

International Journal of Judicial Law

Challenges posed by china on United States of America's foreign policy on the African continent: Reflection of the Sudan issue

Emmanuel Sakarombe

Lecturer Department of Governance and Public Management, Midlands State University, Zimbabwe

* Corresponding Author: **Emmanuel Sakarombe**

Article Info

ISSN (online): 2583-6536

Volume: 02

Issue: 02

March-April 2023

Received: 28-03-2023;

Accepted: 09-04-2023

Page No: 21-27

Abstract

The differences between China-US foreign policies in Africa mirrors long held theoretical debates and is highly complicated. Simeon (2010:58) argues that “after the Second World War, United States of America–Africa policy was determined by a continuous effort to impose American values of democracy and human rights, constitutes the base of the US “rhetorical commitments to Africa”. However the manner in which the objectives were pursued were generally remained shaped by United States (US) geo-strategic interests of containing the Soviet/Communism expansionism on the continent and building ideological affiliation with African countries (Simeon 2010). Power and Mohan (2008:17) argue that “China’s aid, economic cooperation and foreign policy approach differ from the traditional Western models, both in their content and also in norms of practise. Chinese policy towards Africa centred on respect of sovereignty and ‘non-interference’ in internal affairs which by and large differentiates it from Western approaches that unavoidably comes with conditionality’s (Power and Mohan 2010). Patten (2009) argues that while the Western approach is based on an idealistic view of good intentions, the Chinese paradigm is much more objective, pragmatic, flexible and effective. According to US policy makers China-Africa cooperation ensure that human rights concern do not take a place on top in the international agenda (Pollock 2003). Against such a backdrop the problem is that the US comes with external solutions to African problems, while on the other hand the Chinese foreign policy promotes and supports undemocratic governments and also it promotes bad governance in Africa as pointed by Sun (2014) that Chinese activities in Africa are often characterised as ‘evil’ when they are seen representing China’s selfish quest for natural resources and damaging Africa’s fragile efforts to improve good governance and democracy since China supports undemocratic governments in Africa.

Africa lacks a clear path of its foreign policy thus become torn apart of whether to look West or East hence the problem of neo-colonialism manifest. Pham (2005) argue that sadly exploited by colonial rulers before being divided by proxy battles of the Cold War rivals, the African continent as it continuous to brightened by environmental degradation, economic malaise, social misrule has not yet to see any ‘peace dividend’. This article analyses that the competition of interests of US and China in Africa has brought more harm than good this is because Africa still lags behind in terms of development despite the increased involvement of these two super powers (US and China) in the African continent. The African continent has been reduced to become an “exploitative zone” because of the US-China struggle for resources. In this struggle for resources, different mechanisms have been used to lure African countries into the exploitation trap with the effect that the USA and China, especially, have now been locked in a new cold.

Keywords: United States, foreign policy, Sudan issue, Challenges posed

Introduction

The American Foreign Policy institution historically paid little attention to Africa in comparison to other continents (Schraeder 1994) ^[32]. Pham (2005) referred the African continent as the ‘step child of United States (US) foreign policy’ he depicted Africa policy as handled with official attitudes and policies in Washington ranging from benign neglect at best to callous indifference at work. Despite the linkages of US and Africa, Africans generally agree that US-Africa policies from the founding of the Republic in 1789 to present have been marked by indifferences at worst and neglect at best (Schraeder 1994) ^[32].

Alden (2000)^[1] further argues that relationship between the US and Africa is one characterised mainly by indifference and neglect punctuated by flurries of vested interests and action. According to Yi Chong (2008)^[41], US interests in Africa can be classified into three main groups, economic interests, geopolitical interests and geo-strategic and security interests.

Yi Chong (2008:19)^[41] argues that “the growing importance of oil is the top priority for the US due to some factors such as the rising of domestic energy demand, advent discoveries and production of oil in the African continent, and the involvement of new players moving into the African continent”.

According to Makwerere and Chipaike (2012:311)^[21] “Pursuant to the idea of the exploitation of various strategic resources in Africa, the USA came up with the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) in 2000”. “As the world’s biggest economy, the USA’s increased interest in Africa’s oil, uranium, gold and other mineral resources should not be surprising, on the other hand, with reports that the Chinese economy is now second to the USA, the country now, more than any time, needs the markets to sell its cheap products, the oil for its industries and the uranium for its electric energy sector” (Makwerere and Chipaike 2012:312)^[21]. According to Makwerere and Chipaike (2012)^[21] the USA promulgated the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA), the Africa Command (AFRICOM), Millennium Challenge Account (MCA) among many other similar initiatives to extend a benevolent hand to African countries in an effort aimed at both establishing even stronger relations with and finding more acceptable ways of resource exploitation and securing national security interests in the continent.

