

2차대전 이후 미국의 대아프리카 외교정책 : 도전과 전망*

마브레 테이드** 윌디아 대학교

김일수*** 충북대학교

논문 요약

본 논문은 미국의 대 아프리카 외교정책을 분석하고 있다. 이 논문에서는 미국과 아프리카 관계가 그동안 큰 진전을 보이지 못한 요인들이 무엇인지 살펴보고 있다. 일부 전문가들은 미국과 아프리카의 협력이 포괄적이며 꾸준히 진전되고 있다고 주장한다. 그러나 이 논문은 미국이 아프리카에 대한 장기적이고 전략적인 정책과 비전이 부재하기 때문에 미국과 아프리카 관계는 발전하지 못하고 있다는 점을 지적하였다. 9/11테러 이전 미국의 대아프리카 정책은 인도주의적인 원조와 초국가적 범죄, 테러, 그리고 고질적인 질병 치료 지원 단기적인 협력과 같은 분야에만 국한되었다. 그러나 9/11테러 이후 미국은 테러의 확산과 안보 위협의 증가를 막고, 지정학적, 경제적으로 중요한 지역에 대한 통제, 그리고 자원과 시장에 대한 이유로 아프리카에 대해 적극적으로 개입하기 시작하였고, 그 결과 미국의 아프리카에 대한 직접 투자의 증가, 아프리카의 정치, 보건, 민주화의 개선 등이 이루어지고 있다. 현재 미국과 아프리카 관계는 후원자와 고객 사이의 관계에서 동등한 협력 방식으로 변화하고 있으며 이러한 추세는 지속될 것이다.

주제어 : 미국-아프리카 관계, 미국의 아프리카 정책, 후원자-고객 관계, 아프리카 자원과 시장

* 이 논문은 2020학년도 충북대학교 연구년제 사업의 연구비 지원에 의하여 연구되었음(This work was financially supported by the Research Year of Chungbuk National University in 2020).

** First author *** Corresponding author

I. Introduction

After the end of the Second World War, the United States has managed to sustain its relationship with African states, but its strategic priorities, strategies have not been firmly and comprehensively established as one of the bedrocks of the elements of American foreign policy. In simple terminology, in the tradition of US foreign policy there has been no long-term strategic goal and policy structure regarding Africa.

This paper's goals are three. First, it aims to investigate the factors that lead to the slow development of U.S.-Africa relations and to unveil determinant factors in U.S.-African relations. Second, it addresses developments in the international environment that have affected American interest in Africa. Thirdly, it analyzes US involvement in Africa's defense, economic, and political motives.

II. U.S. Interests in Africa: Changes and Continuity

1. The System-level of Analysis and U.S.-Africa Relations

In the course of dealing with international relations, there are three levels of analysis: system level, state level, and individual level analysis (Rourke and Boyer 1998, 48-49; Rourke 2005, 58-94). The system-level analysis focuses on four factors: structural characteristics, power relationships, economic realities, and norms. According to the system-level of analysis,

the relationships of states in the international system are always influenced by the power structure, wealth distribution, and global norms.

The state-level of analysis focuses on the domestic factors that shape foreign relations: the process of foreign policy decision making, political culture, and actors of making and implementing foreign policy. According to the state level of analysis, the nature of a particular state foreign policy at large is determined by characteristics of a state: democratic or non-democratic, and values and customs that reflects the political cultures of society, etc.

The individual-level of analysis focuses on human nature, organizational behavior, and idiosyncratic behavior. Its initial argument is rooted in the view that the basic unit of any form of decision making or policy formulation is the role of individuals. It firmly claims that understanding the cognitive factors of decision making process and the roles of psychological factors are fundamental to get the bottom insights of foreign policy and international politics. It also believes organizational behavior that dictates group thinking, and the personal characteristics of leaders are key determinants of decision making and policy formulation.

These three levels of analysis are very essential approaches to analyze and understand the U.S.-Africa relations from different perspectives. But this paper adopts the system level of analysis as the main framework for examining the nature and course of the U.S. and African relations. There are two reasons for adopting this approach: its inclusiveness, and appropriateness to deal about the two continents (multi-lateral) relations.

Africa, as a continent, has been one of the centers of contention between Europeans during the colonial era and between the U.S. and the former USSR (now Russia), China, in the post-colonial years. Particularly after the emergence of the Cold War, Africa was one of the strategic areas that the U.S. and USSR had competed to have the upper hand control (Magu 2019, 62-64).

From 1991 up to 2000, the U.S. competition over and the concern for Africa has diminished because of the end of the Cold War rivalry and the decline of the significance of strategic areas. However, Africa has received high attention again from the great powers including the U.S., China, Russia, Japan due to its vast market opportunity, cheapest labor force, and untapped resources (Osaretin 2013, 144).

