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Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to discuss the negative impact the foreign policy of the United States has had on Africa. Key foreign policy initiatives of the United States will be reviewed by looking at how they impacted individual countries in an attempt to show specific examples of how policy affected each state. The paper will in brief look at how European colonialism helped mold the African continent to what it is today as a precursor to understanding some of the reasons for why the United States would need to get involved in African affairs.
My Story

One of the main reasons I chose this topic for my honors project is because of its relevance to my future aspirations in life. This section details my own experiences and feelings concerning U.S. foreign policy and problems in Africa. I came to Ball State University with very little knowledge of the outside world. Coming from a small town in Indiana, studying history was not seen as the best possible decision I could have made. Several classes quickly awakened me to the harsh reality of the world that it was not as peaceful as it was in small town U.S.A. Through my studies at Ball State, I focused on learning how to help people involved in conflicts. As I am a student close to graduating, I have taken the time to reflect that if I had decided to study history, I would not be in the same position that I am today, knowing what I want to do and how I will go about achieving it.

The world is not as perfect as many Americans believe. In elementary and high school, my teachers seldom discussed or answered questions about problems around the world. Operation Desert Storm in 1991 was the only exception to this. While I knew that some problems were occurring in former Yugoslavia, I never realized the extent of the conflict until I entered Dr. Friedman’s honors 189 class on the Balkans. Likewise, I was mortified to learn that worse atrocities had been committed in Africa and my country did nothing to stop it. The worst examples that were never mentioned in my middle or high school classes were the civil wars in Liberia and the Sudan, the effects of Somalia, and the ethnic genocide of Rwanda that killed 1.2 million people. These events were left out of my curriculum, something that I later felt students needed to know.

For this reason, I undertook what ended up being the hardest and most strenuous portion of my project. While I had wanted to present my research to a high school class, I did not envision it to becoming a full day activity that would not only require me to present my
research to 6 senior government classes, but to present it in such a way that it would not seem to foreign to them. I spent a lot of time working with the high school government teacher from New Castle, Mr. Wesseler, who had agreed to let me present my findings to his classes. Though the intent was to only discuss past and present foreign policies and how they impacted Africa, I had to work with Mr. Wesseler to present a very brief summary of the definition of foreign policy, its goals, and how we attained the goals of foreign policy. In the end, informing the students about this helped them in understanding the implications the policies such as containment and Bush’s New World Order had on Africa.

My ultimate goal with this project was to inform people of a growing problem in the world that small conflicts are affecting people throughout the world. The United States has had a hand in starting or prolonging some of these conflicts. While I believe that it is the U.S. interest to pursue its policies, I believe that Americans who are educated about how the U.S. attains its foreign policy goals will be better able to become involved in government and possibly help end conflicts throughout the world.

Though the problem of how U.S. policy impacts the world, especially Africa, is very personal to me, I am not alone in my sentiments. It was sometimes hard to not take into account anti-American rhetoric of foreign citizens from Britain, Russia, Turkey, and France who disguised their views into sometimes seemingly accurate sources. Another prominent group that initially had a view on U.S. policy towards Africa was the protesters in the recent peace rallies who cried “no blood for oil.” They hold the belief that the U.S. is only involved in Africa now to gain oil concessions. It is my final hope that this paper will provide the accurate evidence that shows the U.S. has had an adverse impact on Africa and that it helps dispel any myth on the adverse impact on Africa that is not based on fact.
The United States has enjoyed a unique position in the world community by being separated by two oceans enabling it to rise in international activity without fear of reprisals. While the intent of any foreign policy of the United States is to promote its interests, the American public seldom considers the ramifications of their government’s actions. One area of the world that has seen little attention by the American public, let alone the United States government, is Africa. Sub-Saharan Africa has only seen an interest from the United States since the 1950s, but while the U.S. promoted the protection of democracy from communism, U.S. foreign policy had a wholly unintentional negative effect on the nations of Africa.

This paper looks at how U.S. policy has affected individual nations in Africa. While every country was not affected in the same way, the countries studied offer a general consensus of how U.S. policy impacted their nation. Before one can look at how U.S. policy has impacted Africa, it is important to first look at the unique relationship Africa has with Europe. European colonialism enabled Africa to remain free of any U.S. influence until the colonies declared independence in the 1950s, the point where the United States begins to exert influence throughout Sub-Saharan Africa.