However the end of the Cold War (1989) marked major challenges for the American foreign policy towards Africa. Tammen and Kugler (2006)^[38] argue that the US places at risk its opportunity to remain the world’s pre-eminent nation by focusing all of its energy, time and capabilities on war against terrorism and on its ancillary action in Iraq, despite compelling reasons otherwise. Alden (2005)^[2] states that at a time when the rest of the world seems preoccupied by unfolding events in the Middle East region and the ‘global war on terror’, China’s growing engagement and involvement in Africa has gone little noticed by the US and the West. Pollock (2003) argues that China has begun to deepen its engagement in parts of the world where Washington has enjoyed a near monopoly of influence since the end of cold war hence directly challenging US interests.

Makwerere and Chipaike (2012)^[21] argue that China is not new to Africa. During the colonial period, China’s visible influence in Africa was in the aid it provided to many liberation movements especially in the Southern African region. The support that ranged from provision of military hardware to combat training set the tone for a positive post-independence engagement between Africa and the Chinese (Makwerere and Chipaike 2012)^[21]. The year 2000 witnessed an upgrading in Sino-Africa relations, especially with institutionalization of the Forum on China –Africa Cooperation (FOCAC). FOCAC is based on five principles which include mutual respect for sovereignty and integrity, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in each other’s affairs, equality and mutual benefits and peaceful coexistence (FOCAC 2009).

Sun (2014) posits that China seeks to satisfy four broad national interests in its relations with Africa. Politically China

seeks Africa’s support for China’s ‘One China’ policy and for its foreign policy agenda’s in multilateral forums such as United Nations (UN), economically Africa is seen primarily as a source of natural resources and market opportunities to fuel China’s domestic growth, China also sees an underlying ideological interest in Africa as the success of the “China model” in non-democratic African countries offers indirect support for China’s own political ideology and evidence that western democratic values are not universal (Sun 2014). “China and the US have interests that are mainly confrontational and conflicting” (Xuetong 2010:292). Makwerere and Chipaike (2012)^[21] argue that China and the US have become the major parties in the new cold war as a result of their competing position in the world economic and political architecture. “This state of affair has increased competition for resources and influence especially in Africa between the two countries (China and US) hence giving birth to the new cold war and new scramble for Africa” (Makwerere and Chipaike 2012:312)^[21]. Against such a background this research analyses the challenges posed by China on U.S foreign policy on the African continent.

Same bed different dreams

The clash of interests between the US and China in Africa have been complicated, though never the primary terrain, has always been a chess board for the manoeuvres of major powers (Yi-Chong 2008). Africa by and large serves mainly as a commercial playing field in which economic interests rather than ideological, religious, security and military interests are fought over (Ibid). Though much literature have agreed on the fact that economic interests are at the forefront of great powers involvement in Africa this however is not to deny other political, social, military, ideological and security interests as being at play in US-China clash in Africa. This article views Africa as more like a pawn in a chess game while the US is a king and China is a rival attacking queen, the situation represent a complicated equation, this ‘clash of interest’ and competition of influence have torn the African continent leaving it to be preyed by vulture hungry states. According to Makwerere and Chipaike (2012:314)^[21] “the African continent has been at the mercy of resource hungry Western nations over a century”. The competition of resources and influence especially in Africa between the US and China have gave birth to the new cold war and new scramble for Africa (Makwerere and Chipaike 2012)^[21].

This research discovered that the interests of the US and China are highly complicated, problematic, confrontational and conflicting to an extent that the two are in real battle though they both deny this fact. Xuetong (2010:290) argues that “there are more mutually unfavourable interests than favourable ones between the US and China”. However Shinn and Eisenman (2008) argue that American and Chinese interests in Africa are different but not substantially so. They further argue that there are more areas where the two countries can cooperate for the benefit of Africans than there are issues of disagreement and competition. Scholars such as Schrader (1994) argue that the US have no or little specific interest in Africa, if there is truth in this then therefore what really the US have in Africa? Or is it responding to the increased involvement of China in the African continent? According to Schrader (1994) in essence, American involvement in Africa is frequently driven by external factors, not specific interest in the continent. US policy makers have tended to ignore the African continent until

some sort of politico-military crisis grab their attention (Schrader 1994). China's interests in African resources already represent a major development in global politics, as well as new geography of trade and cooperation outside traditional North-South linkages (Marafa 2009).

