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Africa today has emerged as a continent of strategic consequence. Domestic and international terrorism aside, the two great powers of our time, the United States and the People’s Republic of China (PRC), are vying for influence over African governments and people. Not unlike the Cold War, the primary means of exerting influence in Africa is through the use of non-violent instruments of grand strategy.

In this monograph, Dr. Donovan Chau considers one nonviolent instrument of grand strategy in particular, political warfare. Retracing the origins and mischaracterizations of political warfare, Dr. Chau suggests that the PRC has used political warfare as its leading grand strategic instrument in Africa. The monograph offers a concise, detailed overview of U.S. capabilities to conduct political warfare in Africa. It then examines PRC political warfare operations in four regional “anchor” states—Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, and South Africa.

What emerges from Dr. Chau’s analyses is the Chinese use of political warfare intentionally targeting U.S. interests in Africa. Unless the U.S. Government recognizes the utility of political warfare and reorients the federal bureaucracy to employ it effectively, he intimates that future U.S. influence in Africa will wane—to the benefit of a country that understands political warfare and uses it seriously.
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SUMMARY

Today, as in the past, the People’s Republic of China (PRC) exerts influence on the African continent. Unlike the United States, which also attempts to sway African nations and people, the PRC uses an instrument of grand strategy called political warfare as its primary means of influence. What is political warfare, and how is it being employed in Africa today? How do U.S. capabilities compare to PRC operations and capabilities in Africa? The monograph answers these and other questions to inform the current national security debate among U.S. policy and decisionmakers. For while the struggle against international terrorism will continue indefinitely, the U.S. Government must not overlook other grand strategic challenges currently taking place around the world.

The monograph explains political warfare in its historic context and offers a current definition. Simply, political warfare is a nonviolent instrument of grand strategy, involves coordinated activities, and results in tangible effects on intended targets. In operational terms, political warfare includes economic aid and development assistance, as well as training, equipping, and arming military and security forces. Exchange visits and public pronouncements are secondary political warfare operations, supporting and facilitating primary operations. Political warfare offers distinct advantages to other instruments of grand strategy, making it a desirable means of exerting influence. Vis-à-vis other instruments—particularly military power—political warfare is economical. Though results may not appear immediately, using political warfare has grand strategic benefits, from information-gathering to relation-
ship-building. Moreover, political warfare may potentially garner prestige and a positive reputation around the world.

The U.S. Government possesses numerous political warfare capabilities, though they may not be viewed as such. From the U.S. Army and other armed services to the State Department and the Agency for International Development, U.S. capabilities exist but are not being used to their full potential or in a coordinated manner. Meanwhile, another country is intentionally targeting U.S. policy in Africa through the use of political warfare.

Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, and South Africa are considered regional “anchor” states according to U.S. national security policy. Since 2000, the PRC has expanded political warfare operations in these four countries. The monograph examines PRC political warfare operations in each country.

- The first case highlights how the PRC used political warfare to gain access to and develop opportunities in Ethiopia. Using donations to the Ethiopian government and people as well as to the African Union (and its predecessor), Beijing attained government contracts, signed agreements, and cultivated bilateral relations.

- The PRC used political warfare to move relations with Kenya to a higher level. PRC operations expanded China’s reach into the information, education, and infrastructure development areas of Kenya.

- PRC operations were diverse and directed at influencing the people and government of Nigeria, particularly state governments. PRC political warfare operations affected all aspects of
Nigerian society, furthering PRC interests in the country.

- Gaining South Africa’s allegiance had the benefit of weakening Taiwan’s global diplomatic status, which was part and parcel of the primary objective of Chinese grand strategy. PRC operations in South Africa were used to attain cooperation in technical and scientific fields.

Comparing PRC operations and U.S. capabilities, the monograph underscores the lack of political warfare in America’s current grand strategy. Educating and deploying the U.S. military to conduct political warfare in Africa is an immediate, short-term solution. In the long term, however, a civilian U.S. Government agency must lead the political warfare charge abroad. This will require political leadership as well as prudent policy. Most importantly, national security policy and decisionmakers must come to the realization that how operations are conducted is as important as what operations are performed.
POLITICAL WARFARE IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA: U.S. CAPABILITIES AND CHINESE OPERATIONS IN ETHIOPIA, KENYA, NIGERIA, AND SOUTH AFRICA

Introduction.

In October 2005, U.S. Naval Mobile Construction Battalion THREE began rebuilding and constructing water wells in Ethiopia. “Being in a place like this where water is so hard to come by and knowing we’re giving people water who’ve never had water before . . . this is a really rewarding mission to be on,” said Steel Worker Third Class Jared M. Perry.1 That same month, U.S. troops on patrol nearby discovered two cheetah cubs tied up with ropes around their necks at a restaurant, where the cubs were forced to fight each other for the amusement of patrons and village children. The soldiers alerted the Ethiopian government, the U.S. Embassy in Ethiopia, and a U.S.-based cheetah rescue organization, eventually flying the two cubs to the National Palace in Addis Ababa. “This is the first kind of rescue of animals, let alone cheetahs, that we have done,” said Army Sgt. Leah Cobble.2 The following month, a U.S. Army Civil Affairs team held a 3-day clinic to treat the sick from six villages surrounding Gode, Ethiopia. “We treated everything from minor injuries such as cuts to severe long-term injuries,” said Army Staff Sgt. John Dominguez, a civil affairs medic.3

Meanwhile, about the same time west across the African continent, it was reported that the People’s Republic of China (the PRC or Beijing) would help Nigeria drill 598 boreholes in Nigeria’s capital, Abuja, as well
as 18 states—all as a free aid project. The free water supply project was “aimed at providing clean drinkable water to ordinary Nigerians living in out-of-the-way areas,” said PRC Ambassador to Nigeria Wang Yongqiu. Nigerian Minister of Water Resources Alhaji Muktar Shagari later remarked, the project “is a typical example of bilateral cooperation” between Nigeria and the PRC, and appealed to other countries to “learn from China.” Also in October 2005, it was reported that Beijing donated $3 million worth of military equipment to Nigeria. The equipment included “two special vehicles, emergency runway systems, bullet proof helmets and vests, communication gadgets, computers, uniforms and diving devices.” Ambassador to Nigeria Wang later mentioned that 21 Chinese “experts” would arrive in Nigeria in November to train Nigerian soldiers on how to use the equipment.

What do these actions by the United States and PRC governments mean, and why are they relevant today? These events in two strategically-located countries in East and West Africa are examples of governmental efforts to conduct an instrument of grand strategy called political warfare. Both the United States and the PRC were using nonviolent means in a coordinated (or semi-coordinated) manner to directly affect the targeted population. They were using political warfare to achieve their national objectives. But what is political warfare, and why is this instrument of grand strategy being used by two of the world’s dominant powers on the African continent today?

**Political Warfare: What It Was and What It Is.**

The term political warfare was first used by the British during World War II. During the war, the British established the Political Warfare Executive to
help defeat Nazi Germany. The Executive’s primary mission was the creation and dissemination of propaganda, particularly beyond enemy lines. In modern parlance, the British have continued to define political warfare as “overt and covert forms of information management.” At the conclusion of the war, the British government disbanded the Political Warfare Executive—the term and concept falling into disuse.

Across the Atlantic Ocean after the war, George Kennan, head of the newly established State Department Policy Planning Staff, attempted to invigorate the post-war U.S. Government with a paper concerning “the inauguration of organized political warfare.” Although his attempt to codify political warfare into the U.S. national security establishment ultimately failed, Kennan offers a sound basis from which to define political warfare and understand its utility to the United States. In his State Department Policy Planning Staff memorandum, Kennan drew on the British experience in World War II to define political warfare. “In broadest definition,” Kennan wrote, “political warfare is the employment of all the means at a nation’s command, short of war, to achieve its national objectives.” Kennan made a distinction between overt and covert “types” of political warfare. Moreover, he considered overt operations “the traditional policy activities of any foreign office enjoying positive leadership, whether or not they are recognized as political warfare.” Unlike any American policymakers before him, Kennan advocated the use of this instrument of grand strategy.

From Kennan’s memorandum, three significant concepts relevant to a sound definition of political warfare may be deduced. First, political warfare, according to Kennan, was an instrument of grand strategy that involved all the means of a nation-state, short of war.
While broadly applicable, this concept implies the utility of all nonviolent instruments of grand strategy, as well as the utility of coordinating them together. Second, Kennan’s definition of political warfare states explicitly that this instrument is used to achieve national objectives. This concept may appear self-evident—being an instrument of grand strategy—but it is crucial to understanding political warfare’s ultimate aim. Finally, Kennan mentions in passing the importance of “positive leadership” in a foreign office’s “traditional” policy activities. He may have been simply suggesting the importance of leadership in foreign affairs. At the same time, one may interpret “positive leadership” to mean the ability to connect means—as whole—to ends, which is political warfare at its best.

A clear, concise, and contemporary definition of political warfare is needed—for this study and for U.S. national security today. Based on past definitions and uses, political warfare is an instrument of grand strategy. The purpose of political warfare is determined by an actor’s objectives—its intent. Any actor with the capabilities and intentions may employ political warfare as an instrument of grand strategy. And the use of political warfare is not confined by an actor’s specific culture. Used by state or nonstate actors, political warfare targets groups and individuals. Overt or covert, it is a nonviolent instrument of grand strategy comprising interrelated activities that are tangible (or, at least, audible or legible). Therefore, the mind and the body are both targets; and political warfare operations often have a direct effect on peoples’ lives. Therefore, operations include targeted economic aid, development projects, exchange visits, and public pronouncements, as well as the training, arming, and equipping of military or security forces. While nonviolent, political warfare
operations may sometimes support or result in violent activities. In order to be effective, political warfare operations must be based on detailed, factual information about the targeted group, including knowledge of peoples and cultures.\textsuperscript{19}

To summarize, political warfare is a nonviolent instrument of grand strategy, involves coordinated activities, and results in tangible effects on intended targets.\textsuperscript{20} Primary political warfare operations include economic aid; development assistance; and training, equipping, and arming military and security forces. Exchange visits and public pronouncements are secondary political warfare operations because they support and facilitate primary operations. Political warfare offers distinct advantages over other instruments of grand strategy. Vis-à-vis other instruments—particularly military power—political warfare is economical; it does not require a vast amount of financial resources and, thus, may be readily used around the world. Though results may not appear immediately, using political warfare has grand strategic benefits, from information gathering (to understand different peoples and cultures) to relationship building (to prevent future conflict). Political warfare, if used appropriately, may potentially result in much-needed prestige and a positive reputation around the world, which is difficult to gain and even more difficult to preserve.\textsuperscript{21} These benefits help explain why political warfare is currently being used by the United States and the PRC in Africa, and why understanding it is vital for the U.S. military, policymakers, and Congress.