Affects of European Colonialism

While the United States has played an impact on the political, economic, and social spheres within Africa, it is impossible to discuss any impact without first considering the affects that European colonialism had on the native populations. In most of the cases, European colonial rule has had a negative impact on the political and social life of the African people. Some colonies experienced more change than would have happened if Europe had not gotten involved in the affairs of the native people. Ethnic conflict worsened due to the inability of the European leaders accounting for the regional and ethnic differences
when carving Africa into separate colonies at the Berlin Conference in 1884.¹ By putting
sometimes hostile ethnic groups together that had an already long history of conflict pre-
dating colonialism “act as powerful centrifugal forces that constantly threaten to disintegrate
post-colonial Africa states” as was the case with the Tutsis and Hutus of Rwanda.²

Other Africans were forced to ordeal the worst possible lifestyle: forced slavery in
large plantations to harvest a single or sometimes various crops that benefited the colonial
leaders but left the natives utterly dependent on the state as was the case with the Congo.
Africans in other colonies were forced off their land onto the worst land available so that
white settlers could make a living by hiring the natives at cheap prices.³ Although the inter-
African slave trade had existed for centuries, the transatlantic slave trade offered Europeans
and African slave traders a chance at earning more money. The slave trade followed and
began the initial depopulation of the continent from five thousand slaves a year in the 1530s
across the Atlantic to fifteen thousand a year by the seventeen hundreds.⁴ As was the case
throughout Africa but especially in the Congo, teachers and even missionaries became slave
traders because it was such a profitable business.⁵ The trade was so lucrative that it
depopulated the African continent so much so that Congo’s King Affonso I tried to end the
slave trade through writing a series of letters to Portugal’s King Joao III stating in no small
words that the “[European] goods exert such a great attraction over simple and ignorant
people that they believe in them [which] pushes our subjects ... to seize members of their
own families”⁶ and others to sell into slavery.

Colonial rule also impacted Africa by subjugating the people through years of
oppression. In Algeria, the natives were forced off their land and into the desert. The British
in Southern Rhodesia saw the fertile land of the Hoogveld as their own, forcing the Africans
into the lowlands filled with the deadly tsetse fly. Once the land was theirs, the colonists

¹ See map of tribal boundaries pg. 28.
used the abundant source of labor at cheap pay to work the land. If groups were found to be able to turn the poor unfertile land into a sustaining enterprise, the government would tax the people, a policy brought on by the Rhodesians.

Colonialism also brought numerous conflicts to the continent as the native Africans tried to regain their homeland. Liberia is the only state to have not had any European influence. With the exception of the Lesotho and the Ethiopians under King Menelik, all resistance to European colonialism failed. In the Sudan, more than 20,000 poorly armed Muslims were slaughtered at the Battle of Omdurman. In Algeria, the French had to bring in a large part of their military to fight the growing revolts by the Muslims. This led to the genocide of the native people due to an intense sense of racism that developed amongst the French similar to those among the British and Dutch in South Africa. These colonies were seen as a part of the colonizing nation.

Although each colony has its own unique history in how it developed into an independent nation, the current conditions of African countries in crisis today cannot be blamed wholly on their colonial past. Most of the problems are due to political mismanagement and in some cases a renewed conflict of the tribal groups that have been forced to live within a country that does not share a common ethnic group or language. Ethnic conflicts resurfaced after independence in Rwanda that eventually led to the 1994 genocide that killed almost 2 million Tutsis. These ethnocentric conflicts were allowed to emerge after independence due to competing ethnic groups attempting to “impose their sovereignty [onto others] causing many other African communities’ to resist.” This has kept the nation in a constant state of poverty by not letting a government institute needed reforms in which to combat the social problems facing the people. The conflict between the Tutsi minority and the Hutus majority had started before European arrival. The colonial

---

*See map of colonial control of Africa. p. 29.*
period only strengthened, encouraged, and kept each side’s hatred alive until after independence. After colonial rule ended, the two sides were now able to fight for their own destiny via the government as were many other ethnic groups throughout Africa.

Foreign Policy Case Studies

The second section of this paper focuses on individual nations in Africa that have been affected by U.S. foreign policy. In the first case study, Liberia will cover 200 years of U.S. involvement from President Monroe’s initiative to end the slave trade to the more encompassing policy of containment. The second case study focuses on the warlord epidemic of Somalia in the early 1990s that has had ramifications on how the U.S. gets involved in peacekeeping operations and marked an end to Bush’s new world order. The section will conclude with a look at how the United States is handling terrorism and its impact on the African continent, primarily on the Sudan.

Liberia

Liberia has been independent since the mid 1800s making it the oldest country in Africa. While other states were under the control of colonial overlords, feeling the effects of European superiority due to the need to “civilize” the natives, Liberia was a land of immigrants that practiced the same policies as Europe. The immigrants that came to Liberia were freed slaves from America that since the 1780s had envisioned returning to Africa.