China is forging deep economic relationships with most African countries with the aim of securing access to their vast resources (Marafa 2009:19). Brookes and Shin (2006) posit that Beijing has identified the African continent as an area of economic and strategic interest. Critics are quick to cite China's exploitation of African resources including the focus of oil and minerals as a major part of China-Africa trade (Vines 2010). Asongu and Aminkeng (2013:263) ^[4] posit that "China target aid to African states with abundant natural resources and bad governments". US interests in Africa rose because of new players who were pursuing oil interest (Yi-Chong 2008). According to Alden (2006:147) "motivated by vital resources and new markets to fuel its economy, coupled to a commitment to multilateralism, Beijing has embarked in a comprehensive trade and diplomatic offensive that is challenging Western preeminence in the region".

This article is of the view that both the US and China have specific interest in Africa and their interests are mainly centred on looting and exploiting African resources in whatever way, using whatever means and wherever possible. Both China and the US have little specific developmental or helping hand to the African continent their fight is of having access of exploiting abundant African natural resources for their own survival in the international system and benefits while the African continent remain poor and poorer. Yi-Chong (2008) also observes that the two countries however have no intention of developing the continent; their interests are just the same to grab, colonise and loot as much resources as they can, using whatever means, wherever they can.

"As the world's biggest economy, the USA's increased interest in Africa's oil, uranium, gold and other mineral resources should not be surprising, on the other hand, with reports that the Chinese economy is now second to the USA, the country now, more than any time, needs the markets to sell its cheap products, the oil for its industries and the uranium for its electric energy sector" (Makwerere and Chipaike 2012:312) ^[21]. China is identified as a main competitor that the US must 'work tirelessly and aggressively' to compete in order to advance its vested national interests (Yi-Chong 2008).

According to Yi-Chong (2008), from a traditional realists point of view international competition is a totally zero sum game most specifically when nonrenewable or non-replaceable energy is concerned that means if China takes one barrel of oil from the African continent it would mean one barrel less for the US and also if China expands its trade with African countries, America would lose out in those markets. In this struggle for resources, different mechanisms have been used to lure African countries into the exploitation trap with the effect that the USA and China, especially, have now been locked in a new Cold War (Makwerere and Chipaike 2012) ^[21].

Clash of titans

In diplomacy and diplomatic circles, Africa was largely regarded as a "backwater", a continent where old Western colonial powers competed for control (Yi-Chong 2008). Historically, Africa has been marginal to both the US and China foreign policy (Alden 2005, Yi-Chong 2008, Pham

2005) ^[2]. However, the continent becomes a strategic region by end of the Cold War. "On the part of China, the demise the Soviet Union and the end of the ColdWar altered the role and place of China in the world. Given the changes in the international environment, China began playing a role of challenging US hegemony and acting as a 'torchbearer' for the third world" (Muekalia 2004:7) ^[27]. Keenan (2008:16) argues that "after the end of the Cold War, Africa gained an increased strategic importance to the US for three reasons; the global war on terror, fears of impeding energy crisis, and China's growing presence on the continent".

There is a growing body of literature sustaining that the lost decades in Africa could be substantially be traceable to its application to the Washington consensus (Lin 2015), and false economic preconditions (Monga 2014). Accordingly policies of privatization, liberalization, marketization, complete openness, and growing reduction of government involvement in economic activities have not led to expected benefits in the continent (Asongu and Aminkeng 2013) ^[4]. This research has a clear position that although the US has a sound footing of control in the African continent nothing much have benefited Africa, the so called Washington consensus was only but more like a tool of imposing US values and preferences without taking into consideration the values and needs of Africans. Simeon (2010:58) ^[35] argues that "after the Second World War, US -Africa policy was determined by a continuous effort to impose American values of democracy and human rights, constitutes the base of the US "rhetorical commitments to Africa". However, the manner in which the objectives were pursued were generally remained shaped by US geo-strategic interests of containing the Soviet or Communism expansionism on the continent and building ideological affiliation with African countries (Simeon 2010) ^[35].