Monograph Scope.

This monograph examines Beijing’s use of political warfare on the African continent.\textsuperscript{22} The central ques-
tion asks: to what extent has the PRC achieved the central objective of its grand strategy in Africa. The PRC is examined because of today’s lack of sound grand strategic analyses of Beijing’s actions, particularly in Africa. Since early 2004, attention has been paid to the PRC’s involvement in Africa. While some analysts have focused narrowly on PRC interests in raw materials (hydrocarbons, in particular), others have recognized Beijing’s broader interests on the continent. As in the past, the PRC has continued to emphasize its historic ties, shared common experiences, and peaceful cooperative relations with African nations. Also as in the past, however, Western assessments of PRC operations in Africa have been flawed. U.S. intelligence analysts, policymakers, and senior diplomats have cited Beijing’s recent “increased” interest and engagement in the region and identified its objective of attaining status as a “major player” on the world stage. However, their commentaries have demonstrated a general lack of knowledge and understanding pertaining to the PRC’s grand strategy. This monograph will provide a current assessment of PRC actions in Africa based on recent historical evidence and an understanding of an essential instrument of PRC grand strategy, political warfare.

Because Beijing is currently operating (or has operated) in nearly every country on the African continent, it is beyond the scope of this monograph to examine all of its operations in detail. Instead, Beijing’s use of political warfare will be highlighted in four sub-Saharan African countries: Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, and South Africa. These countries were chosen due to their importance to U.S. policy in Africa. As the 2002 National Security Strategy stated, “[C]ountries with major impact on their neighborhood such as South Africa, Nigeria,
Kenya, and Ethiopia are anchors for regional engagement and require focused attention. . . ”26 Based on historical relations, the United States has maintained close ties with these countries. Examining the PRC’s operations in these four African “anchor” states will reveal the extent to which it has intentionally targeted U.S. Africa policy in addition to furthering its grand strategic objectives. While it will be necessary to draw from historical bilateral relations, the focus of this selective study will be on Beijing’s 21st century political warfare operations in the four African anchor states—Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, and South Africa.27

In addition to examining Beijing’s use of political warfare in Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, and South Africa, the monograph will provide an overview of U.S. political warfare capabilities in Africa. This overview will serve as a comparative reference point vis-à-vis PRC operations and will enlighten analysts, policymakers, and diplomats on some of the political warfare capabilities of the U.S. Government. Therefore, with a focus on the four anchor states, U.S. political warfare capabilities will be highlighted before examining the PRC’s central objective and its operations. The concluding chapter will answer the central research question, compare the PRC’s capabilities with U.S. capabilities, and offer policy recommendations to the U.S. Army, Department of Defense (DoD), and the U.S. national security establishment.

**U.S. Political Warfare Capabilities in Africa: An Initial Assessment.**

This section provides an overview of U.S. political warfare capabilities on the African continent.28 The focus is on U.S. Government organizations and agencies
that have the ability to provide economic aid and development assistance, as well as to train, equip, and arm military and security forces. Secondarily, organizations and agencies that conduct exchange visits and make public pronouncements will be mentioned as they pertain to supporting political warfare operations. U.S. nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) with political warfare capabilities will be included in this overview as well. When assessing U.S. political warfare capabilities, it is necessary to discuss the agency or organization’s missions and roles, in addition to providing concrete examples of operations. The breakdown of U.S. political warfare capabilities necessarily varies by context—dependent on the country and the requirements of U.S. foreign policy, as well as the purpose and functions of the organizations. Moreover, it is crucial to bear in mind the various competing interests among U.S. Government organizations and agencies in each country.\textsuperscript{29} It will become evident that the United States possesses a robust (but latent) political warfare capability across the African continent.

The U.S. military possesses many political warfare capabilities, though they may not be viewed as such. The U.S. military conducts primary and secondary political warfare operations. It conducts operations on the African continent through three combatant commands: U.S. European Command (EUCOM), U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM), and U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM).\textsuperscript{30} Directed by the President through the Secretary of Defense, the authority and resources to conduct political warfare lie in the hands of the combatant commanders (COCOMs). COCOMs oversee and coordinate overall operations within their areas of responsibilities.

The U.S. Army has a wide range of political warfare capabilities that have been used in Africa. At the fore-
front of these capabilities in Africa is the 3rd Special Forces Group, U.S. Army Special Forces Command. Special Forces’ political warfare capabilities include Foreign Internal Defense, as well as collateral activities such as humanitarian assistance and de-mining. In 2000, for example, 3rd Special Forces Group trained two Nigerian battalions in peacekeeping duties for United Nations (UN) initiatives in West Africa—Sierra Leone, in particular. Nigeria was also given $42 million in military hardware, including rifles, mortars, machine guns and ammunition, as well as vehicles and medical and communications gear.31 Another element of Army Special Operations Command that conducts political warfare in Africa is the 96th Civil Affairs Battalion, U.S. Army Civil Affairs and Psychological Operations Command. Working with civil authorities and civilian populations, the 96th Civil Affairs Battalion conducts a multitude of political warfare missions from locating civil resources to support military operations to establishing and maintaining liaison with civilian aid agencies and civilian commercial and private organizations.32 Together, 3rd Special Forces Group and the 96th Civil Affairs Battalion represent the most active and versatile political warfare capabilities within the Army.

The Army also possesses unique political warfare capabilities outside of the Special Forces community. Within U.S. Army Europe/Seventh Army, EUCOM’s Army resources, support elements, and medical professionals—such as the 30th Medical Brigade—have conducted political warfare operations in Africa. In 2002, a team of U.S. soldiers (including a civil affairs unit and professionals from the 30th Medical Brigade) helped destroy and dispose of thousands of unexploded ordnance pieces in Nigeria.33 In addition to theater
resources, the Army possesses a range of multi-mission forces that have the ability to conduct political warfare in Africa. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has valuable construction capabilities that could be leveraged across Africa. The Army’s Security Assistance Training Management Organization (SATMO) also provides a wide spectrum of training and technical assistance that falls within the realm of political warfare. Though widely unrecognized, SATMO has deployed security assistance teams to all four anchor states in Africa over the past 20 years.  

The Army Reserve and State National Guards play significant political warfare roles in Africa. For example, in September 2004, military equipment and personnel from the New York Air National Guard participated in a South African air show. The New York National Guard is partnered with South Africa through the State Partnership Program (SPP), a reserve component initiative that aligns U.S.-based Guard and Reserve units with militaries of other nations “to enhance professional relationships and mutual understanding amongst the participating nations.”  

Established by the National Guard Bureau in 1993, the SPP fosters economic, political, and military ties between U.S. states and partner nations. It does so using a three-tiered approach to build military-to-military, military-to-civil, and civil-to-civil relations. This simultaneous approach is designed to evolve from strictly military relations to robust civilian interactions. By building relationships in an all-around fashion, the SPP is one of the U.S. Government’s key political warfare mechanisms.

The U.S. Navy and Marine Corps also have demonstrated political warfare capabilities in Africa. U.S. Naval Forces Europe/U.S. Sixth Fleet has long been active
along the Atlantic Ocean seaboard of the African continent. Since 1978, the Sixth Fleet has deployed ships on regularly scheduled West African training missions. In 2005, for example, the USS Emory S. Land (AS 39) participated in a Gulf of Guinea deployment. “The purpose of the deployment is to enhance security cooperation between the U.S. and participating Gulf of Guinea nations by providing the opportunity to interact and improve familiarization with how we operate in real-world environments,” said Vice Adm. Harry Ulrich, Commander, U.S. Sixth Fleet.37 The U.S. Naval Construction Force—popularly known as the Seabees—is another political warfare capability within the U.S. Navy. For example, Naval Mobile Construction Battalion THREE and Underwater Construction Team ONE completed the Manda Bay boat ramp project in March 2006, which allowed the Kenyan Navy smoother access to patrols along coastal and international waters. “The Kenyan Navy and surrounding communities will benefit greatly from this ramp,” said Major General P. O. Awitta, commander of the Kenyan Navy. “We’re very thankful to the coalition for helping us complete this important project, which will enhance our training and capabilities in the region.”38 Marine Corps Special Operations Command (MARSOC) was established in 2006, adding nearly 2,600 personnel to U.S. Special Operations Command’s total end strength. Like Army Special Forces, MARSOC possesses a valuable political warfare capability in its Foreign Military Training Unit.39

The U.S. Air Force also possesses political warfare capabilities. With responsibility for Sub-Saharan Africa, U.S. Air Forces in Europe has sent personnel and equipment to Africa. In 2004, for example, over 500 U.S. and South African military doctors, dentists,
technicians, and support personnel participated in a military medical exercise known as MEDFLAG. Initiated in 1987 between EUCOM and various African nations, MEDFLAG exercises offer the chance to conduct health care and disaster relief training and to provide rare medical and dental care to the local African populations. Like the Army, the Air Force possesses a range of political warfare capabilities within its support units.

Finally, various multi-service components of the U.S. military possess political warfare capabilities. Some of these components—like Special Operations Command Europe—have overlapping resources and capabilities within the services. Others, like Combined Joint Task Force – Horn of Africa (CJTF-HOA), are semi-autonomous entities that draw from the various services and COCOMs to conduct political warfare activities. Established in June 2002, CJTF-HOA is unique among U.S. military political warfare capabilities because of its stated post-September 11, 2001, mission: “to wage peace across the region, to deny the enemy a safe haven, to increase the capacity of host nations to provide services for their people and combat terrorism.”

Outside of the U.S. military, a civilian political warfare organization within the U.S. Government is the Department of State. U.S. embassies represent sovereign U.S. territory abroad. In the four sub-Saharan African nations examined in this monograph, this is certainly the case. U.S. embassies represent U.S. policy as directed by the White House through the Chief of Mission. Operating on annual timelines, political warfare capabilities of U.S. embassies vary from country to country. For example, U.S. Embassy Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, dispersed grants “to expand classrooms in Amhara, to
purchase and install a grinding mill in Gambella, to construct antenatal, delivery, and postnatal wards at a health center in Oromiya, and to discourage female genital cutting in the Somali region,’ while U.S. Embassy Abuja, Nigeria, “provided a collection of books, CD-ROMs, and magazines on American history, literature, education, culture and law, as well as educational advising materials’’ as part of the “American Corner Kaduna.” The State Department also provides foreign assistance through various funding mechanisms such as International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (INCLE) and Non-proliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining, and Related Programs (NADR). The programs and initiatives from these mechanisms provide various forms of training, equipment, and technical assistance, which may be categorized as political warfare.