The early history of the United States is tarnished with a history of slavery. Racism was prevalent not only in the minds of plantation slave owners but in abolitionists. The perceived hope of freedom declared in the Declaration of Independence for Africans never came causing many to want to escape the racism by emigrating as being the only way to achieve the promise of freedom and independence granted in the Declaration of
Independence. The Africans used the American hypocrisy to further their support that they should be allowed the right to emigrate to Africa.

Emigration to Africa was supported by the most unlikely of people, the plantation owners. Freed Africans, numbering 230,000 citizens in 1820, were seen as a “contradiction and threat to the system of slavery” that enabled the cotton industry to thrive to the number one producer in the world. The slave owners naturally felt that the Africans were inferior but so did the abolitionists who supported freeing the slaves. Indeed it was the overwhelming sentiment of many abolitionists that Africans should also not live near whites! It was these two groups of people that helped Robert Finley form the American Colonization Society in 1816. Finley’s goal was to locate a suitable location in Africa for the formation of a colony, fund their transfer to Africa, and pay for the needed supplies to lay the foundation to an independent African state.

Liberia, or the Malaguetta Coast, in the early 1800s was inhabited by some 20 different ethnic or tribal groups, each with its own language, religion, and culture. These tribal groups for purposes of easy identification were labeled into three broad ethnic groups, the Malinke (Mel), Mande, and the Kwa. The Malaguetta Coast was a popular location for the Portuguese slave trade that had impacted the tribal groups so much that it had “impoverished the populations so much” that it helped enable the ACS gain a foothold on what would later become Liberia. The ACS signed the first in a series of treaties on December 15, 1821 with King Peter of the Dea tribe for Sherbro Island and Cape Mesurado which would later become the site for the Liberian capital of Monrovia. In return for the land, King Peter received “muskets, beads, tobacco, gunpowder, clothing, looking glasses, food, and rum [totaling] less than three hundred dollars.” Later treaties would follow the same procedure of tricking local kings to deed their land in return for small trinkets. Not

---

iii The term African is used here to describe the slaves or freed slaves of African descent living in the United States
only did the immigrants trick local kings to give away their land, they also began an ethnic division within their new colony where they were at the top and placed the indigenous population at the bottom.

In 1822, the first conflict broke out between the immigrants, now called Americo-Liberians, and the indigenous populations led by King Peter. The Dea people had begun to demand the settlers to pay annual tributes to live on the land or else be sold into slavery. Martial law was instituted and with the help of a United States warship the Americo-Liberians were able to defeat the Dea people and begin their conquest of the rest of Liberia. Although the attempted slaughter of the settlers is one reason for the further push into Liberia, the Americo-Liberians also viewed it as their duty to civilize the pagan natives. Many of the white leaders in the ACS saw that their effort to get rid of freed slaves was in fact "practical and necessary to help the 'uncivilized Africans.'" The Americo-Liberians quickly began assuming more political authority for themselves and began to civilize the natives as they saw fit. By 1933, Americans were disgusted that the Americo-Liberians were being "insensitive to their African brothers and sisters." The indigenous population had become a second class citizen, being lowered to the level of a slave to the settlers to help them grow the crops and build their cities. The settlers had hoped to bring the Declaration of Independence to their new world so as to give them equality but by so doing they created the same hypocrisy that the White Americans had created in 1776!

The ACS had over a period of time given the Americo-Liberians increasing power to rule their institutions. On July 26, 1847, Liberia became recognized by the United States. The Liberian Constitution made it official that the indigenous populations were not considered equals by giving them no political rights or representation in government. While the Americo-Liberians were beginning their system of institutionalized racism, the American
government felt that it was the Liberian's responsibility to finally end the slave trade in Liberia.

President Monroe had promoted and encouraged the settlement of Liberia as a way to further his policy of ending the slave trade when the ACS was founded, but the government stopped short of helping the colony become an equal democracy. In the early 1850s, immediately following the ratification of the Liberian constitution, the United States, United Kingdom, and the Liberian militia rooted out the native slave traders and put a stop to the Atlantic slave trade originating near Liberia, Sierra Leone, and the Ivory Coast. This created a new problem along with the problem of institutionalized racism created under the Liberian Constitution: Recaptured slaves were granted freedom and were given sanctuary in Liberia. This new group of people, referred to as the Congo people because they were destined to work in the Caribbean sugar plantations, created a new class of citizens that were offered the same freedoms as the Americo-Liberians. The Congo people, who had some exposure to European values and had a sense of gratitude to their white saviors, also saw that they were the "carriers of European values and culture" to the African pagans. While the hypocrisy in creating a democratic state with the Congo people and the Americo-Liberians dominating the system was perpetuated by the United States and the UK in order to halt the slave trade, the Americo-Liberians felt that they were just to treat the indigenous people that way because they were living in darkness and needed to be brought into the "civilized" light.

