s coastal waters. Between 2003 and 2005, ATA provided training both in Kenya and in the United States to 454 Kenyan police, internal security, and military officers in courses on “Preventing, Interdicting, and Investigating Acts of

1. Office of Logistics Management, Department of State, *AFRICAP Program Re-Compete*, 21 February 2008, electronic version accessed at www.fbo.gov on 5 March 2008; see also, David C. Walsh, “Africom: Stabilizing a Region in Chaos,” *Serviam*, Vol. 3, No. 2), pp. 6-12.

Terrorism,” “Crisis Response,” “Post-Blast Investigation,” “Rural Border Operations,” and “Terrorist Crime Scene Investigation.” The creation of the KAPU was financed with \$10 million from the FY 2003 Peacekeeping Operations Appropriation for Kenya, along with \$622,000 from ATA; the ATA spent \$21 million on training for Kenya in FY 2004 \$3.5 in FY 2005, and another \$3.2 in FY 2006. The administration requested \$2.9 for FY 2007 and an additional \$5.5 in FY 2008.

The second largest ATA program in Africa at present is one used to help fund the *Trans-Saharan Counter-Terrorism Partnership (TSCTP)*. For FY 2007, the administration requested \$7.2 million in ATA funding for the TSCTP and for FY 2008 requested another \$6 million in ATA funding for FY 2008 for Africa Regional activities, most of which may be used to fund the TSCTP. ATA programs are also being used to train and equip police, internal security, and military forces in a number of other African countries, including Tanzania (\$2.1 million in FY 2006), Mauritius (\$903,000 in FY 2006), Niger (\$905,000 in FY 2006), Chad (\$625,000 in FY 2006), Senegal (\$800,000 in FY 2006), Mali (\$564,000 in FY 2006), Liberia (\$220,000 in FY 2006), Ethiopia (\$170,000 in FY 2006). Training courses provided to these countries include topics like “Investigation of Terrorist Organizations,” “Rural Border Operations,” “Antiterrorism Instructor Training,” “Terrorist Crime Scene Investigation,” and “Explosive Incident Countermeasures.” In Djibouti, this training helped to create the country’s National Crisis Management Unit, within the Ministry of the Interior, to respond to major national emergencies.

ATA utilizes training facilities at three International Law Enforcement Academy (ILEA) centers, one located in Botswana. In 2003, students from Botswana, Ethiopia, and Tanzania attended a course on “Terrorist Investigations” at the Botswana ILEA center. In 2004, students from Djibouti, Malawi, Uganda, and Zambia took the same course there. In 2005, students from Botswana, Ethiopia, Kenya, and Tanzania attended a course on “Combating Domestic and Transnational Terrorism” at the Botswana ILEA center and students from Angola, Mozambique, Uganda, and Zambia took a course on the “Police Executive Role in Combating Terrorism.”

Other programs that complement America’s war on terror are the *Combined Joint Task Force-Horn of Africa (CJTF-HOA)* and the *Joint Task Force Aztec Silence (JTFAS)*. In October 2002, the US Central Command played the leading role in the creation of this joint task force that was designed to conduct naval and aerial patrols in the Red Sea, the Gulf of Aden, and the eastern Indian Ocean as part of the effort to detect and counter the activities of terrorist groups in the region. Based at Camp Lemonnier in Djibouti, long the site of a major French military base, the CJTF-HOA is made up of approximate 1,400 US military personnel – primarily sailors, Marines, and Special Forces troops – that work with a multi-national naval force composed of American naval vessels along with ships from the navies of France, Italy, and Germany, and other NATO allies.

The CJTF-FOA provided intelligence to Ethiopia in support of its invasion of Somalia in January 2007 and used military facilities in Djibouti, Ethiopia, and Kenya to launch air raids and missile strikes in January and June of 2007 and May of 2008 against alleged al-Qaeda members involved in the Council of Islamic Courts in Somalia. The command authority for CJTF-HOA, under the US Central Command, was expected to

be transferred to Africom by 2008. Under the initial five-year agreement with Djibouti, the CJTF-HOA base occupied less than a hundred acres, but under a new five-year agreement signed in 2007, the base has expanded to some five hundred acres.