In contrast to its foreign offices, the State Department has offices in Washington, DC, that perform political warfare as well. These include the Office of the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs, which is charged with formulating a policy for representing the United States abroad. Two organizations that directly support this effort are the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA) and the Bureau of International Information Programs (IIP). ECA’s mission is to foster “mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries around the world,” while IIP “informs, engages, and influences international audiences about U.S. policy and society to advance America’s interests.” More recently, the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization was established in 2004 to work “across the U.S. Government and with the world community to anticipate state failure, avert it
when possible, and help post-conflict states lay a founda-
dation for lasting peace, good governance and sustain-
able development.” \(^{45}\) In some respects, this office was
intended to act as a coordinator of political warfare
operations. The State Department, while ideally posi-
tioned within the federal bureaucracy to lead and coor-
dinate such activities, conducts mostly secondary—or
supporting—political warfare operations. \(^{46}\)

The U.S. Agency for International Development
(AID) is the leading non-military political warfare or-
ganization within the U.S. Government. Established in
1962, AID has provided disaster assistance aid, helped
alleviate poverty, and engaged in global democratic re-
forms. AID’s focus has evolved—from a “basic needs”
approach in the 1970s to “stabilization and restructur-
ing” in the 1980s to greater attention on failing states
now and greater responsibility for developing nations
(e.g., through the Millennium Challenge Account,
MCA, and the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS
Relief, PEPFAR). \(^{47}\) Throughout its history, AID’s field
offices (or missions) have represented the strength of
this political warfare organization. Like U.S. embassies,
the priorities of AID field offices vary from country to
country. For example, the mission in Kenya focuses
on goals such as “raising the living standards of the
poor,” “helping to prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS,”
and “fostering better management of Kenya’s natural
resources.” \(^{48}\) The mission in South Africa, on the other
hand, identified sustainable “transformation” as the
office’s overall goal. \(^{49}\) Field offices formulate multi-
year (often 4 years) strategic plans based on in-depth,
in-country research and analysis. In this manner, AID
shares similar qualities with the military; both are in-
terested in the realities on the ground. By the same to-
ken, AID and the military can be considered “do-ers”;
rather than being response driven, both organizations focus much of their attention on prevention. In October 2005, the similarities between these organizations led to the establishment of the Office of Military Affairs within AID. Based in Washington, DC, this office is intended to function as a focal point for AID relations with the military, among its various tasks.

Finally, within the U.S. Government, various agencies with interests abroad perform political warfare-like functions. While these agencies pursue their agency responsibilities abroad, they serve in each country at the behest of the chief of mission, who ostensibly retains overall authority for all official U.S. Government activities within the country. Organizations such as the Peace Corps have long had interests in sending volunteers abroad to assist targeted countries—for example, in Kenya where key areas include economic and small business development, education, and public health; and in South Africa, where volunteers provide advice on computer use and technology, classroom management, and English, math, and science lesson plan development. The Peace Corps can be considered a political warfare organization. Similarly, the various agencies within the U.S. Intelligence Community (IC) also maintain a strong international presence, though not directly related to political warfare. Other U.S. agencies, such as the Departments of Agriculture, Health and Human Services, and Justice play specialized political warfare in terms of development and health projects, as well as the training of foreign security forces. Most recently, the 2003 establishment of the Department of Homeland Security created a large bureaucratic organization with interests abroad. Again, however, this organization only plays an indirect role in political warfare operations vis-à-vis the U.S. military and AID.
Outside of the U.S. Government, several U.S. non-government organizations (NGOs) conduct political warfare operations in Africa. NGO missions range from emergency relief services that assist people afflicted by conflict or disaster to sustainable community development projects that integrate agriculture, health, housing and infrastructure, economic development, education and environment, and local management. While some are faith-based organizations, U.S. NGOs receive funding from public and private donations and grants—including funds from the U.S. Government. Thus, NGOs warrant mentioning in this examination of U.S. political warfare capabilities in Africa.

Founded in 1970, Africare is a leading U.S. NGO that provides aid to Africa; it also is one of the oldest and largest African-American organizations specializing in African aid. A pioneer in village-based rural development in Africa, Africare’s programs address needs in the principal areas of food security and agriculture, as well as health and HIV/AIDS. Africare also supports water resource development, environmental management, basic education, microenterprise development, governance initiatives, and emergency humanitarian aid. Africare’s five principal areas—food, water, the environment, health, and emergency humanitarian aid—fall under the rubric of political warfare operations.

Catholic Relief Services (CRS) was founded in 1943 by the Catholic Bishops of the United States to assist the poor and disadvantaged outside the United States. While policies and programs of the agency reflect and express the teaching of the Catholic Church, CRS assists persons ostensibly on the basis of need, not creed, race, or nationality. Some of CRS’s programs that can be considered political warfare involve agriculture,
HIV/AIDS, community health, education, and emergency response. An example of CRS operations occurred after violence erupted in the northern Nigerian city of Kano. In 2004, CRS responded to the violence by providing affected families with basic nonfood items that were lost or destroyed during the crisis, as well as food distributions to help cover the anticipated 2-month hunger period.56

Another U.S. NGO is Mercy Corps. Founded in 1979, Mercy Corps was among the first humanitarian groups to use relief and development programs to strengthen civil society. In Africa, Mercy Corps is working with agro-pastoralists in the West Hararge Zone of Ethiopia to support recovery from drought and foster ways to minimize the effects of future crises. The West Hararge Livestock Program will benefit 75,000 people by vaccinating over 200,000 head of cattle and camels against several livestock diseases.57 The program will also establish a plant nursery to grow improved stocks of forage for livestock and provide two new veterinary clinics to develop better preventative animal care. Mercy Corps is known nationally and internationally for its quick-response, high-impact programs.

The U.S. Government and NGOs have operated on the African continent for centuries. Between the late 18th and early 19th centuries, the United States was embroiled in a conflict with Barbary pirates and North African authorities, which led to the establishment of the U.S. Navy and the freedom of seas principle.58 Throughout the 19th century, the American Colonization Society sent free African-Americans to Africa as an alternative to emancipation in the United States. The society established a colony in West Africa in 1822; this colony became the independent nation of Liberia in 1847.59 Nevertheless, Robert Kaplan has asserted,
“Despite what African rulers say, the lack of an imperial tradition in the United States has hindered, rather than helped, its ability to be a force for positive change in Africa.” In contrast, however, a nation with an imperial tradition that is operating in Africa today is the PRC, whose ties to the African continent date back as early as the 15th century.

**The PRC in Africa: History and Objectives.**

The People’s Republic of China became engaged in Africa issues as early as 1955. At the Bandung Conference on Afro-Asian solidarity, delegates from Egypt introduced the PRC to the independence struggle in French Algeria. From that point forward, the PRC provided support for Algerian independence and used Cairo as a central node from which to conduct operations around the continent. From the very beginning, Beijing’s operations were multifaceted, from “friendship” tours to economic assistance to weapons transfers. The PRC’s relations with Africa were always more than support for revolutionary movements and more than an ideological struggle with Soviet Union. Throughout this period, Beijing’s relations with Africa were based on the central objective of its grand strategy. And its central objective in Africa was part and parcel of its central objective globally. Examining past statements and analyses reveals the continuity of the PRC’s central objective.

Chairman Mao Tse-tung delivered a speech at the Preparatory Committee Meeting of the Chinese People’s Political Consultative Conference (CPPCC) that stated in plain terms the central objective of the forthcoming People’s Republic; though pronounced over a half-century ago, this statement encapsulates accu-
rately the central objective of the PRC’s current grand strategy. On June 15, 1949, Mao said, “We will build up an entirely new, strong, and prosperous People’s Democratic Republic of China, not only in name but in fact.” This was a clear statement of Beijing’s central, grand strategic objective. Eleven years later, Sinologist Howard L. Boorman assessed the PRC’s central objective along similar lines: “Internationally, revitalized Chinese national power, under Communist control, has signaled Peking’s primary foreign-policy goal: recognized status as a major world power on its own terms.” Boorman’s analysis was later echoed in the mainstream media: “China’s long-run objective is to become the most important power on this planet to correspond with the fact that it has the largest population of any nation.” While these words may seem dated, the PRC’s central aims remain the same.

Since the mid-1980s, Chinese security analysts have debated the future security environment and their country’s role within it. This has had an indirect bearing on Beijing’s central objective. One of the major themes that emerged was a trend toward a multipolar world after a period of turbulence and transition. The PRC, it has been debated, will emerge as one of the poles. This view of the world reaffirms previous analyses that the PRC desires to become a major world power “on its own terms.” Beijing’s 1998 National Defense white paper was even more explicit in identifying its central objective. “Mankind is about to enter the 21st century of its history. It is the aspiration of the Chinese government and people to lead a peaceful, stable and prosperous world into the new century.”

Beijing released a White Paper entitled China’s Peaceful Development Road in December 2005. In it, the PRC identified its goal for the first 20 years of the century:
“to build a moderately well-off society in an all-round way that benefits over one billion people, further develop China’s economy, improve democracy, advance science and education, enrich culture, foster greater social harmony and upgrade the quality of life of the Chinese people.” A month later, Beijing released its first official government paper on its policy toward Africa. The paper stated, “China, the largest developing country in the world, follows the path of peaceful development and pursues an independent foreign policy of peace.” The goal of building a “moderately well-off society in an all-round way” and the “independent” foreign policy being pursued by the PRC today have the same central objective as enunciated by Mao in 1949—to achieve great power status.

The central aim of the PRC’s grand strategy is to become a global power, restructuring the world order—including the African continent—to achieve this objective. It seeks to wield the influence of a global power, receiving the concomitant favors and privileges associated therewith—including freedom of action, access to natural resources, and respected authority around the world. While other interests—including diminishing Taiwan’s diplomatic presence worldwide as well as seeking greater access to raw materials and energy resources worldwide—no doubt play some role in the PRC’s grand strategy, they are too often overemphasized at the expense of recognizing Beijing’s primary objective of becoming a global power. Furthermore, these secondary interests—some of the favors and privileges associated with being a global power—may be subsumed under the PRC’s primary objective. Understanding its central objective and viewing its operations in a grand strategic context, therefore, Beijing’s recent operations in Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria, and
South Africa demonstrate continuity with past objectives—not a renewed or drastically divergent focus on the continent—and a continuation of the use of political warfare as an essential instrument of grand strategy. How successful has the PRC been in achieving its central objective? We begin by examining PRC political warfare operations in two Horn of Africa countries. Each case highlights PRC political warfare operations, followed by discussions of PRC gains in each country.