Therefore, adopting the system level of analysis is appropriate to discuss the courses of U.S.-African relations because it enables us to see the impacts of changes in the international system on the two region's interactions. Also, it is an instrumental frame to identify the variables that causes up and downs of the U.S. interests in Africa. American foreign policy towards Africa is quite often dictated by the changes in the international system including ideological rivalry, security threats, competition over resources and market, and geopolitical advantages.

2. U.S.-Africa Relations before 9/11 and after 9/11

The formal relations of the U.S. and Africa started immediately after the end of WWII when the U.S. endeavored

to uphold the independence movements of African nations from colonial rule (Emerson 1962, 1). It was this firm stand that laid the cornerstones of U.S.-Africa relations. Since then, the U.S. has been involving in Africa in various spectrum of issues that range from providing diplomatic and political support to developmental aid.

However, the U.S. policy towards Africa, especially from post-WWII up to 9/11, has been amorphous: there have been no comprehensive and long-term policy priorities and objectives (Magu 2019, 59-62; Crabb 1998, 369-401). This could be caused by several reasons and even the interpretation is different from the perspectives of Africans and Americans. From the African point of view, the U.S. policy in Africa has been amorphous because of at least three interrelated precluding red tapes.

The first is related to the appeasement policies of the U.S. towards the European countries. This approach is also emanated from the U.S. policy maker's perception that the responsibility of managing African affairs is down to the former European colonial powers (Magu 2019, 68).

The second factor is related to the pessimistic views of the U.S. about the continent of Africa. The American public and the Western world, in general, had been portraying Africa as a lost continent and the land of dispute. As a result, both the U.S. government and non-governmental organizations have neglected Africa (Booker 1999, 88). Because of such a negative sentiment, the infrastructural and socio-economic development engagements of the U.S. in the region remained the lowest and fragile.

The third precluding factor that made U.S. foreign policy towards Africa amorphous is the absence of significant domestic pressure from the U.S. This leads to a long-lasting ignorance of issues that matter Africa in the mainstream U.S. political dialogue and even presidential debates subsequently. Walle (2009, 4) argued that the absence of political support led subsequent U.S. leaders to be less ambitious in Africa until recent times. Walle argued:

“The absence of political support on Capitol Hill led successive White House leaders to downscale policy ambitions in Africa, and to focus their attention and resources on other, more strategic regions of the world. In effect, the Africa policy came to be made by mid-level officials with a hard-budget constraint.”

As such, the U.S. policy initiatives and fundamental components of its engagement in Africa had not been significant to bring radical socio-economic and political transformation in Africa as it compared with its role in the process of reconstructing post-war Europe, and its security and developmental role in the Middle East and the Pacific region. In simple terminology, the U.S.-African relations during the cold war could be described as unproductive which had been limited only to exchanging humanitarian aid, fighting disease and securing some geopolitically strategic interests of Americans (Ibid, 4).

Even after the end of the Cold War, the involvement of the U.S. in Africa was highly restrained due to the diminishing of Africa's strategic significance in the eyes of U.S. policymakers. One of the instances that exposes American's reluctance and strengthens the African claim is the Clinton Administration's

inability to act in the 1994 Rwandan genocide (Carroll 2004, 1). This inaction had caused the death of around one million Tutsi Rwandans within less than four months.

However, around the year 2000, the Clinton administration introduced new policy initiatives to improve the U.S. and African interaction after fierce criticism of the inaction during the 1994 Rwandan genocide and the coming of new competitors for the African market as well as resources. The enactment of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) in 2000 is one of these initiatives that aimed to open market access to Sub-Saharan African states in the United States domestic market (Katito 2009, 147). The figure 1 below identifies the top 15 recipients of U.S. foreign assistance for FY 1995, FY 2005, FY 2015.

Table 1. Top Recipients of U.S. Foreign Assistance from All Sources, FY1995, FY2005 and FY2015(in millions of current U.S. dollars)

FY 1995	USD (Million)	FY 2005	USD (Million)	FY 2015	USD (Million)
Israel	3,010	Iraq	7,767	Afghanistan	5,452
Egypt	2,318	Israel	2,713	Israel	3,100
Russia	543	Egypt	1,791	Iraq	1,829
Turkey	528	Afghanistan	1,730	Egypt	1,456
Ukraine	261	Russia	1,577	Jordan	1,088
Greece	251	Sudan	1,025	Pakistan	805
Palau	245	Colombia	736	Kenya	739
India	166	Pakistan	712	Nigeria	692
Haiti	157	Jordan	647	Ethiopia	650
Rwanda	139	Ethiopia	629	Tanzania	647
Peru	128	West Bank/Gaza	347	Uganda	521
Kazakhstan	121	Honduras	287	South	497

				Sudan	
Bangladesh	110	Uganda	287	Mozambique	457
Armenia	106	Indonesia	231	Zambia	441
South Africa	101	Kenya	224	South Africa	436

Source: Tarnoff and Lawson, "Foreign Aid: An Introduction to U.S. Programs and Policy", Congressional Research Service, 2016, p. 13.