Against such a backdrop of the ills of the US foreign policy towards Africa, China has tailored its foreign policy to take advantage of this frustration from African policy makers (Asongu 2014) ^[15]. Shinn and Eisenman (2008:14) argue that "many, perhaps mossst, African leaders view China as an alternative to Western development and funding". Lum (2009:1) argues that "China's growing presence in Africa is clear threat to the US and the West in their continued failure to help the continent as they pretend". Shinn and Eisenman (2008) argue that by its presence in Africa, China has been trying to promote a Beijing consensus, relying on the example of their model, the strength of their economic position, and their rigid defence of Westphalian system of national sovereignty. Patten (2009) ^[29] argues that while the Western approach is based on an idealistic view of good intentions, the Chinese paradigm is much more objective, pragmatic, flexible and effective.

However, to argue that the US and the Western approach are based on good intentions represents an academic bias and to some extent it is misrepresentation of facts, according to Lum (2009) "US policy did not showcase American values but instead exported fear and anger". According to Makwerere and Chipaike (2012:313) ^[21] "the Chinese have befriended the US enemies and friends alike while the US continues to qualify countries for economic and trade incentives according to their willingness to fulfil certain conditions ..." The US, because of its position in global affairs was expected to take the upper hand in Africa since2000 but the unipolar giant's policies towards Africa are largely a reaction to the Chinese policy of expansionism (Makwerere and Chipaike 2012)

^[21]“China’s recent engagement in Africa reflects “the emergence of a new and ambitious vision” (Muekalia 2004:89) ^[27].

This article is of the position that the differences between China and the US foreign policies in Africa mirror long held theoretical debate and is highly complicated. Both the Washington and Beijing consensus represents a lot of hypocrisy and they come from divergent strands and are just like water and oil that can never mix. The US foreign policy is full of conditions and rhetorical democracy and human rights at its centre while China’s foreign policy maintains a clear non-interference stance. This difference is more like clash of titans and the sinking of more coherent cooperation in foreign policies.

This study likens the Washington versus Beijing consensus as more like a reflection of mathematical parallel lines that can never meet. Wenping (2007:28) ^[40] says that “Africa is perhaps the most important testing ground for promotion of Chinese soft power”. Cox (2011:416) ^[10] concludes that “it has become the truth of our age that the western world we have known is fast losing its pre-eminence to be replaced by a new international system shaped by China and increasingly determined by the economic rise of Asia...”. According to Ojatorotu and Whetho (2008) ^[28] over the years, each camp has pointed fingers in the opponent’s direction. It is argued that China follows the basic policy of enhancing confidence, reducing trouble, increasing cooperation avoiding confrontation with the US, in contrast to the US principle of contact and containment (Ojatorotu and Whetho 2008) ^[28].

Conflict or Cooperation (an uncertain future)

“At this point, scholars and political analysts lack the kind of powerful predictive tools that would allow them to say with any degree of assurance what the state of relations between the US and China will be in 5 year time or to say anything for 10-20 years to come” (Friedberg 2008:8). An analysis of the future of US-China clash in African can be analysed using international relations theories; of much importance this study focuses on comments from realism, idealism and power transition schools of thoughts. This study however using realis theory maintains that there are a lot of conflicts currently and more are going to come, although the future remains uncertain the present US-China relations in Africa clearly show real enmity between the two countries in their selfish desire of looting and grabbing African resources, the competition is clear so do the conflicts. This study pick Sudan as a case study, the situation in Sudan clearly reflects the sour relationship between US and China hence Sudan is the ‘Taiwan of Africa’ or the ‘Sarajevo of the 21st century’.

Ample evidence suggests that the US is preparing a long cold war with China (Zhou 2011) ^[42]. Hurrel (2014) argues that periods of shifting power are difficult and dangerous times. Rising states will naturally seek to challenge the status quo and to revise the dominant norms of the system to reflect their own interests and values and established powers will be tempted to use their own power (Ibid). In fact, Sudan (especially the crisis in Darfur) has been a thorny issue in relations between China and the US, with the latter frequently criticizing the former for its support of the Sudanese government (Ojatorotu and Whetho 2008) ^[28]. This study is of the view that despite China’s rise has been celebrated as a ‘peaceful rise’ this is not to eliminate at any cost the probability and potential for war, although again it is mostly argued that wars have become outdated, the recent China-US

clash in Africa is something else which can led to spillover effects in other continents and make war unavoidable. Gordon (2011) recently observes that the US is heading into a more conflict ridden world with the US-China tension at its core. Zhou (2011:628) ^[42] states that “China views that the US seeks to contain China’s rise and attempts to block it”. Kaplan (2005) notes that whether or not there will be a Sino American war is no longer a question, the remaining question is how the US should fight China.