**In-Roads: PRC Political Warfare Operations in Ethiopia.**

The PRC established diplomatic relations with Ethiopia in 1970. Cultural contact between the two countries, however, predated the formal establishment of diplomatic relations when an Ethiopian music and dance group first visited Beijing in 1960. Bilateral relations between the two countries were limited until the mid-1990s. Reciprocal high-level visits by Prime Minister Meles Zenawi and President Jiang Zemin occurred in 1995 and 1996. This led to a series of agreements between the two countries, including the PRC provision of free assistance to Ethiopia for a period of 5 years (June 1, 1996, to May 31, 2001). Agreements also encouraged the establishment of cooperation projects and service centers in order to facilitate the development of trade, economic and technical cooperation, and exchanges between the two countries; advocated exchanging and training necessary technical personnel to implement the agreed upon cooperation projects; and promoted holding exhibitions and fairs in each country. Using this comprehensive agreement as a springboard, the PRC used political warfare to gain access to and influence Ethiopia.
In December 1999, the PRC donated $100,000 to the Organization of African Unity (OAU, predecessor to the African Union) peace fund. PRC Ambassador to Ethiopia Jiang Zhenyun recalled that Beijing had always admired Africa’s efforts in their liberation struggles and pledged his country’s full support to the OAU’s endeavors to solve African problems with Africans themselves. Similarly, the PRC donated another $200,000 to the OAU peace fund in April 2000. Ambassador to Ethiopia Jiang handed over the money to OAU Secretary General Salim Ahmed Salim in Addis Ababa, saying his government attached great importance to the role of the OAU in maintaining peace and stability on the continent. By providing the OAU, headquartered in Ethiopia, free funds, the PRC demonstrated a commitment to peace and security in Ethiopia and, more broadly, in Africa as a whole. Next, the PRC turned directly to the Ethiopian government and people.

In April 2000, the PRC donated $200,000 to Ethiopia to support the country’s effort to save millions of people facing starvation due to prolonged drought. Ambassador to Ethiopia Jiang stressed that the donation reflected “the goodwill of the Chinese people towards the Ethiopian people.” In October 2000, the PRC donated office equipment worth $24,000 to the Ethiopian Ministry of Information and Culture on the eve of the 30th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries. The office equipment included computers, printers, and television sets. This PRC donation was the fourth of its kind to the Ethiopian Ministry of Information and Culture. Beijing, by providing free financial contributions at opportune times, used political warfare to demonstrate Chinese support for the Ethiopian people and possibly gain benefits in the future.
In October 2000, a low-cost housing project, aided by the PRC government and completed by Chinese constructor workers, was delivered to the Addis Ababa city government. The project, with the first phase consisting of five blocks, was implemented under the grant of the Chinese government in accordance with the Exchange of Letters signed by the governments of China and Ethiopia in October 1997. The houses, which could accommodate a total of 85 families, went into construction in June 1999 and were completed in August 2000. Using government funds and a state-owned construction firm, this was a tangible example of PRC support to the people of Addis Ababa. Yet the PRC continued to use political warfare to gain a favorable impression.

In December 2001, the PRC donated demining equipment worth more than $100,000 to the Ethiopian government. The donation of the equipment was part of an international demining cooperation program, according to the new PRC Ambassador to Ethiopia, Ai Ping. Two years later, the PRC donated $300,000 to the newly formed African Union (AU) peace fund. Ambassador to Ethiopia Ai made the donation, while the chairperson of the AU Commission, Professor Alpha Omar Konaré, expressed appreciation to the PRC for the financial gesture that demonstrated “the strong partnership and mutual friendship existing between China and Africa.” Beijing used a combination of financial contributions to the Ethiopian government and the AU as political warfare. While the contributions were not particularly large, they demonstrated Beijing’s support. These types of ploys would continue.

In April 2005, the PRC donated $400,000 to the AU in support of its peace efforts. Making the donation on behalf of his government, PRC Assistant Minister of
Foreign Affairs Lu Guezeng said the donation was to support the African Union’s peace efforts, particularly in Darfur, Western Sudan. Receiving the donation, Chairperson of the AU Commission Konaré expressed appreciation to the PRC for its continuous support, indicating that the donation was yet another demonstration of China’s determination to assist the AU in resolving conflicts on the continent. While the financial donations were not sizeable, they showed the PRC willingness to assist the African people achieve peace and security.

The PRC also used its own people and culture as forms of political warfare. For example, a three-man delegation from the Ethiopian Ministry of Education visited the PRC in December 2005. Ethiopian Education Minister Dr. Sintayehu Wolde-Michael told a press conference that Chinese teachers would arrive in Ethiopia to share their experiences in various fields of study. The next month, speaking at an exhibition of pictures of Beijing and the art of Weifang Kites from the PRC, the new PRC ambassador to Ethiopia, Lin Ling, said the bilateral relations and understanding between the peoples of China and Ethiopia was consolidating on the basis of mutual respect and benefit. Ethiopian State Minister of Culture and Tourism Mohammad Ahmed Ga’as said cultural exchanges between the two countries were of immense significance in consolidating relations of the peoples and governments of the two countries, which he said shared similar ancient civilization, history, and culture. By sending Chinese teachers and exhibiting Chinese culture, the PRC attempted to influence the Ethiopian people directly.

PRC political warfare operations resulted in tangible benefits as well. In December 2003, the Gotera-Wollo Areas Road Project, located south of Addis Aba-
ba, was inaugurated by high-ranking Ethiopian and Chinese officials. The 2.2 kilometer road, named the “Ethio-China Friendship Avenue,” was completed in 80 days at the cost of 30 million birr. The cost was covered by the PRC. Inaugurating the avenue, Ato Arkebe Uqubay, the mayor of Addis Ababa, said the avenue reflected the ever growing bonds of friendship between China and Ethiopia. PRC Foreign Minister Li Zhao Xing, who attended the inauguration ceremony, said “Being proud of the ever increasing co-operation, we would work for more partnership and mutual trust.”

The PRC and Ethiopia also signed a memorandum of understanding on cooperation in water resources development in May 2004. The memorandum, signed by visiting PRC Water Resources Minister Wang Shucheng and Ethiopian Minister for Water Resources Development Shiferraw Jarso, expanded existing Sino-Ethiopia cooperation in utilization, management, and sustainable development of water resources and established a long-term cooperative relationship. In line with the memorandum, the PRC would provide various support, including capacity building in the areas of rural water supply, irrigation development, hydro-power generation, and water resources management, as well as technological transfer and training of manpower.

These are examples of the PRC paving roads and attaining water for the Ethiopian people, conducting operations that directly affected Ethiopians’ lives. Since late 1999, these examples of PRC political warfare led to fruitful opportunities at the grand strategic level in Ethiopia.

Military-to-military relations were an important fruit of PRC operations. In November 2002, PRC Defense Minister Chi Haotian met with Ethiopian Defense Minister Abadula Gemade to further strengthen
military cooperation and contribute to transforming the capacity of the Ethiopian army to a better standard. Noting that consolidation of military-to-military relations was one way to further strengthen the growing relationship between his country and Ethiopia, Defense Minister Chi, who was also vice chairman of the Central Military Commission, said his meeting with Gemeda focused on military cooperation. PRC Vice Foreign Minister Yang Wenchang, who was interviewed later that month, declined to reveal the type of military assistance the PRC was providing to Ethiopia, although he insisted it would help them improve their defense capacity and make their countries more secure. In another example from August 2005, Prime Minister Zenawi Meles told a visiting PRC military delegation led by the commander of the Nanjing Military Region, Lieutenant General Zhu Wenquan, that Ethiopia wanted mutual cooperation in military training, technology, and peacekeeping expertise. Wenquan said strengthening bilateral ties between Ethiopia and China “will contribute a lot toward ensuring peace and stability at a global level.” An official from the Ethiopian Ministry of Defense, who attended the talks, said Ethiopia and China had long-standing cooperation in military training. PRC political warfare operations allowed such grand strategic relations to flourish.

Political warfare operations have helped the PRC achieve the central objective of its grand strategy in Ethiopia. This case highlights how the PRC used political warfare to gain access to and develop opportunities in Ethiopia. Using donations to the Ethiopian government and people as well as to the OAU and, later, the AU, Beijing attained government contracts, signed agreements, and cultivated bilateral relations.

After Kenya gained independence, the PRC established diplomatic relations with the new nation-state on December 14, 1963. Leading up to the end of the 20th century, the two countries already maintained close relations. For example, in August 1991, on a visit to the PRC, Kenyan Foreign Minister Wilson Ndolo Ayah met with PRC Foreign Minister Qian Qichen and agreed to increase the number of technical scholarships to Kenya. General Lieu Jingsong, commander of the Lanzhou Military Zone, headed the first Chinese military delegation to visit Kenya in December 1996. Two Kenyan military delegations visited the PRC in 1997. One was led by then Chief of General Staff General Daudi Tonje, and the other by the then Kenya Air Force commander, General Nick Leshan. In April 1997, Kenya received a batch of six 17-seat Y-12 aircraft manufactured by Harbin Aircraft Manufacturing Corporation.

PRC political warfare operations had already resulted in tangible gains. The China Road and Bridge Corporation (CRBC) was involved in a massive irrigation project underway in Kenya’s Tana River Delta. Also, CRBC was working on over $100 million worth of ongoing projects, including 200 kilometers of coastal road and 150 kilometers of Kenya’s most important transport route, the A-109 road from the port of Mombasa to the capital, Nairobi. Based in Nairobi since 1984, CRBC was controlled entirely through the PRC Ministry of Communication. In December 1999, the PRC provided Kenya a $6 million interest-free loan earmarked for a road project. Visiting PRC Assistant Minister for Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation
Xu Bingjin and Kenyan Finance Minister Christianus Okemo signed the agreement in Nairobi. The loan was used to build a 54-kilometer section of road in Kenya. Despite its past successes, the PRC continued to use political warfare to further its interests in Kenya.