As the table 1 shows, there were only three African countries (Egypt, Rwanda and South Africa) received U.S. aid in FY 1995. After ten years later, two more African countries joined the top fifteen recipients of U.S. aid across the world. The increase is largely influenced by the security concerns particularly terrorist attacks that targeted the U.S. and to prevent diseases including HIV AIDS and malaria.

In general, the U.S.-Africa relations before the 9/11 had been practically focused on some narrowly defined agendas such as controlling geopolitical strategic areas, providing humanitarian and development aid, tackling diseases, and ill-defined expansion of democratic institutions. Simply put, the foreign policy position of the U.S. was not clear concerning Africa, and its approaches did not include mega-projects that would shift the perceptions of Americans and the West from portraying Africa as a region of crisis to a land of fortune and future business destinations.

The tragedy of September 11 terror attack shaped and changed the principal attention of the U.S. government in Africa. Following the end of the Cold war, the geopolitical strategic importance of Africa was diminished. As a result, the involvement of the U.S. in the region has been restricted to

non-sensitive issues including foreign aid provision, fighting against diseases, and insignificant development assistance.

But, after September 11 terror atrocity, the trajectory and contours of U.S. foreign policy towards Africa shifted to an all-out securitization and fighting terrorism. The U.S. began to realize that the threats to American national security come not only from powerful states but also it emerges from the environment characterized by failed states and many conflict-ridden areas such as the African continent (Ploch 2011, 13-19; Walle 2009, 2-4).

Taking this account, the Bush administration established a Combined Joint Task Force-Horn of Africa (CJTF-HOA) in 2002 with a mission of detecting and defeating regional as well as international terrorist operations in the region. The Bush Administration installed a separate geographical combatant command forces, African Command (ARICOM) (Ploch 2011, 4-13). Since then, the courses of U.S.-Africa relations have made remarkable progress.

As table 1. above indicates, ten out of fifteen top recipients of U.S. aid are from Africa including Egypt, Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, Tanzania, Uganda, South Sudan, Mozambique, Zambia, and South Africa. This rapid increase implies the improvements of the U.S. commitment to Africa.

The expansion of U.S. engagement with regionally influential African states has three major objectives: ensuring national security, expanding commercial opportunity and responding to the humanitarian crisis (Tarnoff and Lawson 2016, 3-4). Also, the emergence of new forms of security threats and the rising of Africa's significance has an impact on the aggressive U.S. endeavor to cooperate with Africans.

III. System's Change and Its Implication to U.S.-Africa Relations

1. International System's Change in the 21st Century

Since the starting of the new millennium, several changes have been observed in the global system. The international system has been shaped by the 9/11 terror attack that targeted the U.S. These global changes can be summarized into four categories: the introduction of economic multi-polar system, the gradual shift of the center of the economic powerhouse from the Western powers to the non-western powers, the rising roles of Africa in the international system, and the emergence of new global security threats.

The first change observed in the global system, in the aftermath of the Cold war, is the introduction of an economic multi-polar system. Huntington (1996, 21) described the post-Cold War global politics as multi-polar and multi-civilizational. Barry Buzan also argues that the end of the Cold War has created a remarkable fluidity and openness in the whole pattern and quality of the international system (Buzan 1991, 432). This fluidity and openness have created the door for emerging states to play key roles in the global politics that manifested in the forms of regional hegemony. Some of the notable emerging powers include China, Brazil, India, Russia, Turkey, and South Africa (Magu 2019, 113-118).

The second change is the gradual shift of the center of the

global economic powerhouse from the Western to non-Western powers. Until the beginning of the new millennium, the U.S., Germany, and Japan had been in control of the global economic powerhouse. For the last two decades, however, the BRICS including Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa challenged the traditional Western economic powerhouse nations (Magu 2019, 115-118).

In 2011, the IMF has predicted that the BRICS would account for up to 61% global growth in 2017 (Magu 2019, 115). China alone is predicted to overtake the U.S. economy soon (Steinbock 2017, 1). Not only the BRICS states but also other vibrant emerging economies such as Turkey, South Korea, Singapore, Mexico, Indonesia, Saudi Arabia, Nigeria, and Egypt are new competitors of the global economic power (Ibid, 1-3; Magu 2019, 114).

The third global change is the rising roles of Africa in the international system. Africa has witnessed an impressive improvement: expansion of democratic election, improvement of human rights, and allowance of more political freedom (Ward et al. 2016, 17-20; Walle 2009, 6-10). Africa's economic situations improved significantly: according to OECD, Africa has registered 4.6% growth rate between 2000 and 2016 which is higher than Latin American region. This helps Africa to attract investors from different regions and to become a new center of the global trade exchange. The emergence of information and technologies enables Africa's economic and social integration, and innovation of entrepreneurship.