In addition, the CJTF-HOA has established three permanent contingency operating locations that have been used to mount attacks on Somalia, one at the Kenyan naval base at Manda Bay and two others at Hurso and Bilate in Ethiopia.¹ A US Navy Special Warfare Task Unit is currently based at Manda Bay, where it is providing training in anti-terrorism operations and coastal patrol missions.²

The Joint Task Force Aztec Silence (JTFAS) was created in December 2003 by the US European Command to carry out counter-terrorism operations in North and West Africa and to coordinate US operations with those of countries in those regions. Specifically, JTFAS was charged with conducting surveillance operations using the assets of the US Sixth Fleet and to share information, along with intelligence collected by US intelligence agencies, with local military forces. The primary assets employed in this effort are a squadron of US Navy P-3 “Orion” based in Sigonella, Sicily. In March 2004, P-3 aircraft from this squadron and reportedly operating from the southern Algerian base at Tamanrasset were deployed to monitor and gather intelligence on the movements of Algerian Salafist guerrillas operating in Chad and to provide this intelligence to Chadian forces engaged in combat against the guerrillas.

And, in a particularly ominous incident, in September 2007, an American C-130 “Hercules” cargo plane stationed in Bamako, Mali, as part of the Flintlock 2007 exercises was deployed to resupply Malian counter-insurgency units engaged in fighting with Tuareg forces and was hit by Tuareg ground fire. No US personnel were injured and the plane returned safely to the capital, but the incident constitutes a major extension of the US role in counter-insurgency warfare and highlights the dangers of America’s deepening involvement in the internal conflicts that persist in so many African countries.

Naval Operations in the Gulf of Guinea

Although American naval forces operating in the oil-rich Gulf of Guinea and other areas along Africa’s shores are formally under the command of the US Sixth Fleet, based in the Mediterranean, and other US Navy commands, Africom will also help coordinate naval operations along the African coastline. As US Navy Admiral Henry G. Ulrich III, the commander of US Naval Forces (Europe) put it to reporters at Fort McNair in Washington, DC, in June 2007, “we hope, as they [Africom] stand up, to fold into their intentions and their planning,” and his command “will adjust, as necessary” as Africom becomes operational.³

The US Navy has been steadily increasing the level and pace of its operations in African waters in recent years, including the deployment of two aircraft carrier battle groups

1. Thomas P. M. Barnett, “Africa Command: Inside the Mission,” *Esquire*, 19 June 2007, electronic version accessed at www.esquire.com/features on 3 May 2007 and “The Americans Have Landed,” *Esquire*, 27 June 2007, pp. 4-9, electronic version accessed at www.esquire.com/features on 3 May 2008.

2. Steve Cline, “Across Kenya, US Forces share knowledge, assistance,” US Central Command news release, 2 May 2008, electronic version accessed at www.hoa.cencom.mil on 7 May 2008.

3. Gerry Gilmore, “US Naval Forces Europe Prepares for AFRICOM Stand Up,” American Forces Press Service, 1 June 2007, electronic version accessed at www.defenselink.mil on 4 September 2007.

off the coast of West Africa as part of the “Summer Pulse” exercise in June 2004, when identical battle groups were sent to every ocean around the globe to demonstrate that the United States was still capable of bringing its military power to bear simultaneously in every part of the world despite its commitment to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

More recently, American naval forces led an unprecedented voyage by a NATO fleet that circumnavigated the African continent from August to September 2007. Under the command of its flagship, the guided missile cruiser USS Normandy, the ships of Standing NATO Maritime Group One – composed of warships from Denmark, Portugal, the Netherlands, Canada, Germany, and the United States – conducted what were described as “presence operations” in the Gulf of Guinea, then proceeded to South Africa, where they participated in the Amazolo exercises being held by the South African Navy, and then sailed to the waters off the coast of Somalia to conduct more “presence operations” in a region which has experienced an upsurge in piracy. Later that same month, the guided missile destroyer USS Forrest Sherman arrived off South Africa to engage in a separate joint training exercise with the South African Navy frigate SAS Amatola.