Twelve performers from the Tianjin Acrobatic Troupe of China "conquered" Kenyans with their exquisite acrobatic performances from September 18 to October 2, 2000. They presented Kenyans with a range of acrobatic programs like the juggling of umbrellas with their feet and spinning small red carpets on their toes. The PRC performers gave a total of 14 performances, attracting an audience of 100,000 during a half-month tour of Kenya. The troupe not only acted as envoys of Chinese culture but also helped raise about $30,000 for nearly 3.3 million Kenyan people in drought-stricken areas. To help solve the power shortage in rural areas, the PRC donated $160,000 to implement a pilot solar energy program for Kenya in November 2000. The project came at a time when power rationing was widespread in Kenya due to the severe drought; it also provided a source of new, clean energy in a country heavily dependent on hydropower. Using a combination of cultural performance, fund-raising, and solar power, Beijing attempted to influence Kenyan public opinion.

In May 2001, China Central Television (CCTV), Beijing’s national television station, agreed to authorize Kenya Broadcasting Corporation (KBC) to use programs from CCTV’s Channel 4 and 9, both for international services. According to the Kenyan minister for information, transport and communication, this broadcasting cooperation enabled Kenya to have more news sources instead of concentrating on Western media. In addition, the two countries signed a docu-
ment for CCTV to donate to KBC a set of equipment to receive satellite signals from CCTV. The PRC director of the State Administration of Radio, Film and Television, who led the visiting delegation, noted that radio and television were crucial in mass mobilization and expressed the hope that bilateral relations between both countries would be boosted through the technical cooperation. In June 2001, the $60,000-donated set of equipment to receive satellite signals was fixed and put into operation by KBC. In July 2001, the Kenyan minister for tourism and information and the president of Xinhua News Agency signed an agreement under which Xinhua donated equipment—including computers, printers, and a fax machine—to the Kenya News Agency. CCTV later donated additional TV equipment worth approximately $154,200 to KBC. The equipment included a nonlinear editing system, a digital video recorder, and a monitor. China Radio International (CRI), Beijing’s sole operating overseas radio station service, launched an FM radio service in Nairobi in January 2006. The FM radio station, known as *Africa Express*, began providing 19 hours of CRI programs a day in English, Swahili, and Chinese to the estimated 2 million residents in Nairobi. PRC political warfare operations used information to influence the Kenyan people.

Beijing’s operations targeted various sectors of the Kenyan populace. The All-China Federation of Trade Unions (ACFTU), for example, donated a batch of computers to its Kenyan counterpart to help the latter improve its capacity in information technology in January 2003. The computers were handed over to the Central Organization of Trade Unions of Kenya (COTU) at its headquarters by Counsellor Guan Ruoxun of the PRC embassy to Kenya. The computers would be used to
launch a computer training center at the Tom Mboya Labor College in Kenya’s western city of Kisumu to train labor movement personnel. The following month, Beijing donated 32 military vehicles to the Kenyan military. Valued at approximately $1.2 million, the 32 vehicles included 12 buses, 12 mini buses, and eight ambulances. PRC Ambassador to Kenya Du said during the handover ceremony, “What we are seeing here today is true testimony of the cordial relations that has been in existence for the last 40 years since the two countries established diplomatic ties.” By the end of 2003, the PRC was expected to deliver an additional 26 vehicles to the Kenyan military. The PRC also provided the Kenyan military with 103 vehicles at the end of 2000.

In February 2003, the PRC donated agricultural machinery worth approximately $64,900 to help Kenya in its agricultural development. The equipment included eight walking tractors, 20 diesel engines, and 20 maize crushers. During the handover ceremony with PRC Ambassador to Kenya Du, Kenyan Deputy Agricultural Minister Joseph Munyao said, “Kenya can no longer continue depending mostly on the west for mechanization technologies.” The explicit prejudice against the West was significant. The following month, the China Red Cross Society, through the PRC embassy in Kenya, donated relief goods worth $10,000 to Kenyan flood victims. Purchased locally, notably, the donations included blankets, mosquito nets, soap, and other necessities. Zhongxing Telecommunication Equipment Corporation, a major PRC telecommunication company operating in Kenya, also donated relief goods worth $5,000. Through these actions, the PRC demonstrated concern with the health and well-being of the Kenyan people.
The PRC also focused operations on the provision of medical supplies. The PRC donated $23,219 worth of medical equipment and contraceptives to Kenya in August 2003. The donation included an ultrasonic machine, a digital video imaging machine, and an infrared therapy machine. PRC Ambassador to Kenya Guo Chongli, on behalf of the State Family Planning Commission of China, donated the equipment and contraceptives to Kenyan Minister for Planning and National Development Peter Nyongo.115 The following month, the PRC donated $50,000 worth of anti-malaria drugs to Kenya.116 In November 2002, the PRC donated 100,000 bottles of an anti-tuberculosis drug to Kenya to help fight the disease. The $900,000 of pasiniazide was donated by the PRC ambassador to Kenya on behalf of the China Society for Promoting Guangcai Program, a Chinese entrepreneurial NGO in the private sector, to the Kenyan Ministry of Health.117

To celebrate the 40th anniversary of the establishment of Sino-Kenyan diplomatic relations, the PRC embassy in Kenya and the Kenyan Ministry of Gender, Sports, Culture, and Social Services sponsored an 8-day photograph exhibition entitled “Beautiful China” in December 2003. The exhibition recorded various aspects of the PRC, serving as a guide “to explore a very diversified country.”118 The Kenyan National Assembly also called for closer parliamentary cooperation with the PRC National People’s Congress (NPC). Celebrating the 40th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic ties, the NPC also granted $48,000 worth of office equipment to the Kenyan parliament.119 The following month, the PRC Ministry of Education, through the PRC embassy in Kenya, donated books and audio-video materials to the Egerton University, one of the leading public universities in Kenya. Focused mainly
on Chinese language teaching, the books and materials included cassettes, video tapes, and CD-ROMs.¹²⁰

PRC political warfare operations continually targeted the Kenyan people. In August 2004, the PRC donated 60,000 kg of maize worth $20,000 to help flood victims in Budalangi in western Kenya. Emphasizing long-term measures, the PRC also offered to help Kenya develop water conservation facilities to enable the country to harvest and store rain water for use during the dry spells.¹²¹ That same month, the PRC pledged a total of KSh 4.8 billion to upgrade the distribution of Kenya’s electrical industry.¹²² The All-China Youth Federation donated $25,000 worth of office equipment—including 40 computers—to the Kenya Youth Service in September 2004. Speaking at the handover ceremony, PRC Ambassador to Kenya Guo Chongli said, “They are not only a gift from All-China Youth Federation to Kenya Youth Service, but also a symbol of friendship that millions of Chinese young people cherish toward their Kenyan peers.”¹²³ Also in September, Roads and Public Works Minister Raila Odinga announced that the PRC would build a road network around Lake Victoria. The roads were expected to greatly boost fishing and other activities in the region.¹²⁴

In response to the January 2005 Indian Ocean tsunami, Beijing provided the Kenya government with a donation of $100,000 in support of its disaster relief efforts. The tsunami killed one Kenyan, damaged over 200 fishing boats, and caused more than 12,000 lost jobs along Kenya’s coastline.¹²⁵ Later that month, the PRC donated an additional $1.31 million in relief materials to Kenya as a result of the tsunami. The relief materials included tents, power generators, medicines, food, and daily necessities.¹²⁶

Political warfare operations gave Beijing influence in Kenya’s education system. For example, a 5-year
bilateral agreement between the two countries aimed at boosting manpower development in the country. In July 2003, PRC Ambassador to Kenya Guo Chongli said selected universities would receive assistance under an agreement. Assistance would go towards upgrading facilities at universities, improving research capacity, and creating direct linkages between local and state funded universities in the PRC. Ambassador Guo made his remarks during a send off ceremony for nine Kenyan students on PRC scholarships. According to Kenyan Senior Deputy Director of Education Gilbert Lengoibone, the PRC provided scholarships to about 30 Kenyan students annually.

Furthermore, the PRC and Kenya signed a memorandum of understanding in June 2004 regarding university-level Chinese language instruction in Kenya. The University of Nairobi and Egerton University would establish a “Confucius Unit” offering Chinese language courses. PRC Minister of Education Zhou Ji said China would post lecturers to the two universities in addition to providing facilities and teaching materials. Less than 2 years later, the PRC opened its first Confucius Institute in Nairobi. Designated by the National Office for Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language (NOCFL) and planned by Tianjin Normal University, the Institute was designed to popularize the teaching and learning of Chinese language and culture worldwide.

PRC political warfare operations also affected infrastructure construction in Kenya. For example, the PRC spent approximately $3.8 million in July 2004 to renovate and equip Kenyatta National Hospital in Nairobi, the country’s largest referral hospital. The economic and commercial counsellor of the PRC embassy in Kenya, Ju Sichuan, also said the PRC would fund the con-
struction of the Serem-Shamakhokho road in western Kenya for $19 million and a maize processing mill in Bomet in the Rift Valley Province for $76,000.\textsuperscript{131} In January 2006, it was announced that the PRC would finance construction of two high voltage power lines in Kenya at a cost of $19 million. Constructing the lines, China CAMMC Engineering Company would establish lines from Chemosit in Kericho to Kisii and from Kamburu to Meru.\textsuperscript{132} By using political warfare, the PRC was active throughout Kenyan society.

PRC operations affected the political and military establishment in Kenya as well. Kenya’s parliament and government voiced support for Beijing’s anti-secession law in March 2005. “Kenya, as a friend of China, has always supported the one-China policy and will never support Taiwan’s secession from China,” said Speaker of the National Assembly of Kenya Francis Ole Kaparo.\textsuperscript{133} The PRC and Kenya held military discussions regarding the possible purchase of military hardware for the Kenyan DoD in the summer 2005. The deal for PRC military vehicles included troop-carrying vehicles and armored personnel carriers.\textsuperscript{134} A PRC military delegation visited the country in June for talks with Kenya’s DoD. The PRC team, led by Vice Minister for Logistical Affairs Lieutenant General Wang Xian, was in the country for 5 days.