This researcher maintains that there is sufficient evidence of conflicts between the US and China are real, but the conflict will not turn into a deadly war. China’s peaceful rise will not necessarily create the scenario of World War 1 and World War 11 which violent and very disturbing. It is important to note that military conflict is not inherent in a nation’s rise and the US in the twentieth century is a good example of a state achieving eminence without conflicting with the dominant countries (Kissinger 2011) ^[19]. A military clash between China and the US will exhaust both countries. A cold war between the two nations is possible, but the cold war will inevitably damage the interests of both countries (Kissinger 2011) ^[19]. Kissinger (2011) ^[19] made it clear that another cold war is not an answer. Therefore cooperation between China and the US will result in a win-win situation. Kissinger (2011) ^[19] argues that China, the world populous state and the US the world’s most powerful state, will contribute to peace. “In foreign affairs most Americans are liberals and regard the prospects for peace, cooperation and understanding among nations” (Friedberg 2005:12) ^[13]. This study maintains that although American literature and scholars view Americans as liberals and peace lovers this is just but cheap politicking, from an African perspective Americans are barbaric they have an appetite for war and they favour conflicts. Friedberg (2005) ^[13] argues that the current state of China- Africa cooperation is not an important foreign policy threat to the US interests in Africa, the Chinese level of political and economic engagement is still modest so as to constitute a real threat. Deduced from this is the fact that conflict between China and the US is mistaken. From an African perspective this research is of the view that whether conflict or cooperation the clash of US and China on their desire to grab African resources represents a greatest conflict of interest which has left Africa largely torn apart. Playing politics in artificial friendship type and a hide and seek game, full of rhetoric speeches the two US and China are in direct conflict the case of Sudan portrays a big picture of conflicting hands in the crisis. This research observes that much of the literature on China-US clash is largely distorted and twisted in a way of avoiding reality of the conflicts between the two, this study therefore maintains a position that the new world order is unavoidably coming with a lot of conflicts, some are currently underway. Sudan might become the Sarajevo of the 21st century, hence spark another world war.

When elephants fight grass suffers

Sadly exploited by colonial rulers before being divided by proxy battles of the Cold War rivals, the continent as it continuous to be brightened by environmental degradation, economic malaise, social misrule has not yet to see any ‘peace dividend’ (Pham 2005). This researcher maintains a position that Africa though seems to be a strategic region has been since time immemorial at the losing end, all the fights and battles of interests mainly economic being fought in the region have proved beyond any reasonable doubt that Africa

is nothing but a pawn in a chess game which fight wars for important pieces like the queen and the king. Makwerere and Chipaika (2012:312) ^[21] argue that “using a hotchpotch of trickery, feigned benevolence and sometimes naked aggression, participants in the new scramble have set their sight not only on exploiting the continent’s resources but also on making sure that they establish strategic partnership that will give them perpetual access to those resources”.

This researcher maintains a position that both the US and China are causing a lot of problems in Africa. Brookes and Shinn (2006) observe that the most pernicious effect of the renewed Chinese interests in Africa is legitimizing and encouraging Africa’s most repressive regimes, thereby increasing the likelihood of weak and failed states. Chemingui and Behir (2010) ^[9] argue that due to the small capacities in production and low levels of diversification in African economies, Africa will not much benefit from Sino-Africa relations. Asungu and Aminkeng (2013:263) ^[4] posit that “China targets aid to African countries with bad governments”. Breslin and Taylor (2008) ^[7] further argue that violations of human rights accompany Sino-Africa relations, especially in coalition with corrupt elites (Askouri 2007:17) ^[3].

This study come to a conclusion that although China is largely viewed by most African government leaders such as Robert Mugabe, Oma al-Bashir among others as a friend and benign hegemony the situation at hand clearly shows that China is not a permanent friend to Africa but rather have permanent interests, it is good in signing Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) and lacks the enforcement mechanism of transforming what is on paper to reality. The US is no better its illusory approach of spreading good intentions of democracy and governance goes hand in hand with its hypocrisy in some instances in which it turns a blind eye driven by its selfish interests. This study observes that although the US plays a role as the global police it is not a god in itself nor is it son of man but rather it is a wolf in sheep clothing.