The improvements of Africa and its active engagement in the global system have transformed the psychological makeup

of its nations significantly. Oyewole (2008, 98) explained the changing of the atmosphere in Africa as follows:

“The age of pity is over. Africans do not want the world to see their continent as one characterized mainly by kwashiorkor-ridden children with begging bowls or emaciated adults waiting to be saved by the West. It is a continent with people who are willing to work hard to earn a living and a private sector that is dynamic and innovative, but disabled by lack of, or limited, infrastructure that is made all the more inadequate by the digital divide.”

The fourth change in the global system is the emergence of new forms of global security threats. The ideological conflict has gone and there emerged new types of security threats other than military security. According to Huntington (1996, 29), the post-Cold War world insecurity is mainly caused by the difference in terms of culture, identity, values, religion, and civilization. He further argues that local conflicts most likely to escalate into broader wars are those between groups and states from different civilizations. This shift has brought non-state actors as new threats of global security as it is observed in the September 11 terror attack that perpetuated by Al-Qaeda.

In addition to this, the twenty-first century global security is threatened by emerging issues like inter-ethnic conflict, environmental degradation, a higher level of interdependence, and cyber-attacks (The Global Risks Report 2019, 5-8; Brauch 2005, 10-19). It has posed a complicated threat that requires multilateral strategy, and response rather than a unilateral or bilateral alliance. Therefore, the twenty-first century international security threats nature, its sources, and responses are not the

same from that of the 20th century.

2. U.S. National interests in Africa: Rational and Policy

Before the four grand changes in the global system i.e. multi-polarity, the emergence of new economic powers, the rising roles of Africa, and the emergence of new security threats in the international system, the U.S. interests in Africa were limited to two things. These are sustaining its hegemonic status and global stability, and ensuring the loyalty and votes of African states in the UN decision making process. For this end, the U.S. has been providing African nations a limited amount of economic assistance, humanitarian aid, support for building democratic institutions, and military aid (Walle 2009, 1-2; Oyewole 2009, 93-94). Generally, its overall engagement with Africans has been insignificant and did not bring any meaningful results.

However, after witnessing dynamic changes in the international system, the U.S. is diversifying its interest and started to be involved in Africa aggressively. Particularly after 9/11, the U.S. has been engaged in Africa to prevent the proliferation of terrorism and the rise of security threats to itself and the rest of the world. The U.S. also tried to ensure its control over geopolitically and economically strategic areas as well as to expand its access to resources, market, and commercial institutions in the region.

The primary U.S. interest in Africa, in the aftermath of 9/11, is to prevent the proliferation of terrorism and the rise

of security threats. The U.S. national security strategy (2002) outlined new and engaging security strategic plans about Africa. It has suggested a special close engagement with countries such as South Africa, Nigeria, Kenya, and Ethiopia (The White House 2002, 10-11). The U.S. has established regional-based military cooperation: the combined joint task force-Horn of Africa (CJTF-HoA), Operation Enduring Freedom Trans Sahara (OEF-TS), the Pan Sahel Initiative (PSI), and Trans-Saharan Counter-Terrorism Initiative (TSCTI) as new security strategic cooperation plan.

Furthermore, the 2006 U.S. national security strategy sets up long-term strategies of eliminating the source of terrorism by underscoring that the U.S. security depends upon participating with African states to strengthen fragile and failing states and bring ungoverned areas under the control of effective democracies (The White House 2006, 37). This strategic improvement was followed by the establishment of a new combatant command Called Africa Command (AFRICOM). This was aimed to fight terrorism, preventing piracy, preventing transnational crime, and facilitating U.S. security cooperation with African states.

Another major interest that the U.S. attempted to achieve in its relation with Africa is the control over strategic areas. It includes the ambition of encountering the influence of emerging powers (China, Russia and Iran), controlling key routs of navigation like the strait of Bab-el-Mandeb which connects the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden, and having strong hold over politically significant areas such as the Horn of Africa (Magu 2019, 172; Thrall 2015, 57-59; Korybko 2015,

1-3). The horn of Africa region is one of the busiest region in Africa which hosts foreign military bases including the U.S., France, Italy, China, Japan, Saudi Arabia, UAE, Turkey, and Russia (Ani Christian 2019, 1).

This has prompted the U.S. to regard the horn of Africa region in particular and the African continent in general as a key strategic place to fulfill its national interests and global stability. Indeed, it is a very valuable place to ensure safe passages of oil from Africa and the Middle East into the global market. It can reduce the impacts of failed states and fragile areas that exist in various parts of Africa, halt the activities of terrorists, and gather intelligence about the activities of evolving powers in Africa.