For the next one hundred years, the Americo-Liberians and the Congo people felt little U.S. presence. However, when W.W.II ended a new threat came to the United States. While Russia had been an ally during W.W.II, its competing system of communism directly threatened the democratic system of the west.

A policy was quickly formulated that would have a lasting impact on Africa even past the fall of communism. The policy of containment formulated in 1946 by George Kennan,
the U.S. State Department's foremost expert on Russia, internationally recognized the hostile
character of the Soviet regime while recognizing that

"only the United States has it in its power to increase enormously the strains under
which Soviet policy must operate, to force upon [it] a far greater degree of moderation
and circumspection than it has had to observe in recent years, and to promote
tendencies which must eventually find their outlet in either the breakup or the gradual
mellowing of Soviet power."

This policy focused on ensuring that communism would not spread beyond the U.S.S.R.
because it was felt that communism was a direct military, political, and economic threat
against American interests. It went against the U.S. need to "create an international
economic system that encouraged growth [...] and expansion of the world economy and the
U.S. economy" so much so that the United States began to get involved militarily and
defensively in Southeastern Europe, Turkey, and Korea.

The containment policy did not have an affect on Africa until the European colonies
began to declare their independence. Since Europe no longer had the resources to keep their
colonies and had already taken immense wealth from the African colonies, most of the
colonizing powers were willing to grant independence. Many of the European nations failed
to adequately prepare their colonies for self rule, making many Africans hostile to the West.
The Soviet Union still looking to further communism in the world saw "Africa as a fertile
ground for [communist] revolution" according to Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev. This
was most likely seen as the case because once the colonies became independent; they faced
the colonial legacy of poverty, illiteracy, and little support from the international
community. The success of Russia in overcoming being a 3rd world nation to becoming a
world superpower made communism very appealing to the African people. During the period
between the end of the Korean war to the end of communism, the United States would help
keep and instill leaders who were allies to the west, democratic in principles but dictatorial in
their leadership.
The policy of containment helped the Americo-Liberians control politics until 1980 by controlling politics through a one party system. The True Whig Party enabled the Americo-Liberians the freedom to institute policy while staying in power by limiting its membership to only citizens whose ancestors came from the United States.\textsuperscript{31} The party was able to achieve this level of success through a heavy system of taxes on the indigenous population designed to not only keep them from gathering a political force, but to keep them as a viable labor source that was furthered during the era of containment. An earlier figure shows just how much the regime taxed the native populations. The figure showed that the "hut tax [per village] on a tribal population stood at $300,000, whereas the property tax for Americo-Liberians was only $4,668 for the country as a whole!"\textsuperscript{32} With twenty ethnic groups each having at least one village, the state was able to gain enough revenue to make the Americo-Liberian lifestyle very easygoing. Although society was divided further due to these practices attempts at reconciling ethnic differences were only made with the help of.

The first president of Liberia to be affected by the containment policy was William Tubman, the 17\textsuperscript{th} President of Liberia who led Liberia from 1944 to 1971. Tubman was a man that was bent on staying in power as long as possible. One of the major tasks that he had to overcome was finding a support base due to his lack of experience in national affairs since his only governmental experience was at the provincial level. He felt that healing the hatred of the past one hundred years was possible and would garner him further support from the United States government.\textsuperscript{33}

To ensure he gained popular support and U.S. support, he initiated two very popular policies that gained him popular support from the Liberian people: Unification and integration policy and an Open Door economic policy. In 1947, he extended "suffrage to the hinterland (indigenous) population and three seats in the House of Representatives were allotted to the three interior provinces [while also] making symbolic appoints to indigenous
individuals to significant positions in government.

To make his unification policy complete he also gave women the right to vote within his Constitutional Amendment. His economic policy was to bring in needed foreign investment into Liberia to build the country into an industrialized nation but also to build his government in such a way that would increase his hold on power. Due to these activities, agricultural production decreased while industrial production increased enabling the Liberian economy in the mid 1950s to have a growth rate of 15%, the 2nd highest in the world.