This research is of the view that the US-China clash in looting African resources has left Africa torn apart without a clear policy of whether to look east or west, the continent is still suffering with little developmental projects at hand. The African continent is affected by dependency syndrome in which African leaders cannot do things on their own without a helping hand from foreigners this cancer have reduced the continent to become an orphan it is against such backdrop in which Africa still lags behind in terms of development as best illustrated by dependency theory in Walter Rodney’s book ‘How Europe Underdeveloped Africa’. On the Chinese side Asongu and Aminkeng (2013:263) ^[4] argue that Chinese do not hire Africans to work on their projects”. This research maintains that by the very fact that the US have lost grip in Africa and that their quest to impose their own values on Africans have been received with condemnation however the Chinese way of not hiring Africans is a no better alternative to a flood of unemployed Africans. Carmody (2009:1197) ^[8] argues that “Sino-Africa relations offer the possibility of a development regime that reduces poverty”. McCormick (2008) ^[22] emphasized that China’s aid is positively affecting African development. This study however come to a conclusion that the conditions in Africa is more equivalent to a medical critical comma of a hospitalized patient, Africa is still underdeveloped and facing economic, social and political crisis.

Hegemonic Stability Theory

According to Keohane and Nye (1997:44) ^[17] hegemony is a state that possesses the characteristics of, the capability to create and enforce international norms, the will to do so, and decisive economic, technological and military dominance. Major proponents of the hegemonic stability theory are Kindleberger, Gilpin, Keohane, Krasner and Organiski. According to Kindleberger (1973) ^[18] states can only cooperate economically with one another when a hegemonic power holds the ring economically or militarily. Kindleberger (1973) ^[18] comes to a conclusion that “for the world economy to stabilize they must be a stabilizer, one stabilizer”. Important to this study from these assumptions is that they should be a stabilizer more like a super power enjoying a unipolar status with vibrant economic and military power. In this research the US have enjoyed the unipolar status since the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 however the “peaceful rise” of China and its increased involvement in Africa since 2000 to present is a direct challenge of the US hence posing challenges to US foreign policy on the African continent. Roy (2003:75) argues that “China’s ultimate goal is not to attain the level of merely the second most powerful state but rather to replace US as a regional hegemony and to achieve parity with the US in global terms”. Kindleberger (1973) ^[18] argue that “hegemony creates an open world and its decline leads to closure and finally instability”. However Keohane (1984) ^[16] argues that “despite the relative decline of the US, economic stability has endured because of the strength of the institutions the US has created”. Relevant to this study from Keohane (1984) ^[16] argument is the fact that though the rise of China as economic power house and China-US clash in Africa reflects the fall of the US as a hegemony that does not mean closure and instability as portrayed by Kindleberger (1973) ^[18] and Gilpin (1981) ^[15].

Conclusion

The article analyses the challenges posed by China on US foreign policy on the African continent with special focus with issue of Sudan period from the year 2000 to 2015 before the birth of South Sudan. It concludes that the rise of China as an economic power house, its Beijing consensus and foreign policy approach poses a lot of challenges to the US interests and foreign policy in Africa. Competition and exploitation of African resources is not new and the current scramble for Africa has not developed the similar features of political, ideological or cultural interests. China and the US are competing from an economic angle, basing on commercial interests in Africa. This study comes to a conclusion that the increased involvement of China in Africa has created a battle ground with the US especially in economic playing field in their quest to exploit African resources in which oil is a focal point of that competition. This study concludes that the “clash of interests” and competition for resources has torn the African continent to be preyed by vulture hungry states hence the new Cold War and new scramble for Africa. It is of much importance to note that both the Chinese foreign policy and the US foreign policy are crafted to lure African countries into the exploitation trap the case of Sudan and other oil rich countries clearly explain this scenario.