Global Terrorism Index (2016) showed that among the ten worst-affected countries by terrorist attacks, six countries were from the continent of Africa (Institute for Economics and Peace 2016, 19). Failed states index also shows that seven states out of trouble ten are coming from Africa including Somalia, Sudan, Congo, Chad, Central Africa Republic, and Zimbabwe (Blandford et al. 2011, 11-12).

The third major U.S. interest is expanding its access to resources, market, and commercial institutions in the African continent. Currently, the U.S. is trying to control the lion share of the African market, resources especially energy, and the African Union. In the sector of energy, mainly because Africa meets energy demand from China and India, and the uncertainty of Middle East conflict continuous (Lin 2007, 1-2).

In terms of trade and investment, the U.S.-Africa trade relation is on the verge of improving and continuous rise

since 2009 (International Trade Administration 2014, 5). According to the International Trade Administration (2014, 5), the U.S. direct investment has been growing by 40% from 2009 up to 2012 although the U.S. trade exchange with Africa is still insignificant. Thrall's study (2015, 24-25) shows China is the largest trade partner of Africa both in import and export. Recently, the U.S. endeavors to improve its trade and investment exchange with Africa through initiatives including the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA), Power Africa and U.S.-Africa business forum.

3. Prospects of U.S.-Africa relations in the 21st Century

We have seen changes in the international system and its implication for U.S.-Africa relations. Almost for the past two decades, three major progresses have been observed in Africa that triggered by factors ranged from African's internal effort to changes in the international system.

The first progress observed in Africa is higher flows of foreign direct investment and strong integration into the global market. African states are gradually stepping up to integrate with the global market and creating a better business environment including an impressive improvement of bureaucratic red tapes (Cooke and Downie 2014, 2-3). Holodny's study (2015) shows six out of thirteen fastest-growing economies in the world come from Africa with an impressive socio-economic transformation (Holodny 2015).

Second, Africa is gradually getting the capacity and technology

to extract its resources, particularly its untapped oil resource. Africa is the most exciting and potentially dynamic market in the world, increasingly capturing the attention of the world's largest businesses (Arnold 2019, 1). Technological integration and human skill development have helped to bring Africa into the center of the international market, particularly manufacturing and providing reliable energy to the global market.

The third of Africa's progress is its impressive democratization and institutional building since the beginning of the new millennium (Ward et al. 2016, 9-13). The continent has started to manage its security challenges through domestic institutions like AU and regional integrations. As the 2018 Ibrahim Index of African Governance (IIAD) shows, 34 out of 54 countries have improved in overall governance over the past decade, with 15 of these having accelerated their pace of improvement in the past five years (Altenburg et al 2019, 10). This has helped the continent to see 3 of 4 of its citizens living in a country where public governance is improving in the past ten years.

These changes, in turn, led to a new form of relationship between the U.S. and Africa. First, the U.S.-Africa relation is transforming from a patron-client kind of relation to an equal manner of partnership. In recent decades, the U.S. interest in Africa is transformed into pursuing a trade, investment and encouraging private American companies to do business in Africa. The U.S. has generated FDI and created job opportunities for Americans (The White House 2012, 2-4). According to a report presented to Congress in 2012, the U.S. trade exchange with Sub-Saharan Africa states during 2010 and 2011 increased

by 29.5% and 17% respectively (Jones and Williams 2012, 7).

Second, the image of Africa is changing from conflict-ridden areas to the land of opportunity in the postures of U.S. foreign policy and national strategy. The 2012 U.S. Strategy toward Sub-Saharan Africa consolidates this by stating that the economies of Sub-Saharan African are among the world's rapidly growing. An increasing number of African governments and regional organizations take a leading role in addressing the security and political challenges within their borders. It further adds that the African Union serves as an important leader on political, diplomatic and peacekeeping issues across the continent (The White House 2012, 1).

The changes in Africa's image, which is contributed by both domestic and international changes, can be summarized into three sectors: political, military and economic. In the political sector, Africa is building an inclusive and pluralistic administrative system that is capable of accommodating diversity in terms of religion, ethnicity, and gender. The improvement in the political sector helps African nations to reduce security vulnerability that emanates from ethnic conflict, religious antagonism, political unrest, and environmental-related problems (Daschle 2017, 1-3; Altenburg et al 2019, 10).

In the economic sector, Africa is rapidly integrating with the global system. Africa is bringing a rapid improvement of infrastructure, technological expansion, trade diversification, and financial institutions expansion including bank and credit unions. From 2000 to 2016, African states have diversified their trade exchange three times from \$276 billion to \$806 billion (Africa Union Commission 2018, 37).