The PRC used political warfare to move relations with Kenya to a higher level. Prior to 2000, Beijing already had access to Kenya, from military relations to water and road projects. Its operations since 2000, however, expanded the PRC’s reach into the information, education, and infrastructure development areas of Kenya. Unlike its operations in neighboring Ethiopia, the PRC focused on furthering its already close relations with Kenya through the use of political warfare.
Diplomatic relations between the PRC and Nigeria were established in 1971. Trade and interaction between the two countries, however, dated back to 1960. Bilateral relations grew leading up to the 20th century. In October 1989, for example, Nigeria’s chief of army staff made a 10-day official visit to France and China to explore military cooperation. PRC Vice Foreign Minister Tian Zengpei visited four West African nations, including Nigeria, in the summer of 1994. PRC agreed to assist in socio-economics and political stability; Nigeria, along with the three other West African nations, agreed to support the PRC on the “one China” policy. Three years later, Premier Li Peng visited Africa for 2 weeks. Visiting Nigeria, Premier Li placed emphasis on the positive, long-standing relationship between the PRC and Africa. Nigerian President Olusegun Obasanjo even visited the PRC in 1999. The PRC, however, did not have significant political, economic, or military access to Nigeria; its political warfare operations would change this.

As with the Horn of Africa countries, a focus of PRC political warfare was the health and well-being of the Nigerian people. For example, a well-known PRC pharmaceutical company donated $50,000 worth of anti-malaria drugs to Nigeria in May 2000. Etim Oyoso, Managing Director of Churchbells Pharmaceuticals Ltd, the marketing agency for Cotecxin drugs in Nigeria, presented the drugs to the Minister of Health Tim Menakaya. Beijing’s COTEC New Technology Corporation produced and donated the anti-malaria drug Cotecxin to Nigeria. The PRC also donated 300 medicine-treated mosquito nets to Nigeria to mark the African Malaria Day. The PRC provided Nigeria with
approximately $3.5 million free aid, which was reportedly to be used to buy medicine-treated bed nets and other malaria drugs. In December 2000, the PRC and Nigeria agreed to establish a tropical infections disease center to promote Chinese techniques of infectious disease diagnosis in Nigeria. The center would also train Nigerians in the application of diagnoses in China, notably, and provide Nigeria free amounts of diagnostic reagents and equipment. The PRC donated additional drugs for malaria control worth approximately $2.4 million to Nigeria in May 2003. The drugs donated included cartons of malaria drug Cotecxin, bales containing child-size mosquito nets, and bales of family-size mosquito nets. The donation also included insecticide for treatment of the nets.

Typical of its operations, the PRC exploited the local situation in Nigeria. In February 2002, the PRC donated emergency relief assistance to Nigeria after a blast at a military armory in Lagos. Vice Mayor of Shanghai Zhou Muyao indicated the PRC pledged the sum of $120,000 to Nigeria to alleviate the sufferings of the victims. He said even though this amount was small, it was a symbolic gesture to show that both countries feel concern for each other. Later the year, the PRC donated $120,000 worth of relief supplies to the victims of the January 27 bomb blast in Lagos. Donated on behalf of the PRC by its ambassador to Nigeria, Liang Yinzhu, the items included blankets, wax print, and towels. The ambassador explained that the donation was in recognition of the cordial relationship between China and Nigeria and pledged the continued cooperation of the governments and peoples of both countries.

PRC political warfare operations were also directed toward the Nigerian government. In May 2000, the
PRC Ministry of Science and Technology donated 40 computers and 21 laser printers to the Federal Ministry of Science and Technology of Nigeria. The ministers of science and technology had previously made reciprocal visits to each other’s countries. The original agreement was amended in August to provide two additional laser printer toners. In December 2001, the PRC, through its embassy in Nigeria, presented office equipment as cultural aid to the Nigerian Federal Ministry of Culture and Tourism. PRC Ambassador to Nigeria Liang Yinzhu said the donation was a gesture of the PRC government to further cement the good relationship between the two countries. Items presented to the ministry included computers, printers, fax machines, toner cartridges, and two copy machines.

The cultural aspect of PRC operations, while not prominent, was also present. Anniversaries, in particular, were exploited. In October 2001, a 6-day photo show entitled “Photo Album of the People’s Republic of China (2000-2001)” and the third Nigeria-China Arts and Crafts International Exhibition were held at the National Theater in Lagos as part of the activities to commemorate the 52nd anniversary of the founding of China. The events were also held to celebrate the 19th anniversary of the signing of the Cultural and Educational Cooperation Agreement between two countries. A pictorial exhibition titled “World Heritage in China” was held in Abuja in December 2001 to mark “the 30th anniversary of the restoration of China’s legitimate seat in the United Nations.”

PRC operations also targeted Nigeria’s agricultural and educational sectors. In September 2003, the PRC provided Nigeria with a $2.5 million grant. Although the grant was not tied to any specific projects, it was believed discussions were aimed at formalizing PRC
agriculture assistance to Nigeria. The following month, it was reported that Chinese entrepreneurs expressed interest in investing in agricultural industries in Nigeria’s northwestern state of Kebbi. Chinese entrepreneurs had decided to invest in the development of rice, onions, and sugar. In February 2005, the PRC embassy in Nigeria donated teaching aids and accessories to the department of languages at Nnamdi Azikwe University, Awka. Mrs. Tina Okoye, head of the department, announced that the department was set to begin teaching the Chinese language. Items donated included a compact disc player, cassettes, books, journals, and magazines.

Given its influence in the region, Nigeria’s military was also a focus of PRC operations. The PRC granted $1 million to Nigeria to upgrade the country’s military facilities in the summer 2001. Disclosing the grant in Abuja, PRC Deputy Chief of Defense Staff General Wu Quanxu said the gesture was part of his country’s contribution to the development of democracy in Nigeria. Heading a high level visiting military delegation, General Wu said China had much respect for Nigeria for participating in peace missions and contributing to sub-regional peace efforts. During the announcement meeting, Chief of Defense Staff Vice-Admiral Ibrahim Ogohi thanked the PRC delegation for the 30 Nigerian officers undergoing courses in various Chinese military institutions, with another 11 to start in September. In September 2004, the PRC donated digital equipment to the regional intergovernmental body, the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) secretariat. PRC Ambassador to Nigeria Wang Yongqiu presented the equipment in Abuja and said the donation was “a symbol of China’s interest in the subregion.” Valued at $123,000, the items included computers, fax
machines, copiers, and satellite phones. In October 2005, the PRC donated $2 million worth of military equipment to the Nigerian Armed Forces. A team of 21 Chinese was expected to train Nigerian personnel in Nigeria in the use of equipment such as computers, air field sweeper vehicles, emergency navigational and light vehicles, and deep sea diving equipment. PRC Ambassador to Nigeria Wang Yongqiu said the gesture was mainly to facilitate Nigeria’s effort in its various responsibilities that included peacekeeping operations in West Africa.

The fruits of PRC political warfare operations began on the provincial level. Nigeria’s Gombe State and China’s Shandong Province agreed to six developmental projects in September 2000. The areas included diesel engine assembly, textiles, real estate, tricycle and tractor assembly, and the agricultural sector. The governor of Gombe, Abubakar Habu Hashidu, also solicited the assistance of Shandong Province in the areas of education, water supply, rural development, and communication. In June 2001, the Akwa Ibom State government and Beijing signed an agreement to build a refinery and an independent power plant at a cost of $1.5 billion. The Kogi State government signed a $60 million loan agreement with the PRC government for the establishment of a sugar factory in the state in April 2004. The state governor, Alhaji Ibrahim Idris, who disclosed this on his return from an economic trip to the PRC, said the loan package also covered the provision of water schemes as well as the establishment of vocational centers for training unemployed youths.

In the agricultural sector, the PRC made considerable gains. Nigeria and the PRC agreed to embark on a $22.2 million project in the field of agriculture under the South-South Co-operation Initiative and within the
framework of a Special Program on Food Security in October 2002. Areas identified for cooperation included small holder irrigation, production and marketing of field crops and horticulture, livestock production, aquaculture, and farm mechanization. The leader of the PRC delegation, Quan Dieng, further said China had a considerable comparative advantage and expertise in these areas and would be willing to provide the necessary experts and field technicians. In May 2003, the first group of PRC agricultural experts arrived in Nigeria’s northern Kano state to support farming activities under a 4-year program with the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). The PRC planned to send 20 experts and at least 500 field technicians with expertise in various fields of agriculture to spend 3 years in Nigeria. They would work alongside Nigerian experts in 109 sites all over the country and live in the farming communities to which they are assigned. To help revitalize Nigeria’s agriculture sector further, the PRC sent 393 experts in agriculture and related disciplines to provide assistance to farming communities across the West African country. At a 1-day seminar entitled “Poverty Alleviation Through Bamboo-based Development in Agriculture: China Experience,” it was reported that PRC experts would work directly with farmers in 109 communities across Nigeria. Later in the year, 496 PRC experts were reported to be in Nigeria assisting in various technical fields such as water control and fisheries.

The PRC acquired numerous infrastructure agreements in Nigeria. In March 2002, China Machinery and Equipment Import and Export Company (CMEC) and Shandong Power Construction Company agreed to a $390 million deal with the Nigerian Ministry of Power and Steel to build two gas-fired power plants with a
total capacity of 670 megawatts. CMEC President Li Shuzhi said the plants would help ease the electricity shortage in Nigeria and promote economic and trade cooperation between the two countries. In March 2005, the PRC agreed to construct 598 boreholes in 18 of the 37 Nigerian states—including the capital, Abuja—to support the country’s water supply program. The aim of the free-aid water project was to provide “clean drinkable water to ordinary Nigerians living in out-of-the-way areas.” Nigeria also accepted another offer from the PRC for the construction and rehabilitation of small and large dams currently slated for the National Water Supply Program and irrigation. In May, two Chinese companies agreed to provide a $200 million concessionary loan to Nigeria for a rural telecommunications project. It was reported that equipment worth $100 million had been imported, while project execution had since begun at different levels in 108 local government headquarters and locations. In March 2006, Nigeria and the PRC signed a $2 billion memorandum of understanding to construct fast rail lines in Nigeria. Signing the memorandum, Nigerian Minister of Commerce Ambassador Idris Waziri disclosed several areas of future investment including construction of low income housing units, building a cement factory, construction of shopping malls, and building power stations to boost electricity supply across the country. All of these projects—electricity, water, telecommunications, rail, and housing—would directly affect Nigerians’ lives.