This research after analysis of various factors came to a conclusion that the US involvement in Africa is a response to the prominent presence of China on the African continent. Since 2000 the Chinese involvement increased rapidly while

the US seems to have been losing ground in Africa. More so, the Washington consensus versus the Beijing consensus mirror long held theoretical debate and is highly complicated. This study comes to a conclusion that the Washington consensus, World Bank and IMF policies are to be blamed for the lost decade of development in Africa. This study dubbed the year 1990's to early 2000 as the 'dark era of development' in Africa or 'the decade of a robber' it is in this period in which African countries followed the Washington consensus. With the ills of the US foreign policy in Africa what can be called foreign policy syndrome the only medicine was for the African countries to look East. This study concludes that the Beijing consensus was an alternative for Africa as it was more accommodative, lucrative and sounds pragmatic thus the period 2000-present saw the increased involvement of China in Africa. This study dubbed the period 2000-2015 as the 'period of hope' in Africa and China as the "Messiah of African development". This study describes the clash of the US and China in Africa from 2000-2015 as the 'clash of titans'.

However, in a sorrow state of affairs the US-China clash in Africa has brought more harm than good. This study concludes that the African continent has suffered more and more and their resource has been exploited in return of empty and fake promises. Africa once again has been reduced to become an orphan. The two great powers have reduced Africa to become a pawn in a chess game. Africa has suffered negatively in the US-China clash of interests and the continent has remained poor and poorer without taking advantage of its resources.

Politically Sino-Africa relations damaged Africa's fragile efforts to improve good governance and democracy since China supports undemocratic governments in Africa. At the other hand the US-Africa relations creates a problem of imposing American values to the African continent and the US approach is bully especially their regime change agenda. This study concluded that African countries lack a clear path of whether to look West or East.

This study comes to a conclusion that in spite of a possibility of conflict and war between the US and China in Africa, there is a room of competition and cooperation since both the US and China benefits from a peaceful environment. Both the US and China foreign policies approaches in diplomatic, political or military efforts have been made more to assist their economic interests than to engage in a war or military conquest. However, this study maintains that the African continent should benefit from the US-China clash since both the US and China saw an urgent need to develop coherent strategic policy towards Africa.

Recommendations

- This article recommends that African countries might manage their own resources and be able to ensure that more of the value of its resources stayed in Africa, rather than being sent abroad as profits like what is happening in present day Africa a typical fashion of colonisation. The African continent might benefit more from the US-China clash if it becomes the main player in directing and managing its resources.
- This researcher recommends that should stop clapping hands at international conferences, financed by resource hungry states, the African leaders are happier to receive more than mere pittance in exchange of their strategic minerals.

- African countries should have the ability to take of advantage of the US-China involvement in Africa, without being taken advantage of by the US and China, that might account for much of the African continent's success.
- African countries could call for massive injection of investment funds in the construction of roads, railway lines, and information and communication technology and most importantly in establishment of relevant and durable manufacturing and value addition infrastructure that makes it possible for African countries to add value to their natural resources and sell them at better prices (Makwerere and Chipaike 2012) ^[21].
- Since Africa has vast natural resources and is rich in strategic minerals, it might be helpful if it get financing to both extract and processes its minerals into finished products. The African Union (AU) might encourage African countries to come up with common ground with same objectives and clear path of foreign policy. The African Development Bank (ADB) might help individual countries with loans so that they process their minerals into finished products.
- The US might begin to engage China on Africa and work as complementary forces rather the competing forces. If completion is peaceful it will likely result in development and progress thus Africa, China and the US will have the unique opportunity for cooperation rather than conflict. Tammen and Kugler (2006:53) ^[38] recommends that "to avoid the potential of a clash somewhere mid-century, the US must take the lead in finding ways to integrate China into the world community, thereby having it accept the prevailing rules and norms. This study recommends that the playing field could be tilted and Africa should require a balance playing field rather than continuing on a sloping or uneven playing ground of trade and development. Also African countries might draw lessons from the development of 'Asian Tigers'.

References

1. Alden C. From neglect to virtual engagement: The United States and its new paradigm for Africa. *African Affairs*. 2000; 99(2):355-371.
2. Alden C. China in Africa. *Survival*. 2005; 47(3):147-164.
3. Askouri A. China's Investment in Sudan, in *Displacing villages and destroying communities*, edited by E Manji *et al*, 2007.
4. Asongu SA, Aminkeng GAA. The economic consequences of China-Africa relations: Debunking myths in debate. *Journal of Chinese Economic and Business Studies*. 2013; 11(4):261-277.
5. Asongu SA. Fighting African Capital Flight: Empirics on benchmarking policy harmonisation. *The European Journal of Comparative Economics*. 2014; 11(2):93-122.
6. Brautigam D. *The Dragon's Gift: The real story of China in Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
7. Breslin S, Taylor I. Explaining the rise of human rights in analyses of Sino-African relations. *Review of African Political Economy*. 2008; 35(115):59-71.
8. Carmody P. An Asian driven economic recovery in Africa? The Zambian Case. *World Development*. 2009; 37(7):1197-1207.
9. Chemingui MA, Bchir MH. The future of African trade