The U.S. involvement in Africa is always characterized by a recurrent fluctuation and unpredictability. The U.S. has engaged with Africa when there is a real threat to its security or interest. This threat could be the coming of old or new rival powerful states such as Russia, China, Iran, and other emerging states. Besides this, U.S.-Africa relation is highly dependent on emerging global issues (terrorism, transnational crime, trade, conflict, and disease) rather than domestic national interest or factors until recent time. Walle (2009, 11) stated the key flaws of the U.S. policy in Africa during the Bush administration as follows:

“Africa policy under the Bush administration continued the weaknesses of past U.S. administrations. A first striking characteristic of recent U.S. policy in the region has been the absence of an overarching strategic vision that would integrate the different pieces described above and give them policy coherence.”

Different focus and priorities also rendered to Africa during Obama and Trump administration. The Obama administration introduced several initiatives including power Africa, U.S.-Africa leader's summit, U.S.-Africa business forum, and the renewal of AGOA as key measures of furthering the two regions relations rapidly. The Trump administration emphasized culminating the influence of China, Russia in Africa. The U.S. policy towards Africa is devoid of encouraging socio-economic and political transformations of Africa. Schneidman and Sign (2018, 1) explained the weak sides of Trump's Africa policy like this:

“Ambassador John Bolton set the tone for the administration

in a speech where he challenged African governments to choose the United States over China and Russia for their commercial, security, and political relationships. This throwback to great power rivalry runs counter to the most significant current trend in Africa's external relationships, which have more diversity than at any time since the end of the Cold War. This diversity is a key aspect of the economic growth that Africa has enjoyed over the last two decades."

Every presidential candidate tries to garner the votes of African-Americans by pledging an ambitious promise to improve Americans role in Africa but end up taking no engagement policy toward Africa. The discriminatory interferences of the U.S. military in Africa created negative effects such as the revival of authoritarian regimes and socio-cultural cleavage between Muslims and Christians in different parts of Africa (Shinn 2004, 36-42; Harbeson 2008, 1-3).

The prospect of the 21st century U.S.-Africa relations is largely dependent upon the changes and continuity in the international system. Without denying the progresses that have been made since the 9/11 terror attack, U.S. foreign policy towards Africa lacks a far-reaching strategic framework and it has been a failure. The U.S. engagement in Africa is continued as two steps forward and one step backward.

IV. Conclusion

Since the end of WWII, the U.S. has played a key role in encouraging the anti-colonial rule movements of African and providing various forms of assistance for Africans for the last several decades. However, its foreign policy towards Africa has been the subject of criticism and debate because of

mainly lack of a comprehensive policy objective, priority, and approaches that would foster a mutual benefit for both regions in the long term.

As the assessment of this article shows, the policy and practical engagement of consecutive U.S. administrations, especially before the 9/11 had been narrow, amorphous and unproductive. There had been three critical red tapes that precluded the advancement of U.S.-Africa relations: the appeasement policy of the U.S. towards the previous imperialist powers, the pessimistic view of the American public and the West on Africa, and the absence of public pressure in the U.S. to enhance situations in Africa.

In the 21st century, the raising of security concerns and the tragedy of September 11 has partially changed the general road maps of U.S.-Africa relations. The global changes including the introduction of a multi-polar international system and the rising roles of Africa in the international system have impacted U.S. policy towards Africa.

The U.S. embarked on re-engaging itself with Africa: the U.S. tries to prevent the proliferation of terrorism and the rise of security threats, ensure its control over geopolitical and economically strategic areas, and expanding its access to resources, and market in Africa.

As a result of this improved U.S.-Africa relation and global change, several improvements are observed in Africa. There are higher flows of foreign direct investment, technological integration and resource utilization, and improvements of Africa's governance, health, and democratization. U.S.-Africa relation is transforming from patron-client relation to an

equal manner of cooperation.

As this study indicates, the U.S. involves itself in Africa whenever there is a security threat to itself, and emerging global issues such as terrorism, transnational crime, and disease. This indicates that the U.S. suffers from setting long term policy principles and objectives towards Africa.

There's a change in Africa. The gross domestic income has risen by 250% since 2003 and the world bank predicts economic growth at 5.2% in 2014. It is also predicted that Africa's population will grow rapidly.

The U.S. generally does not disclose its African policy until the first term, and there is often a delay in filling the country's key human resources. This uncertainty have left the impression that U.S. policy is passive and that Africa is not a priority. The future of U.S.-Africa relations will be determined more by U.S. policy and action on Africa than by other countries on Africa.

As part of the U.S.-African relations, regular high-level meetings will enhance their cooperation and improve the importance of the U.S. in Africa. It is highly recommended that the U.S. needs to take comprehensive measures in building democratic institutions and bringing socio-economic transformation in Africa for the coming generations. This would pave the way for a paradigm shift of U.S.-Africa relations and win-win partnerships of Americans and Africans other than an antagonistic north-south fraction.