To the world and to many Liberians, Tubman was indeed the savior and father of Liberia. However, Tubman achieved the economic growth and political reforms by creating an extremely corrupt system of government. John Gunther, a former newspaper editor from Liberia, summed it best by stating that “the Tubman era saw political bossism at its Zenith. Tubman packed the Legislature with his [handpicked] servants, cronies and favorites, many of them illiterate.” The Tubman presidency functioned only because Tubman built a cult of personality around himself making him appear to be the father of the nation. While taxes were reduced and changed to be more evenly applicable to the whole population, high paying jobs were only offered to those loyal to Tubman or worked their way into his patronage system.

An economic slowdown began to take shape towards the end of Tubman’s presidency. This occurred at the same time that U.S. interests were being further diverted to Vietnam taking away much needed economic aid packages that Liberia and other African nations had been receiving. However, William Tolbert, Tubman’s successor, had to handle the economic slump when Tubman died in 1971. While attempting to uphold the reforms of his predecessor, Tolbert focused on meeting the demands of a changing world by making concessions to new opposition groups that were forming primarily by getting rid of the corrupt patronage system from the Tubman era. This only led the True Whig Party and eventually
the United States to distance itself from Tolbert. Another problem that Tolbert would later regret was retiring 400 aging seasoned soldiers and replacing them with younger poorly trained and for the most part illiterate recruits. This enabled master sergeant Samuel Doe, later president of Liberia, to gain entrance into the officer corps of the Liberian military.

The United States began to withdrawal its support for Tolbert because he, like Tubman, enabled corruption to grow within Liberian politics. Eliminating the patronage system was beneficial to the population but Tolbert followed Tubman’s path by stealing money from the state treasury. It was Tolbert’s seizure of public funds in the area of controlling the price of rice that would further end his career as a politician. He did this by gaining the monopoly on rice once held by Tubman for himself once he was elected and initially was able to draw on public funds to improve his personal property. However, in 1979, he increased the price of rice leading to the April 14, 1979 rice riots that led to a breakdown of public services for a short period because Tolbert had to divert his civil servants to controlling the rioters. This led the United States to pull its support of the Tolbert administration in the following year.

The rice riots of 1979 started a series of events focused on the removal of President Tolbert that ended with the successful Coup d’etat on April 12, 1980 by the People’s Redemption Council (PRC). The PRC compromised of 17 noncommissioned officers and other men led by Master Sergeant Samuel Doe. Doe, a native Krahn, entered the mansion “killing Tolbert and 27 members of the president’s security guard” starting the beginning of ten years of autocratic rule. The Liberian people were shocked at the military takeover, not because they wanted to see Tolbert remain in power but because it had been instigated by the lowest level of officers. The PRC immediately reformulated the military hierarchy by purging all senior officers and placing themselves, all of whom were uneducated and inexperienced, in command of the army. The people of Liberia and the United States
welcomed the coup for the same reasons as Doe explained the takeover: political oppression, corruption, unemployment, and high cost of living.\textsuperscript{45}

The immediate impact of the coup was that after one hundred and thirty three years, the Americo-Liberian minority was no longer in control of Liberia. Although this should not be so surprising considering that the Americo-Liberians comprised only 2.5\% of the total population of Liberia, making it one of the smallest minority groups in a country to have total control over it that it would be easy for them to lose power.\textsuperscript{46} The People’s Redemption Party leaders were all opportunistic and suspicious of those in the government, two qualities that their predecessors in power had. To quell their fears they began a ten year rule of brutality and tyranny that would be characterized by the executions of 150 high ranking political officials and their family members.\textsuperscript{47} 13 of those murdered were members of Tolbert’s cabinet and were publicly executed to show the Liberian people that Tolbert’s administration was over and to prove that Doe was in charge of the country. Due to their opportunistic nature, characterized by their timely coup, the PRC leaders also found a way to gain immense wealth by taking money from the state treasury and by using the gun to take money from the people. Raids in every district were commonplace, people were killed, others were forced to become refugees, and personal property was stolen.\textsuperscript{48}

From 1980 to 1989, Samuel Doe ruled Liberia with an iron fist. While Tubman and Tolbert had been autocratic rulers, Doe furthered this tradition by again following Tubman’s strategy of placing people loyal to him in key governmental positions. However, Doe gave preferential treatment to his Krahn tribe by giving them good paying government jobs and private sector jobs. This was a difficult task because his fellow PRC leaders came from other ethnic tribes than his own making it hard for policy to be made. Ethnic tensions between the leaders trying to gain the upper hand over the other finally led Doe in the formulative years of