- with China under trade liberalisation schemes. *African Development Review*. 2010; 22(1):562-576.
10. Cox M. Power Shift and Death of the West? Not Yet. *European Political Science*. 2011; 10(3):400-416.
 11. Cox M. Power Shifts, Economic Change and the Decline of the West? *International Relations*. 2012; 24(4):369-388.
 12. Doyle M. Kant, Liberal Legacies and Foreign Affairs. *Philosophy and Public Affairs*. 1983; 12(3):315-326.
 13. Friedberg AL. The Future of US-China Relations: Is Conflict Inevitable? *International Security*. 2005; 30(2):7-45.
 14. Friedman E. How economic superpower China could transform Africa. *Journal of Chinese Political Science*. 2009; 14(1):1-20.
 15. Gilpin R. *War and Change in World Politics*. New York: Cambridge Press, 1981.
 16. Keohane R. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
 17. Keohane R, Nye J. *Power and Interdependence; World Politics in Transition*. Boston: Little Brown, 1997.
 18. Kindleberger C. *The World in Depression 1929-1939*. Berkley: California University Press, 1973.
 19. Kissinger HA. *On China*. New York: Penguin Press, 2011.
 20. Lin JY. The Washington Consensus Revisited: A new structural economics perspective. *Journal of Economic Policy Reform*, Forthcoming, 2015.
 21. Makwerere D, Chipaike R. China and the United States of America in Africa. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. 2012; 2(17):311-319.
 22. McCormick D. China and India as Africa's New Donors: The impact of Aid on Development. *Review of African Political Economy*. 2008; 35(115):73-92.
 23. Mearsheimer J. *Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: Norton, 2001.
 24. Monga C. The False Economics of Pre-Conditions: Policy making in the African Context. *Journal of African Development*. 2004; 16 (2), 121-140.
 25. Moravcsik A. *Liberal International Relations*. Cambridge: Havard University Press, 2001.
 26. Morgenthau H. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. 6th Edition. New York: McGraw Hill, 1985.
 27. Muekalia DJ. Africa and China's Strategic Partnership. *African Security Review*. 2004; 13(1):5-11.
 28. Ojatorotu V, Whetho A. Sino-African Relations: The Cold War and After: *Asia Journal of Global Studies*. 2008; 2(2):35-43.
 29. Patten C. *What Next? Surviving the Twenty-first Century*. New York: Penguin Press, 2009.
 30. Power M, Mohan G. Towards a critical geopolitics of China's engagement with African development. *Geopolitics and Development Journal*. 2010; 15(3):462-495.
 31. Roy D. China's Reaction to American Predominance. *Survival*. 2003; 45(3):70-85.
 32. Schraeder PJ. *US Foreign Policy Toward Africa: Incrementalism, Crisis and Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
 33. Shambaugh D. Introduction: The Emergence of Greater China. *The China Quarterly*. 2014; 136(2):650-665.
 34. Shin D, Eisenman J. *A Century of Engagement*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.
 35. Simeon H. The new US-China rapprochement: A view from Africa. *Journal of US China Public Administration*. 2010; 7(2):35-49.
 36. Snyder GH. Mearsheimer's World-Offensive Realism and the Struggle for Security: A Review Essay. *International Security*. 2002; 27(1):149-173.
 37. Sun Y. Africa in China's Foreign Policy. *Journal of Chinese Foreign Affairs*. 2014; 4(2):1- 39.
 38. Tammen RL, Kugler J. Power Transition and China-US conflicts. *Chinese Journal of International Politics*. 2006; 1(2):35-55.
 39. Waltz NK. *Theory of International Politics*. Reading: Addison Wesley, 1979.
 40. Wenping H. The Balancing Act of China's Africa Policy. *China Security*. 2007; 3(3):23-40.
 41. Yi Chong X. China and the United States in Africa: coming conflict or commercial coexistence. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*. 2008; 62(1):16-37.
 42. Zhou J. American Perspective versus Chinese Expectation on China's Rise. *International Journal of China Studies*. 2011; 2(3):625-645.