<References>

- African Union Commission/OECD. 2018. Africa's Integration into the Global Economy, in Africa's Development Dynamics 2018: Growth, Jobs and Inequalities. pp. 33-66. OECD Publishing, Paris/African Union Commission, Addis Ababa. http://www.oecd.org/Africa's-Integration-into-the-Global-Economy_5j8pf3rbtdq0.pdf (Date: 2019/10/05).
- Altenburd et al. 2019. Foresight Africa: To Priorities for the Continent in 2019. Africa Growth Initiatives at the Brookings. http://www.brookings.edu/BLS18234_BRO_book_007_WEB.pdf (Date: 2019/10/05).
- Ani Christian, Ndubuisi. 2019. Implications of Foreign Bases on the Horn of Africa's Stability. <http://tanaforum.org/2019/05/24/implication-of-foreign-bases-on-the-horn-of-africas-stability/> (Date: 2019/10/05).
- Arnold, Craig 2019. How to Turn Africa's Manufacturing Sector into a High Tech Powerhouse. World Economic Forum. <http://www.weforum.org/agenda/2019/08/how-to-turn-africas-manufacturing-sector-into-a-high-tech-powerhouse/> (Date: 2019/10/15).
- Blandford et al. 2011. The Troubled Ten: The Failed States Index's Worst Performers. The Failed States Index 2011. The Fund for Peace. http://www.pucsp.br/economica/downloads/faile_states_index_2011.pdf (Date: 2019/09/20).
- Brauch, Hans G. 2005. The Threats, Challenges, Vulnerabilities and Risks in Environmental and Human Security. No. 1/2005. United Nations University-Institute for Environment and Human Security. <http://collections.unu.edu/pdf4040.pdf> (Date: 2019/10/05).

- Buzan, Barry. 1991. "New Patterns of Global Security in the Twenty-First Century." *International Affairs*, Vol. 67, No. 3, 1991, pp. 431-451. Blackwell Publishing. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2621945> (Date: 2019/10/04).
- Carroll, Rory. 2004. US chose to ignore Rwandan genocide. *The Guardian*, World News. <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2004/31/usa.rwanda>. (Date: 2017. 05. 12).
- Cooke and Downie, 2014. Launching a New Chapter in U.S.-Africa Relations: Deepening the Business Relationship. Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), UK. https://csisprod.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fspublic/legacy_files/files/publication/1401219_Cook_LaunchingNewChapter_WEB.pdf (Date: 2017/04/17).
- Crabb, V. 1998. *American Foreign Policy in the Nuclear Age*. 5th Ed. Harper &Rob, Publishers, Inc. U.S.A.
- Emerson, R. 1962. "American Policy in Africa". *Foreign Affairs*, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/africa/1962-01-10/american-policy-africa> (Date: 2017/04/14).
- Harbeson, John. 2008. From Africa in World Politics: an Article Review on the War on Terrorism by Princeton L. Lyman. Westview Press. <http://www.africaiss.org/files/Terrorism.pdf> (Date: 2017/04/10).
- Holodny, Elena. 2015. The 13 Fastest-Growing Economies in the World. *Business Insider*. <http://www.businnesinsider.com/world-bank-fast-growing-global-economies-2015-6> (Date: 2017/04/07).
- Jones and Williams. 2012. U.S. Trade and Investment Relations with Sub-Saharan Africa and the African Growth and Opportunity Act. CRS Report for Congress. <http://fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL3772.pdf> (Date: 2017/04/20).

- Katito, George. 2009. Continuity, little Change?: U.S.-Africa Policy under the Obama Administration. OASIS, No. 14, pp. 145-157, Universidad Externado de Colombia Bogota, Colombia. <http://www.redalyc.org/pdf/531/53117118010.pdf> (Date: 2017/04/15).
- Korybko, Andrew. 2015. Saud Arabia and the GCC are Expanding to Eritrea: Geopolitical Implications for Ethiopia. Center for Research on Globalization. <http://www.globalresearch.ca/saudi-arabia-and-the-gcc-are-expanding-to-eritrea-geopolitical-implications-for-ethiopia/5489868> (Date: 2017/04/10).
- Lin, Christina. 2007. The Rise of Africa in the International Geopolitical Landscape—a U.S. Energy Perspective. Institute für Strategie-Politik-Sicherheits-und-Wirtschaftsberaung, Berlin. http://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/45570/Rise_of_Africa.pdf (Date: 2017/04/10).
- Magu, Stephen M. 2019. Great Powers and the U.S. Foreign Policy towards Africa. Palgrave Macmillan. Springer Nature Switzerland AG. <http://www.pdfdrive.com/great-powers-and-us-foreign-policy-towards-africa-d187209296.html> (Date: 2019/09/25).
- Osaretin, Idahosa. 2013. “U.S.-Africa Relations: In Search of a New Paradigm,” In the Global Perspectives on the U.S. Foreign Policy, Edited by S. Burt et al. 143-154. http://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1057%2f9781137357663_9.pdf (date: 2019/10/15).
- Oyewole, D. 2009. “A New U.S. Policy Approach toward Africa: Commentary,” Yale Journal of International Affairs. <http://yalejournal.org/wpcontent/uploads/2011/01/094108oyewole.pdf> (Date: 2017/05/10).
- Ploch, Lauren. 2011. Africa Command: U.S. Strategic Interest