\textsuperscript{17} The most famous incident was the “Nimba Raid” of 1984 where Doe sent the Liberian army to attack Quiwonkpa’s, a former ally, tribe killing hundreds of people because Quiwonkpa wanted to hold public elections.
his reign to eliminate his fellow members on counts of treason and plotting attempted coups against the state.\textsuperscript{49}

The world community did little to stop Doe from carrying out his state campaign of terror because of the strong influence the United States had within the United Nations. The United States under the Reagan administration supported Doe with financial assistance more than it had ever done in the past, giving Liberia $500 million for economic and infrastructure improvements.\textsuperscript{50} The U.S. even legitimized Doe’s 1985 elections that were clearly rigged by Doe stating the “positive aspects of the poll, especially in relation to the standards of ‘a part of the world where the norm is single-party rule.’”\textsuperscript{51} U.S. support only came to Doe because of the U.S. need to keep Liberia an ally to the west during a time when the Soviet Union and Libya, a state sponsor of terrorism, sought new allies in 3\textsuperscript{rd} world nations. The Soviet Union had refocused its efforts to spread communism in Africa since it had been defeated in the early 1980s in Afghanistan.

While the Cold War ended unofficially in 1989, the effects of supporting Doe due to the containment policy were still felt in Liberia. On December 24, 1989, a group called the National patriotic Front (NPLF) led by Charles Taylor invaded Liberia from neighboring Ivory Coast for the sole purpose of placing Taylor in power and ending the Doe regime. Although it was not realized at the time, this invasion would start a seven year civil war that for the most part continues today. President Doe was assassinated a month later by a close ally of Taylor’s.\textsuperscript{52} While the African organization, The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), attempted to bring peace, the United States was facing the growing problem of Saddam Hussein in the Middle East ensuring that this problem would not be handled by the international community. Although Iraq was quickly defeated, the United States failed to stop the civil war that has now claimed an estimated 220,000 lives and forced
1.2 million people to become refugees, making this ethnic conflict one of the worst in African history.\textsuperscript{53}

While the result of the Civil War is easily identified in the high death toll, it also has had profound effects on other areas of Liberian life. The first area involves basic social services. Even after five years, now President Charles Taylor has yet to fix the sewer, water, and, electrical systems as well as not attending to needed repairs to the state's infrastructure.\textsuperscript{54} Primary schools and hospitals are also suffering from a lack of needed improvements and money from the state that would help them get back in working condition. Finally, due to how the government has shown a disregard to needed social areas, it has also not focused the needed attention on restarting the economy so much so that foreign investments into Liberia have dwindled because there is no protection for them in case the money is stolen. Since during the civil war there was no legitimate government it has forced the World Bank and the IMF to "forget about receiving up to $3 billion they are owed [in loans] by the Liberian state."\textsuperscript{55}

However, it is not to say that some Liberians are not becoming wealthy from the current state that Liberia is in today. A primary beneficiary of the civil war was Charles Taylor, who became a multi-million immediately after the start of the war. Taylor, now a dictator, has continued the practice of using the government and the country to gain an immense fortune through the smuggling of diamonds, drugs, and natural resources between Liberia, Ivory Coast, and Sierra Leone. Liberia became France's third-highest supplier of wood during the late 1990s with all of the profits going directly to Taylor.\textsuperscript{56} Taylor also exported Liberian diamonds to Antwerp taking in all of the profits, although there are no figures to show the extent of this activity, but also illegally and against UN resolutions funneled diamonds from embargoed nations such as Sierra Leone and Angola. Finally, Taylor advocated that African nations should earn money by selling drugs, mainly marijuana
and heroin, something that offered him almost as much money as his exportation of
diamonds. While other dictators around the world such as those in Iraq, Iran, and N. Korea
have fallen under the U.S. label of being a part of an axis of evil, Taylor has yet to be forced
by the United States to relinquish his hold on power.

Somalia

Immediately following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the policy of containment
was quickly abandoned for a more world orientated approach. The once bipolar world of east
and west eroded into a unipolar world dominated by the United States. During the Bush
administration, the United States increasingly worked through the United Nations to get its
interests met. This eventually led President Bush to declare his New World Order policy in
1990 that would focus on an international effort to promote the world's interests. One of the
first targets of this policy was Iraq which eventually proved that a large coalition of
governments could work together to promote peace and stability within a region of the
world.58