PRC operations resulted in strategic successes as well. In June 2004, Nigerian Minister of Defense Rabiu Kwankwaso paid a state visit to China. Defense Minister Cao Gangchuan said the military ties between the two countries had been strengthened and the Chinese
armed forces attached great importance to the development of military ties with Nigeria. On the heels of Defense Minister Kwankwaso’s visit, a delegation from the Chinese College of Technology visited Nigeria to explore areas of bilateral cooperation in the manufacturing of military equipment. Collaboration between the two countries was aimed at reviving the activities of the Defence Industry Corporation of Nigeria (DICON). In May 2005, a defense and diplomatic source told a Nigerian newspaper that a Chinese firm had signed a deal with the Nigerian Air Force to supply new combat jets. A state-owned PRC consortium, Aviation Industries of China I (AVIC I), would manufacture and supply the Nigerian Air Force directly with F-8IIM (FINBACK) combat jets. The number and cost of the aircraft was still under consideration.

Nigeria’s defense ministry also signed a contract worth over $250 million to acquire one squadron of 15 Chengdu F/FT-7NI strike aircraft and training aircraft from the China National Aero-Technology Import and Export Corporation (CATIC) in August 2005. It was also reported that 12 Nigerian pilots, including four instructors, would travel to China early 2006 to undergo conversion training on the new aircraft. A related armaments package accounted for approximately $32 million of the deal’s value, which included the supply of short-range air-to-air missiles, unguided rockets, and bombs for anti-tank and runway denial missions. The reequipment process further involved a deal in excess of $70 million to refurbish five of the Nigerian Air Force’s stored Alenia G222 transports. In early 2006, Nigerian security sources said the PRC was becoming one of Nigeria’s main suppliers of military hardware. They said new supplies of hardware would include dozens of patrol boats to secure the swamps and creeks.
in the Niger Delta region.173 This was reinforced after Nigerian Vice President Atiku Abubakar said weapons were coming “from abroad,” namely from Brazil and China.174 At about the same time, it was further reported that Nigeria purchased its trainer and fighter aircraft from Beijing.175

Beijing’s approach to political warfare in Nigeria was similar to that in the Horn of Africa nations. PRC operations were diverse and directed at influencing the people and government of Nigeria, particularly state governments. Targeting such sectors as agriculture, education, and the military, PRC political warfare operations affected all aspects of Nigerian society, furthering PRC interests in the country.

**Hope on the Cape: PRC Political Warfare Operations in South Africa.**

Unlike the other cases, the PRC did not maintain formal diplomatic relations with South Africa until the end of the 20th century. The PRC did, however, maintain indirect relations with South Africa. For example, in 1991 Beijing imported South African iron ore for a steel mill in Guangdong province through Hong Kong.176 The following year, PRC Foreign Minister Qian Qichen visited West Africa and South Africa.177 In addition, Nelson Mandela paid an official visit to the PRC, which began cultivating relations with the African National Congress (ANC).178 In 1996, moreover, South Africa was reported to be engaged in arms activity with the PRC.179

By 1997, PRC-South Africa trade and investment contracts were worth $630 million—covering an array of mineral and metals industries such as diamonds, copper, cobalt, iron ore, and steel.180 A visiting PRC
trade mission to South Africa oversaw the signing of 18 trade and investment contracts worth R 2.6 billion.\textsuperscript{181} In December 1997, it was also revealed that 40 Chinese scientists and technicians were working illegally in South Africa to dismantle a crucial part of the country’s nuclear-fuel production capacity and ship it back to the PRC. South Africa secretly sold Beijing a high-technology plant for making the zirconium tubing that sheaths the fuel for nuclear reactors in return for a Chinese-manufactured facility for engineering titanium.\textsuperscript{182} Official diplomatic relations were established in January 1998, and PRC-South Africa relations flourished more openly.

After diplomatic relations were established, the PRC sent several high level delegations to South Africa. In February 1999, then-PRC Vice President Hu Jintao paid a state visit to South Africa. During the visit, South Africa and China signed agreements on bilateral air services; trade, economic, and technical cooperation; and a joint economic and trade commission. In addition, Beijing made available a grant-in-aid worth $10 million for low-cost housing; the grant followed an earlier grant of $25 million for housing and water projects in South Africa.\textsuperscript{183} In November 1999, Chairman Li Peng addressed the National Assembly and the National Council of Provinces and called for a strategic partnership between Pretoria and Beijing to improve the lives of the underprivileged and work toward a new world order.\textsuperscript{184} The two countries were in the process of negotiations regarding agriculture, customs, police cooperation, health, development assistance, and merchant shipping.\textsuperscript{185} PRC President Jiang Zemin visited South Africa in April 2000. During the visit, the PRC signed numerous agreements with South Africa, including those that dealt with maritime transport,
animal health and quarantine, police cooperation, arts and culture, and prevention of tax evasion. Two months later, South African Minister of Defense Mosiuoa Lekota visited the PRC and reportedly said that South Africa would sell weapons to the PRC after the country had shown an interest in South African manufactured arms. The PRC had apparently expressed interest in South Africa’s fighter attack helicopter. This upward trend in bilateral relations leading into the 21st century was the context within which the PRC conducted political warfare in South Africa.

As with the three other anchor states, the PRC used political warfare to affect the South African people. In August 2001, the PRC donated medical equipment to the Ministry of Health to foster better treatment of patients at the national referral hospital, Queen Elizabeth II. The equipment consisted of x-ray machines, infant incubation, and dental equipment. The following spring, the PRC donated 50 wheelchairs to South African disabled pupils in Pretoria “as a token of friendship between the peoples of the two countries.” The wheelchairs were donated by the China Disabled Person’s Federation. The National Council for Persons with Physical Disabilities in South Africa had hosted a visit and was invited back to China. The PRC used political warfare targeted at the health and well-being of South Africans.

While Chinese had long been present in South Africa, the PRC used cultural operations to influence the South African people. “Bravo China,” an annual overseas gala staged by China’s top performing artists, was held in the Nelson Mandela Theater in Johannesburg in February 2000. The performance was co-sponsored by CCTV, Shanghai Oriental Television, and Pegasus International Entertainment. In September 2003, two
rare and endangered Chinese tiger cubs arrived in Pretoria to be taught survival skills in an exercise to save the species from extinction. They would undergo hunting training with the help of South African experts over the next 5 years before being returned to the PRC. PRC Ambassador to South Africa Liu Guijin said the joint project to save these animals marked a new era in relations between his country and South Africa. The following summer, PRC State Councillor Chen Zhili headed a governmental delegation to South Africa and attended the opening ceremony of the “Voyage of Chinese Culture to Africa” in South Africa. The voyage introduced Chinese culture to Africa and promoted friendly cooperation in culture and education between China and African nations.

Because South Africa was one of the most developed African nations, the PRC focused on economic opportunities. In November 2003, for example, the South Africa-China Machinery and Electronics Products Fair was held in Johannesburg to boost trade between the PRC and South Africa. The first independently held fair included over 150 Chinese companies from 26 provinces and municipalities in China, exhibiting products such as construction, engineering, and agricultural machinery; electronic appliances; and communication equipment. The PRC embassy in South Africa’s economic counsellor, Ling Guiru, added that the ultimate goal of the fair was not only to promote Chinese products more into South Africa “but more importantly to seek opportunity to establish cooperation with local counterparts taking advantage of their advanced technology and skills in this field.” The PRC used the trade fair to influence the South African workers.

In terms of military relations, South Africa also signed a military agreement with China in July 2004.
and donated electronic equipment for use in training South African military personnel. Defense Minister Mosiuoa Lekota signed a letter of offer and acceptance with the PRC Central Military Committee’s second vice chairman, General Guo Boxiong. The PRC donated 100 computers and 100 laser printers for training members of the South African National Defense Force (SANDF).195

PRC political warfare operations resulted in agreements in numerous fields. In May 2002 a PRC delegation led by Vice Minister for Health She Jing—including senior officials of the State Administration of Traditional Chinese Medicine—toured South Africa for 4 days. The two countries agreed to work jointly in developing herbal medicine and regulating traditional medicine.196 In September 2002, South Africa and the PRC signed an agreement for cooperation in communication policy and regulatory framework, technical standards and certification, radio frequency spectrum, and management tools. They also agreed to explore human resources development as well as to share experiences in satellite and other communication networks.197 Furthermore, China and South Africa agreed to launch technical and scientific cooperation on 10 major projects in March 2003. The two governments agreed to carry out research and development in such areas as municipal bridge management information systems, primary health care telemedicine and traditional Chinese telediagnosis, technologies for restoring degraded arid and semi-arid rangelands, and copper mining technology. The PRC also expressed willingness to conduct cooperation and exchanges on the peaceful use of nuclear energy, mini-satellites, remote sensing, mining, space, medicine, and health care.198
The PRC made gains in information cooperation as well. In July 2004, the two countries signed a letter of intent to further enhance mutual cooperation and exchanges in the field of media and information. The two parties agreed to promote communication exchange via periodicals, books, electronic video, and audio products as well as exchange and cooperation between media organizations, including sending journalists to cover news and holding seminars and workshops with the participation of media organizations of the two countries. Once again the PRC was targeting the information sector of an African nation.

As in Nigeria, political warfare operations resulted in successes on the provincial level. The South African and Chinese provinces of North West and Henan signed a memorandum of understanding to promote economic and cultural cooperation in August 2004. The PRC delegation arrived in South Africa to meet the North West Executive Council and explored possibilities of bilateral relations in arts, culture, tourism, textiles, martial arts, agriculture, and mining industries. Also in August, the PRC and South Africa initiated a poverty alleviation project on waste management called Phuthanang Community Upliftment. South African Environmental Affairs and Tourism Deputy Minister Rejoice Mabudafhasi launched the project in cooperation with PRC Vice Minister for State Environmental Protection Administration Zheng Xiaodong. Vice Minister Zheng commented, “I would like to congratulate South Africa on starting a project that starts with children in primary schools but benefits the community at large. We hope it will be a great success and a co-operation that will last for a long time to come.” PRC operations often targeted African youth.
PRC operations also facilitated greater military-to-military relations. In August 2001 Fu Quanyou, chief of the General Staff of the Chinese People’s Liberation Army and member of the Central Military Commission, held talks in Beijing with Siphiwe Nyanda, chief of SANDF. Fu mentioned that military-to-military relations between China and South Africa had developed smoothly with the frequent exchange of visits between senior officers. For example, China-South Africa Defense Committee meetings were held in April 2003 and June 2005. Meetings strengthened cooperation in defense and security fields and further promoted cooperation between the two countries and two armed forces. In November 2005, moreover, PRC Defense Minister Cao Gangchuan met with Deputy Defense Minister of South Africa Mluleki George “to further military cooperation and friendly relations with South Africa in various fields.” Cao also briefed the South African on China’s “domestic construction.”