And in another significant expansion of US Navy operations in Africa, the USS Fort McHenry amphibious assault ship began a six-month deployment to the Gulf of Guinea in November 2007, the first phase of the Africa Partnership Station Initiative. The USS Fort McHenry was accompanied by the High Speed Vessel HSV-2 “Swift” (the prototype for a new fast assault ship capable of operating in shallow, coastal waters) and two maritime prepositioning ships – the USNS 2nd Lieutenant John P. Bobo and USNS Lance Corporal Roy M. Wheat – from Maritime Prepositioning Ship Squadron 1, one of three prepositioning squadrons used to stockpile equipment at strategic locations around the world. The ships made ports of call in Senegal, Liberia, Ghana, Cameroon, São Tomé and Príncipe, Gabon, and Angola, and trained more than 1,200 sailors and other military personnel from these countries.

During their deployment, the ships conducted three weeks of amphibious assault exercises off Monrovia, Liberia, (known as Western Africa Training Cruise 2008) in March 2008 and conducted similar exercises off Dakar, Senegal, in April 2008 before returning to Norfolk, Virginia. Its mission was to serve as a “floating schoolhouse” to train local forces in port and oil-platform security, search and rescue missions, and medical and humanitarian assistance. According to Admiral Ulrich, the deployment matched up perfectly with the work of the new Africa Command. “If you look at the direction that the Africa Command has been given and the purpose of starting up the Africom, you’ll see that the (Gulf of Guinea) mission is closely aligned,” he told reporters in June 2007.¹

In February 2008, the US 6th Fleet conducted seven days of joint maritime exercises (known as Exercise Maritime Safari 2008) at Nigeria’s Ikeja Air Force Base with the Nigerian Navy and Air Force as part of the African Partnership Station Initiative. The American forces involved included P-3 “Orion” aerial surveillance aircraft from the squadron based in Sigonella, Sicily, and elements of the 6th Fleet’s Maritime Patrol Operations Command Center. The highlight of the exercises was a search and rescue exercise off Lagos.

The USS Forrest Sherman and the USS Normandy, as part of the 6th Fleet’s South-

1. Ibid.

east Africa Task Force, made the first tour by American warships of the waters off East Africa in 2007 with visit to eight countries. The Southeast Africa Task Force made its second voyage in April 2008, when the landing-ship dock USS Ashland visited Madagascar, Mauritius, and Reunion.

In addition to direct naval operations in African waters, the Bush administration also negotiated *Base Access Agreements for Cooperative Security Locations* with the governments of Botswana, Gabon, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, Morocco, Namibia, São Tomé and Príncipe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tunisia, Uganda, and Zambia. Under these agreements, the United States gains access to local military bases and other facilities so that they can be used by American forces as transit bases or as forward operating bases for combat, surveillance, and other military operations. They remain the property of the host African government and are not American bases in a legal sense, so that US government officials are telling the truth – at least technically – when they deny that the United States has bases in these countries.

In addition to these publicly acknowledged base access agreements, the Pentagon was granted permission to deploy P-3 “Orion” aerial surveillance aircraft at the airfield at Tamanrasset in southern Algeria under an agreement reportedly signed during Algerian President Abdelaziz Bouteflika’s visit to Washington in July 2003. Brown and Root-Condor, a joint venture between a subsidiary of the American company, Halliburton, and the Algerian state-owned oil company, Sonatrach, is currently under contract to enlarge the military air bases at Tamanrasset and at Bou Saada. In December 2006, Salafist forces used an improvised mine and small arms to attack a convoy of Brown and Root-Condor employees who were returning to their hotel in the Algerian town of Bouchaoui, killing an Algerian driver and wounding nine workers, including four Britons and one American.

Over the coming year, there is one major issue related to the new command that remains to be resolved: whether and where in Africa will Africom establish a regional headquarters. A series of consultations with the governments of a number of African countries – including Morocco, Algeria, Libya, Egypt, Djibouti, Nigeria, and Kenya – following the announcement of Africom found that none of them were willing to commit to hosting the new command. The public response throughout Africa was so unanimously hostile to the idea of a permanent and highly visible American military presence on the continent that no African government – except that of Liberia – was willing to take the political risk of agreeing to host the new command.