The new world order doctrine came about by a need to understand the U.S. role after
the fall of communism and became the primary focus of Bush's foreign policy after the
Operation Desert Storm. The doctrine had a military and economic component to it that
would provide for an increase in U.S. ability to further its interests. The military component
focused on increasing defense spending to enable the United States armed forces the ability to
fight simultaneous wars along with foreign allies while continuing the U.S. presence in
Europe and South Korea. In a leaked Pentagon document the government listed several
scenarios that the U.S. may be needed to resolve: a North Korean attack on South Korea,
coup in the Philippines, emergence of a new superpower, and any conflict that threatens U.S.
interests.59 Above anything, the global leadership of the United States should be insured
through these measures.
The economic component of the doctrine had a more holistic approach that focused on how the economic vitality of the nation ensured political and military superiority. The Undersecretary of State, Robert Zoellik stated that:

"The United States is the only nation in the world today that ranks at the top of political, military, and economic power. Over the course of the past few years—in Europe, the Gulf, and elsewhere—we have demonstrated our leadership. But it is also vital that we remain in the forefront of international economic policy [...] by acting as the primary catalyst for a series of economic structures that would substantially increase U.S. and global prosperity."

By this time in 1992, Somalia had gained the attention of the United Nations through its need for humanitarian relief aid and for peacekeeping forces. Somalia had originally been a colony of Italy and became a UN trusteeship headed by Italy after W.W.II to prepare the nation for statehood. However, the Italian government still feeling the effects of being defeated in W.W.II had little interest in helping the Somali people become independent and able to rule themselves. Somalia became a battleground during the later years of the Cold War for economic aid from the United States and the Soviet Union in attempts to sway Somali to democracy or communism. However, even after the U.S. alone sent “billions of dollars in aid, it was not enough to prevent the total collapse of the Somali state or the continued division of Somalia into dozens of fiefdoms controlled by clan-based [warlords]."

The United Nations had quickly increased its peacekeeping missions after the fall of communism. While the permanent Security Council states did not involve themselves in every operation, the Dutch noted a rise in operations such as "preventive border presence, ceasefire observation and force separation, and voluntary weapon control." It was the importance of forcing opposing sides apart and controlling weapons that sent the United Nations to Somalia at the bequest of the warring factions. However, it quickly became apparent in late December 1992 that the warring factions were not abiding by the UN ceasefire and were placing UN forces in direct harm. The warring clans stole humanitarian aid so that they could “manipulate the supplies to reward friends and punish enemies."
Although this conflict was erupting at the end of Bush’s presidency, he made the decision to get actively involved by committing 28,000 troops to “facilitate the feeding of the starving population” and to protect the current UN peacekeepers. Bush had not run his campaign on his new world order doctrine, instead focusing on attacks made by Presidential hopeful, Bill Clinton, on a lack of U.S. involvement in Bosnia. After his defeat in November, Bush attempted to salvage his new world order doctrine through authorizing the deployment of the 28,000 troops. To rekindle American’s minds in believing in his doctrine Bush gave two valedictory speeches at Texas A&M in December 1992 and at West Point in January 1993. In these speeches, Bush placed a great emphasis on the need for “collective action with the United States taking the leadership role” in any action to safeguard world peace, but warned that “a failure of the United States to lead, would result in not more security for our citizens but less.” In short, Bush had committed U.S. troops to Somalia in order to lead the other nations so that the image of the United States would not be tarnished and that U.S. interests would not be hurt!

The conflict in Somalia erupted after President Bush left office and a president new to foreign affairs had only a few months to get used to the executive office. Clinton had supported Bush in sending troops to Somalia in November and kept them there through the summer of 1993. It was during the summer that events transpired that would alter U.S. policy to the present day. One of the warlords, Mohammed Farah Aidid, had called for the immediate removal of U.N. peacekeepers by attempting to get Somali gunmen to fire on U.N. convoys. Aidid quickly became a target for assassination that led to a failed June operation on his life. Aidid was targeted again on Oct. 3, 1993 but the U.S. led operation quickly fell to a surprise attack by soldiers loyal to Aidid. The conflict that has been popularized by the recent movie Black Hawk Down resulted in the deaths of 18 U.S. servicemen and one American taken hostage and then drug through the streets for media cameras to show the
world that the U.S. was not welcome. Four days later, Clinton had ordered the immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops not only because it was a public relations slam on his presidency but also because the American public had seen enough body bags returning to U.S. soil.

The effects of the failed mission in Somalia not only ended Bush’s doctrine of a new world order but also ensured that U.S. troops would not get involved in another intra state African conflict. Bush’s new world order died on May 5, 1994 with Presidential Decision Directive 25 (PDD-25) that outlined a new set of guidelines for future involvement, militarily or economically, in any U.N. sponsored military action. The directive outlined seven conditions that had to be met for each U.N. action:

“an urgent need for relief aid after widespread violence or rioting, a sudden interruption of democracy or a gross violation of human rights, have clear objectives, availability of enough money and troops, a U.N. mandate appropriate to the mission, a realistic exit strategy, and consent of the parties before the force is deployed.”