- s and the Role of the U.S. Military in Africa. Congressional Research Service (CRS) Report for Congress. <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RL34003.pdf> (Date: 2017/04/05).
- Rourke, John T. 2005. *International Politics on the World Stage*. 10th ed. The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc. New York, U.S.A.
- Rourke, John T. and Boyer, Mark A. 1998. *World Politics: International Politics on the World Stage*, brief. 2nd ed. Dushkin/McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Schneidman and Sign. 2018. The Trump administration's Africa strategy: Primacy or partnership? <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/africa-in-focus/2018/12/20/the-trump-administration-s-africa-strategy-primacy-or-partnership/> (Date: 2019/09/22).
- Shinn, David. 2004. "Fighting Terrorism in East Africa and the Horn." *Foreign Service Journal*, pp. 36-42. <http://www.academia.edu/315000/fighting-terrorism-in-East-Africa-an-the-Horn> (Date: 2017/04/23).
- Steinbock, Dan. 2017. "The Global Economic Balance of Power is Shifting," World Economic Forum. <http://www.weforum.org/agenda/201709/the-global-economic-balance-of-power-is-shifting>(Date: 2019/10/05).
- Sun Yun and Jane Olin-Ammentorp. 2014. "The U.S. and China in Africa: Competition or Cooperation?" <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/africa-in-focus/2014/04/28/the-us-and-china-in-africa-competition-or-cooperation/> (Date: 2017/04/17).
- Tarnoff, Curt and Lawson, Marian L. 2016. "Foreign Aid: An Introduction to U.S. Programs and Policy", Congressional Research Service. <http://nationalaglawcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/assets/crs/R40213.pdf> (Date: 2019/10/20).
- The Global Risks Report 2019. http://www.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Global_Risks_Report_2019.pdf (Date: 2019. 10. 05).

Thrall, Lloyd. 2015. China's Expanding African Relations: Implications for U.S. National Security. http://www.rand.org/content/dam/pubs/research_reports/RR905/RAND_RR905.PDF (Date: 2017. 04. 09).

Walle, Nicolas. 2009. "U.S. Policy towards Africa: the Bush Legacy and the Obama Administration." *African Affairs*, 109/4 31, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-21. <http://academic.oup.com/afraf/article/109/434/1/72224/US-policy-towards-Africa-The-Bush-legacy-and-the-Obama-administration.pdf> (Date: 2017. 04. 03).

Ward, George et al. 2016. The United States and Africa-Looking toward the Next Decade: Symposium Report. Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA), Alexandria, Virginia. http://www.ida.org/idamedia/corporate/files/Publications/IDA_Document/IDA/2016/D-8102.pdf (Date: 2017. 04. 07).

투고일 : 2020년 4월 30일 . 심사일 : 2020년 5월 21일 . 게재확정일 : 2020년 6월 3일

* Mabre Tade는 충북대 정치외교학과에서 정치학 석사학위(국제정치 전공)를 받고, 현재 이디오피아의 Woldia University에서 강사로 활동하고 있다.

* 김일수는 Miami University에서 정치학박사를 취득했으며, 현재 충북대학교 정치외교학과 교수이다. 저서로는, 「미국의 대한반도 정책: 이론과 실제」 외 많은 저·역서가 있으며, 논문으로는 “트럼프 행정부의 대 이란 정책,” 등 다수가 있다.

<Abstract>

U.S. Foreign Policy toward Africa Since World War II :
Challenges and Prospects

Mabre Tade
(Woldia University)

Ilsu Kim
(Chungbuk National University)

This paper assesses the U.S. foreign policy towards Africa. It gives special attention to the factors that led to the slow progress of U.S.-Africa relations. For this purpose, we discuss the trends of relations since the end of WWII. Some experts on U.S.-Africa relations claimed that the cooperation between the U.S. and Africa is becoming comprehensive and progressing steadily. But, this paper strongly argues that U.S.-Africa relation is showing slow progress due to the U.S. absence of the tradition of long term strategic policy and overarching vision towards Africa. As a result of this, their relations have been confined to areas such as humanitarian aid, and short term collaborations on emerging issues including transnational crime, terrorism, and endemic diseases.

Keywords : U.S. Foreign Policy, Africa, U.S.-Africa relations, U.S. long-term strategy to Africa, Humanitarian