This constitutes a signal victory for civil society all across the continent and an important demonstration that the dynamics of global relations and political relations within states have changed radically since the end of the Cold War. Even in Africa – once treated as a convenient arena for manipulation and intervention by both super-powers – the United States can no longer rely on compliant regimes to do its bidding and faces growing opposition from popular political organizations and civic institutions (political parties; newspapers and other independent media; churches, mosques, and other religious institutions; trade unions; community associations; human rights organizations; environmental groups; and private business interests) that are gaining more and more power to challenge US policy. Privately, however, many African rulers have assured the United States that they are still eager to collaborate with the Penta-

gon in less visible ways, including participating in US security assistance programs and agreeing to allow US forces to use local military bases in times of crisis.

Africom became fully operational as a unified combatant command on 1 October 2008, just a month before the election to select President Bush's successor. For the time being, Africom's headquarters will remain in Stuttgart, Germany. In its FY 2009 budget request, the Bush administration requested \$398 million to create and staff the new command. This will cover the cost of creating an Africom intelligence capacity, including a Joint Intelligence Operations Center; launching a stand-alone Theater Special Operations Command for Africom; deploying support aircraft to Africa; building a limited presence on the African continent that is expected to include the establishment of two of five regional offices projected by Africom; and conducting training, exercises, and theater security cooperation activities over the coming year.

It will be up to President Barack Obama to decide whether or not to follow the path marked out by the Bush administration – a strategy based on its determination to depend upon the use of military force in Africa and elsewhere to satisfy America's continuing addiction to oil – or to chart a new path based on an international and multi-lateral partnership with African nations and with other countries that have a stake in the continent (including China and India) to promote sustainable economic development and democracy in Africa and a new global energy order based on the use of clean, safe, and renewable resources.

Six months into his presidency, it is hard to tell whether President Obama will opt out for the latter option or not. If anything, given the political forces lined up, he is more likely to follow the policies of his predecessor. The President is genuinely convinced of the necessity and legitimacy of the Global War on Terrorism and the administration has come under unprecedented pressure from business interests and lobbyists (especially from the oil companies); certain think tanks and NGOs; and the Pentagon; and from some African governments to pursue the plan for Africom initiated by the Bush administration. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's recent visit to seven strategic African countries clearly demonstrated that the Obama administration will continue the militarization of US policy toward Africa to secure its energy security unless it comes under pressure to change direction. However, members of the US Congress are now beginning to give Africom the critical scrutiny it deserves and to express serious skepticism about its mission and operations. Moreover, a number of concerned organizations and individuals in the United States and in Africa – the Resist Africom Campaign – came together in August 2006 to educate the American people about Africom and to mobilize public and congressional opposition to the creation of the new command. And the Resist Africom Campaign will continue to press the Obama administration to abandon the Bush plan for Africom and pursue a policy toward Africa based on a genuine partnership with the people of Africa, multi-lateralism, democracy, human rights, and grass-roots development.¹

1. For more information about the Resist Africom Campaign, see their website at www.resistafricom.org.

THE IMPACT OF THE “NEW SCRAMBLE FOR AFRICA” ON AFRICAN SECURITY, POLITICAL REFORM, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The effects of the growing economic, political, and military competition in Africa between China, India, Russia, the United States, and other external powers on the policy space for African nations have been contradictory and ambiguous. It has allowed African governments to manipulate their external partners and to use their growing leverage to play different foreign powers off against each other. It has provided African governments and private businesses with access to new sources of loans, credits, and other financial assistance as well as to new sources of development assistance. It has increased the market for African energy supplies and other resources. These can be seen as developments that have expanded the policy space for African nations in ways that are generally beneficial for Africans. In some cases, however, it is clear that African governments have used their growing leverage over their external partners in ways that have harmed their citizens. For example, a number of repressive and undemocratic governments in Africa have used their increased revenues to buy arms to be used to keep themselves in power or when they pursue development projects that are environmentally dangerous or destroy existing communities.