This had the immediate affect of keeping the United States out of the Rwandan genocide because not only was the United States still reeling from the humiliation caused by Somalia but because the U.S. did not see that the U.N. only had clear objectives to help end the hunger of the people, not stopping the genocide. This directive also had an impact on U.S. action in Bosnia where ethnic cleansing had been a factor of life since 1991.

Sudan & the Fight against Terrorism

While terrorism has been a factor in the world for the past 30 years, it has only recently gained worldwide attention and has not focused on Africa as it did in the 1980s with Libya as a training ground for terrorist organizations. Terrorist acts have increased in frequency and in the level of destruction caused in loss of human life and in economic loss. Brigitte Nacos believes that this increase
is due to the need of “terrorists to exploit the linkages between the news media, public opinion, and presidential decision making [via] … when they stage violent acts.”

While the first world trade center bombings were focused on getting the media’s attention, it did not have the same affect on the government as the August 7, 1998 bombings of embassies in Kenya and Tanzania had. While it was not immediately known who was responsible, the United States was able to make several arrests a few days later that implicated Osama bin Laden as the mastermind behind the attacks. Bin Laden had been given sanctuary by the Sudanese government making them a target for U.S. led actions. For the first time since Somalia, the United States on August 20, 1998 retaliated by destroying a pharmaceutical plant believed to be linked to Bin Laden that was a key source of foreign income for Sudan. The reason behind the bombing was that it was considered a duel use facility that while it did produce pharmaceutical drugs, it also produced chemicals that could be used for terrorist weapons.

The U.S. has yet to prove that the plant was tied to Bin Laden, but the message they sent the Sudanese factions was clear, harboring an international terrorist will bring reprisals. Since then the United States has become more involved in ending Sudan’s civil war. Recently, the United States was able to bring both sides to a series of peace talks outlined in a Congressional bill titled the Sudan peace Act earlier this year. Peace talks between the government dominated by Muslims and a Christian minority living in the Southern portion of Sudan have been ongoing since January making the hope for peace in Africa’s longest civil war a possible reality. In exchange for diplomats and needed economic aid to help bring about peace, Sudan has willingly offered to help find bin Laden.
**Future of Foreign Policy in Africa**

While ethnic conflicts will most likely be an unfortunate part of African's lives in the future, the United States will continue its policy of non involvement. Due to the debacle in Somalia, the United States will not risk another armed conflict in a region that has yet to overcome chaos. Today, the world is characterized by a growing need for alliances making it very possible for new realignments and power relationships to form that could give some African nations a stronger role in international affairs.

Unfortunately, Africa is now much less significant strategically to the West due to the war on terror being focused primarily on the Middle East and North Korea. However, U.S. interests can still be found in Africa in oil. In a recent New York Times article, African oil reserves are gaining Washington's eye. West Africa is projected within the next decade to have 25 percent of America's oil-import market, an increase of 10 percent. For the United States this is a blessing because it could possibly reduce the power OPEC has on the cost of oil. The need for oil has become so great that it has become a security threat if supply is shortened so diversifying the supply of oil will ensure the security of the United States according to Robin West, Chairman of the Petroleum Financing Company. For the time being, U.S. interests in the oil reserves of Africa will remain mute as long as the administration is focused on its war on terror.

While the United States has had a short history of involvement in Africa, it has well made up for it since the colonial period ended. However, U.S. interest in Africa followed a similar pattern as European colonialism of needing the African. In this case, the nations were needed in an international arena to stop the spread of communism. The track record of U.S. involvement in Africa has not been very positive even with the successful implementation of the Sudan Peace Act. The need to end the slave trade resulted in the subjugation of an indigenous people by former U.S. slaves that led to over a hundred years of forced labor,
autocratic rulers, and harsh living conditions. Ethnic conflicts, one of the worst problems facing Africa today besides AIDS, has been allowed to go unchecked by the United States because there is no strategic value in getting involved. The issue of morality that led to the failed U.S. intervention in Somalia will most likely never be repeated on African soil unless a coalition of foreign governments forms to stop a conflict. Although, most of the conflicts are occurring in countries that have oil as a natural resource, it has so far not been enough to persuade the United States to get involved. Finally, the issue of terrorism has been removed from Africa so much so that Sudan has been cleared of any ties to Osama bin Laden making it harder for the nations of Africa to try to gain help from the United States.
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