Given the context, the PRC used political warfare to achieve somewhat different objectives than in the other three countries. First, gaining South Africa’s allegiance had the benefit of weakening Taiwan’s global diplomatic status, which was part and parcel of the primary objective of Chinese grand strategy. Up until 1997, South Africa was one of the most notable countries in the world still maintaining full diplomatic relations with Taiwan. This transfer of diplomatic representation was, therefore, a significant accomplishment of PRC political warfare. While using medical donations and cultural shows to influence the South African people and government, PRC operations also attained greater cooperation in technical and scientific fields. The PRC used the same means—political warfare—to reach a slightly different end in South Africa. The over-
all outcome, nevertheless, furthered the central objective of China’s grand strategy.

Conclusion.

PRC political warfare operations followed a similar pattern in all four African countries. But did the PRC achieve the central objective of its grand strategy? The PRC had a mission, and it set out to achieve it. The PRC sought—and continues to seek—to become a global power. It seeks to exercise predominant influence over Africa—its governments and people—and eliminate Western influence. In all four countries, the PRC demonstrated that it was able to gain access to and influence the affairs of the African governments, businesses, and communities using political warfare. By exerting greater influence in each African country, Beijing was successful in furthering the central objective of its grand strategy—to become a global power. Since 2000, the PRC has enhanced its bilateral political, military, and economic relations with the African countries; it has gained further access to natural resources, particularly in Ethiopia and Nigeria; and it has received greater respect from the African businesses and communities. Political warfare, one instrument of grand strategy, was essential to Beijing’s success. The cases also demonstrate that the PRC intentionally targeted African countries that were deemed crucial to U.S. Africa policy, also recognizing their geopolitical importance to influencing the African continent as whole. Prior to 2000, the PRC was not influential in the four anchor countries. Today, it exerts influence in each country and is perceived as a global power by the local peoples and governments. Political warfare was crucial to Beijing’s achievement of this position of prominence.
One of the PRC’s strengths was its use of a multitude of coordinated operations from many different angles—using several types of organizations on various targets. Rather than focusing on one segment of society or a single government agency, the PRC targeted and attempted to influence poor and suffering Africans as well as rich politicians. (See Figure 1.) The PRC also benefited from its long-term perspective and persistent presence in target countries, which allowed personnel to understand the different African contexts over time. While it may have been hampered by limited resources and outmoded technology, the PRC’s political warfare operations resulted in tangible benefits for target nations as well as gains for itself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
<th>OAU/AU peace fund, Ministry of Information and Culture, City of Addis Ababa, and Ministry of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Kenya Broadcast Corporation, Ministry for Information, Transport, and Communication, Ministry of Health, and Kenya Youth Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Federal Ministry of Science and Technology, Federal Ministry of Culture and Tourism, ECOWAS, and Ministry of Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1. Select PRC Political Warfare Targets.**

The PRC used a variety of political warfare assets in all four African nations. The PRC used many nongovernmental but state-run organizations. These organizations, ostensibly independent of Beijing, performed actions that consistently furthered PRC inter-
ests abroad. Not surprisingly, it relied on active in-country missions as well as governmental organs with interests abroad. (See Figure 2.) Vis-à-vis the PRC, the United States possesses many of the same type of governmental political warfare assets in Africa.

Though U.S. Government political warfare capabilities match (and, in some respects, even exceed) PRC government capabilities, the United States lacks a coordinated political warfare policy and does not possess nongovernmental state-run organizations that are active abroad. In terms of tangible political warfare operations, the United States is reliant on the military, which is one of the sole entities of the U.S. Government currently conducting political warfare. The United States is sorely deficient in civilian-led political warfare operations. With the military at the forefront of U.S. political warfare operations, a negative perception will arise over the long term because the United States may be viewed as an “occupying” force in foreign countries—especially across the African continent. The United States also overlooks the use of gifts to African governments, businesses, and people. Giving and doing things free of charge furthers U.S. national interests effectively; the PRC has demonstrated this time and again in Africa. Furthermore, unlike the United States, the PRC uses many types of venues and themes to influence target audiences, from trade exhibitions to cultural performances to educational exchanges. These gray areas are often overlooked by the U.S. national security establishment as a means of furthering U.S. interests abroad.207

The U.S. Army, the DoD, and the national security establishment must come to a greater appreciation for what political warfare is, and how it can be used today to defend U.S. interests and allies abroad. Political
warfare is much more than information operations, what is commonly referred to as propaganda or hearts and minds campaigns. Political warfare is about influencing governments and people through words and actions to further the objectives of grand strategy. People, in foreign countries and in the United States, react to actions more so than words; this is the heart of political warfare. The United States is not using its political warfare capabilities to its fullest potential, nor does it recognize political warfare as a useful instrument of grand strategy. What passes for political warfare today in the United States is not recognized as an instrument of grand strategy. Other countries like the PRC, meanwhile, use political warfare and recognize its utility in grand strategy. The regular change in Washington political leadership notwithstanding, the United States needs to develop and cultivate a long-term grand strategic perspective, taking into account the crucial role of political warfare. It must maintain a long-term presence in foreign countries to conduct political warfare successfully, not only to understand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>PRC embassy, Ministry of Water Resources, Ministry of Defense, and Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>China Road and Bridge Corporation, Tianjin Acrobatic Troupe, China Central Television, All-China Federation of Trade Unions, and Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>COTEC Technology Corporation, City of Shanghai, Ministry of Science and Technology, Shandong Province, and CATIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>China Disabled Person's Federation, Shanghai Oriental Television, Ministry for Health, and State Environmental Protection Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Select PRC Political Warfare Organizations.
foreign cultures but to develop and cultivate personal relations. This may be done using official U.S. Government agencies but also through nongovernmental U.S. organizations as well. The U.S. military may be the correct first step to initiate political warfare operations; but a leading civilian U.S. presence is badly needed to maintain enduring influence abroad. Instead of viewing missions from a reactive perspective (like “stability” or reconstruction operations), moreover, the DoD needs to be more proactive in its operational perspective to conduct political warfare successfully. This will require substantial planning, personnel, and budgeting changes over time to take into account the valuable role of political warfare. Longer-term programs like the National Guard Bureau’s State Partnership Program, for example, should be encouraged and expanded. Because of its simultaneous three-tiered approach to relationship building (military-military, military-civil, and civil-civil), the SPP provides a sound basis for future similar civilian-led programs. In terms of education, the National Defense University, as well as the armed services war colleges, should teach grand strategy regularly, including seminars on political warfare. They should examine British and other Western countries’ uses of political warfare but also non-Western examples, from the PRC to the Russian Federation to India.

The United States is not using political warfare in a coordinated, effective manner. Changes at the DoD mean little without civilian leadership at the presidential and congressional levels. Only the President, in coordination with the Congress, can institute the widespread changes needed to create a U.S. grand strategy using political warfare. This will require an unprecedented level of interagency coordination, which must be created and maintained among the essential
instruments of grand strategy—especially in the areas of civil-military, governmental-nongovernmental, and U.S.-international relations. A civilian agency with a global presence like AID—restructured and revamped—should be mandated to lead U.S. political warfare efforts. The U.S. Army and other expeditionary components of the DoD should actively seek out political warfare opportunities—the gray areas—in support of this lead civilian agency. Additional U.S. Government participation also is needed from specialized civilian organizations like the Departments of Agriculture, Health and Human Services, and Justice. Finally, the U.S. national security establishment needs to understand that how operations—political warfare, in particular—are conducted is as important as what operations are performed. The free wheelchair, given in the appropriate manner, rolls further than promises of aid and encouragement of democracy.

ENDNOTES


5. Ibid.

7. Ibid.


9. While some may rightly argue that political warfare was used prior to World War II, empirical research demonstrates that the specific term does not appear at any point prior. See Paul A. Smith, *On Political War*, Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, December 1989, for examples of political warfare used prior to World War II, but not by this name.


15. Ibid.

16. The actor may be a state (e.g., the United States or the PRC) or a nonstate actor (e.g., al Qaeda).

17. Interrelated in the sense that activities are not performed in isolation; rather, there is some rhyme and reason to them. Tangible in the sense embodied in the U.S. Marine Corps’ Stability and Support Operations Steps: “Start the feeding. Stop the bleeding. Fix the feelings.” Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Small Wars (Draft), Quantico, VA: U.S. Marine Corps, 2004, p. 47. The basic needs of human beings—water, food, health, and safety—are primary targets of political warfare activities.

18. Targeted economic aid and development projects are tangible operations. While not tangible in the sense of aid or projects, exchange visits and public pronouncements affect the targeted group’s mindset and serve as a conduit to aid and development. Training, arming, and equipping forces provide tangible skills to the selected group and a sense of duty or, simply, confidence.

19. I use Adda Bozeman’s definition of culture: “a people’s total equipment of ideas, institutions, and conventionalized activities, and . . . that which is most enduring about the ways of a society persisting in history.” Adda B. Bozeman, Conflict in Africa: Concepts and Realities, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976, p. 60.


22. The end date for research materials used in this monograph was May 31, 2006.

23. For example, contrast the following reports: Carter Dougherty, “China a Player in African Politics,” *Washington Times*, February 16, 2004, p. A18; Karby Leggett, “China Flexes Economic Muscle Throughout Burgeoning Africa,” *Wall Street Journal*, March 29, 2005, p. 1. Dougherty wrote, “China has emerged as a major player in African politics, with appeals for developing world solidarity increasingly overshadowed by the country’s interest in securing access to vital raw materials.” On the other hand, Leggett wrote, “In Africa, as in many other parts of the developing world, China is redrawing geopolitical alliances in ways that help propel China’s rise as a global superpower.”


28. This is not a comprehensive examination, which, while useful, is beyond the scope of this monograph.

29. As well as the fact that U.S. agencies and organizations do not view themselves as conducting political warfare, although perhaps they should.

30. This unique arrangement provides EUCOM with responsibility for all of continental Africa, except for Egypt and the Horn of Africa nations, which fall under CENTCOM’s area of responsibility; PACOM is responsible for Africa’s island nations in the Indian Ocean. Some critics within the DoD as well as Congress have called for an Africa Command, which is coming to fruition today.


32. The 96th Civil Affairs Battalion is the only active duty Army civil affairs unity, representing 4 percent of the total force. The remainder of the Army’s civil affairs forces is located in the Army Reserve. “These reserve-component civil affairs units include soldiers with training and experience in public administration, public safety, public health, legal systems, labor management, public welfare, public finance, public education, civil defense, public works and utilities, public communications, public transportation, logistics, food and agricultural services, econom-
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