At the same time, this competition has undermined African producers of raw materials, textiles, and other commodities. It has exacerbated internal political conflict in a number of African countries as external powers compete for political influence by providing support to different political groups within African countries and as these groups seek to use their ties to external powers to strengthen their position against their domestic political rivals. As noted above, it can enhance the internal security capabilities of repressive and undemocratic governments that violate human rights and encourage them to rely on the use of force to stay in power and block political reform. In some cases, it has encouraged these governments to use their military forces to invade neighboring countries, as in central Africa, where six countries sent their troops into the Democratic Republic of Congo or in the Horn of Africa, where Ethiopia and Eritrea fought a bloody border war and where Ethiopia invaded and occupied Somalia. These can be seen as developments that have limited the policy space for African nations in ways that are generally harmful for Africans.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The “new scramble for Africa” has had an enormous impact – both beneficial and harmful – on Africa and is transforming Africa’s security architecture. As this competition continues to evolve, there is a clear need for future research on several topics. First of all, we need to know more about what China, India, Russia, the United States, and other external powers are doing in Africa. Second, we need to learn more about what impact this is having on particular African countries. And third, we need to determine what can be done to help shape these developments and what can be done to avoid or mitigate its negative effects in the future.

CURRENT AFRICAN ISSUES PUBLISHED BY THE INSTITUTE

Recent issues in the series are available electronically
for download free of charge www.nai.uu.se

1. *South Africa, the West and the Frontline States. Report from a Seminar.* 1981, 34 pp
2. Maja Naur, *Social and Organisational Change in Libya.* 1982, 33 pp
3. *Peasants and Agricultural Production in Africa. A Nordic Research Seminar. Follow-up Reports and Discussions.* 1981, 34 pp
4. Ray Bush & S. Kibble, *Destabilisation in Southern Africa, an Overview.* 1985, 48 pp
5. Bertil Egerö, *Mozambique and the Southern African Struggle for Liberation.* 1985, 29 pp
6. Carol B. Thompson, *Regional Economic Polic under Crisis Condition. Southern African Development.* 1986, 34 pp
7. Inge Tvedten, *The War in Angola, Internal Conditions for Peace and Recovery.* 1989, 14 pp
8. Patrick Wilmot, *Nigeria's Southern Africa Policy 1960–1988.* 1989, 15 pp
9. Jonathan Baker, *Perestroika for Ethiopia: In Search of the End of the Rainbow?* 1990, 21 pp
10. Horace Campbell, *The Siege of Cuito Cuanavale.* 1990, 35 pp
11. Maria Bongartz, *The Civil War in Somalia. Its genesis and dynamics.* 1991, 26 pp
12. S.B.O. Gutto, *Human and People's Rights in Africa. Myths, Realities and Prospects.* 1991, 26 pp
13. Said Chikhi, Algeria. *From Mass Rebellion to Workers' Protest.* 1991, 23 pp
14. Bertil Odén, *Namibia's Economic Links to South Africa.* 1991, 43 pp
15. Cervenka Zdenek, *African National Congress Meets Eastern Europe. A Dialogue on Common Experiences.* 1992, 49 pp, ISBN 91-7106-337-4
16. Diallo Garba, Mauritania–The Other Apartheid? 1993, 75 pp, ISBN 91-7106-339-0
17. Zdenek Cervenka and Colin Legum, *Can National Dialogue Break the Power of Terror in Burundi?* 1994, 30 pp, ISBN 91-7106-353-6
18. Erik Nordberg and Uno Winblad, *Urban Environmental Health and Hygiene in Sub-Saharan Africa.* 1994, 26 pp, ISBN 91-7106-364-1
19. Chris Dunton and Mai Palmberg, *Human Rights and Homosexuality in Southern Africa.* 1996, 48 pp, ISBN 91-7106-402-8
20. Georges Nzongola-Ntalaja *From Zaire to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.* 1998, 18 pp, ISBN 91-7106-424-9
21. Filip Reyntjens, *Talking or Fighting? Political Evolution in Rwanda and Burundi, 1998–1999.* 1999, 27 pp, ISBN 91-7106-454-0
22. Herbert Weiss, *War and Peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.* 1999, 28 pp, ISBN 91-7106-458-3
23. Filip Reyntjens, *Small States in an Unstable Region – Rwanda and Burundi, 1999–2000,* 2000, 24 pp, ISBN 91-7106-463-X
24. Filip Reyntjens, *Again at the Crossroads: Rwanda and Burundi, 2000–2001.* 2001, 25 pp, ISBN 91-7106-483-4
25. Henning Melber, *The New African Initiative and the African Union. A Preliminary Assessment and Documentation.* 2001, 36 pp, ISBN 91-7106-486-9
26. Dahilon Yassin Mohamoda, *Nile Basin Cooperation. A Review of the Literature.* 2003, 39 pp, ISBN 91-7106-512-1
27. Henning Melber (ed.), *Media, Public Discourse and Political Contestation in Zimbabwe.* 2004, 39 pp, ISBN 91-7106-534-2
28. Georges Nzongola-Ntalaja, *From Zaire to the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Second and Revised Edition.* 2004, 23 pp, ISBN-91-7106-538-5
29. Henning Melber (ed.), *Trade, Development, Cooperation – What Future for Africa?* 2005, 44 pp, ISBN 91-7106-544-X
30. Kaniye S.A. Ebeku, *The Succession of Faure Gnassingbe to the Togolese Presidency – An International Law Perspective.* 2005, 32 pp, ISBN 91-7106-554-7

31. Jeffrey V. Lazarus, Catrine Christiansen, Lise Rosendal Østergaard, Lisa Ann Richey, *Models for Life – Advancing antiretroviral therapy in sub-Saharan Africa*. 2005, 33 pp, ISBN 91-7106-556-3
32. Charles Manga Fombad and Zein Kebonang, *AU, NEPAD and the APRM – Democratisation Efforts Explored*. Edited by Henning Melber. 2006, 56 pp, ISBN 91-7106-569-5
33. Pedro Pinto Leite, Claes Olsson, Magnus Schöldtz, Toby Shelley, Pål Wrangé, Hans Corell and Karin Scheele, *The Western Sahara Conflict – The Role of Natural Resources in Decolonization*. Edited by Claes Olsson. 2006, 32 pp, ISBN 91-7106-571-7
34. Jassey, Katja and Stella Nyanzi, *How to Be a “Proper” Woman in the Times of HIV and AIDS*. 2007, 35 pp, ISBN 91-7106-574-1
35. Lee, Margaret, Henning Melber, Sanusha Naidu and Ian Taylor, *China in Africa*. Compiled by Henning Melber. 2007, 47 pp, ISBN 978-91-7106-589-6
36. Nathaniel King, *Conflict as Integration. Youth Aspiration to Personhood in the Teleology of Sierra Leone’s ‘Senseless War’*. 2007, 32 pp, ISBN 978-91-7106-604-6
37. Aderanti Adepoju, *Migration in sub-Saharan Africa*. 2008. 70 pp, ISBN 978-91-7106-620-6
38. Bo Malmberg, *Demography and the development potential of sub-Saharan Africa*. 2008, 39 pp, 978-91-7106-621-3
39. Johan Holmberg, *Natural resources in sub-Saharan Africa: Assets and vulnerabilities*. 2008, 52 pp, 978-91-7106-624-4
40. Arne Bigsten and Dick Durevall, *The African economy and its role in the world economy*. 2008, 66 pp, 978-91-7106-625-1
41. Fantu Cheru, *Africa’s development in the 21st century: Reshaping the research agenda*. 2008, 47 pp, 978-91-7106-628-2
42. Dan Kuwali, *Persuasive Prevention. Towards a Principle for Implementing Article 4(h) and R2P by the African Union*. 2009. 70 pp. ISBN 978-91-7106-650-3
43. Daniel Volman, *China, India, Russia and the United States. The Scramble for African Oil and the Militarization of the Continent*. 2009. 24 pp. ISBN 978-91-7106-658-9

