

CHALLENGES UPON FORCE STRUCTURE AND MISSION OF THE AMERICAN AFRICA COMMAND

Murat ŞENGÖZ¹

Abstract

United States of America (US) Africa Command (AFRICOM), provides important knowledge and experience in the organization and management methodology with its unique structure composed of the US Department of Defense, US Agency of International Development (USAID). AFRICOM offers important opportunities for comparison in terms of security, economic development, and international relations. The study aims to examine the emerging security challenges in Africa and to analyze AFRICOM units and headquarters from an organizational perspective. This article is divided into three parts. After a short introduction, the first section describes the historical background of AFRICOM, the purpose of its constitution as well as explaining the methodology of this study. The following section focuses on the factors that affect AFRICOM's performance, such as the settlement, assignment of the Command, environmental conditions, opportunities, risks, and any other security and force structure challenges. In the last part of the study challenges upon force structure and mission of AFRICOM are discussed. The unique nature of AFRICOM force and command structure, consisting of military and civilian elements is highlighted which enable AFRICOM to execute its non-military mission. Finally, this article provides a summary of the possible recommendations to reduce the current security and political challenges facing AFRICOM.

Keywords: AFRICOM, Department of Defense, United States of America Agency of International Development (USAID), Terrorism

1. INTRODUCTION

Back in 2007, the then president of the US announced the creation of AFRICOM to join the existing Combatant Commands of Pacific, European and Central Commands. The events following this action were not only positive but also brought forth detrimental security challenges (Myers, 2008). AFRICOM's designers understood the associations between security, growth, international relations, and affluence in Africa (Morgan, 2019). Due to this, AFRICOM mirrors an inclusive personnel construction that entails important management and staff characterization by the Department of Defense, USAID, as well as other US bodies involved in Africa. AFRICOM equally integrates partner states as well as humanitarian organizations, from Africa as well as other continents, intending to work together on common issues for mutual interests.

AFRICOM reports to the Department of Defense and Secretary of State regarding the military relations with African nations, the African Union, and African regional security organizations. AFRICOM plans and executes operations, exercises, and security cooperation on the African continent, its island nations, and surrounding waters to execute its mission. AFRICOM began initial operations on Oct. 1, 2007, and officially reached full operational capability on Oct. 1, 2008. AFRICOM, in cooperation with its partners, counters transnational threats and malign actors, strengthens the security forces of African Countries, and responds to crises to advance U.S. national interests and promote regional security, stability, and prosperity. AFRICOM has approximately 2,000 assigned personnel, including military, federal civilian employees, and U.S. contractors. About 1,500 work at the command's headquarters in Stuttgart, Germany. Others are assigned to AFRICOM units at Mac Dill Air Force Base, Florida, and Royal Air Force Molesworth, United Kingdom. The Command's programs in Africa are coordinated through Offices of Security Cooperation and Defense Attaché Offices in approximately 38 nations. The Command also has liaison officers at key African organizations, including the African Union, the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), and the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping and Training Centre in Ghana (Jelinek, 2007).

AFRICOM consists of a diverse interagency team that reflects the talents, expertise, and capabilities within the entire US government. The Command has four Senior Foreign Service (SFS) officers in key positions as well as more than 30 personnel from more than 10 U.S. government departments and agencies, including the Departments of State and Homeland Security, and the USAID. The most senior non-military employee is a career State Department official who serves as the Deputy to the Commander

¹ Dr., Savunma Bakanlığı, Ankara, Türkiye, muratsengoz74@gmail.com,  ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0001-6597-0161

for civil-military engagement. US's interagency partners bring invaluable expertise to ensure Command's plans and activities complement those of other US government programs and fit within the context of US foreign policy. AFRICOM is located at Kelley Barracks in Stuttgart-Moehringen, Germany (Crawley, 2007).

2. METHODOLOGY

This study aims to analyze the AFRICOM Forces Units and Headquarters. In this qualitative research, the issues related to US African Command Armed Forces Units and Headquarters are tried to be explained through a holistic perspective with the components of management discipline, using literature scanning. Technical level management issues were not taken into consideration considering the purpose of the study.

The study describes the prevailing security challenges to the AFRICOM on the African continent, as well as providing the necessary recommendations from an organizational perspective. Previous studies (Turse, 2018; Morgan, 2019) over AFRICOM are generally addressed the following questions: How has the execution of the US's security policy affected Africa? What is the extent of security provided by AFRICOM concerning terrorism and human insecurity in Africa? How has AFRICOM been perceived among Africans? What is the political and economic impact of AFRICOM in Africa? How has development in Africa been securitized and militarized?

However, in this study, the issue will be investigated from the organizational perspective regarding the deployment of headquarters and its troops. Organizational perspective widens the appreciation of organizations as well as the world overall, as well as facilitating novel ideas and the potential for change and resolution (Scott, 1992). Such ideas will enable the researcher to come up with renewed perceptions pertinent to the present study topic, hence increasing the capacity to establish novel ideas and theories supporting the objective of the present study, just as portrayed in diverse perceptions of organizational perspective. The multiple perspectives approach regarding organization has been employed by a variety of researchers. One of the earliest and most influential of these was American political scientist Graham Allison (1971), who analyzed the Cuban Missile Crisis using several different theoretical perspectives. John Hassard (1988, 1991; Hassard and Pym 1990) was particularly active in promoting Burrell and Morgan's (1979) framework. W. Richard Scott (1992) presented rational, natural, and open system views of organizations, while Joanne Martin (1992) built her analysis of organizational culture around a multiple perspective approach including integration, differentiation, and fragmentation perspectives.

3. AFRICOM'S ASSIGNMENT

AFRICOM, together with additional US organizations and global partners, engages constant security integration via military to military projects, military-supported events, as well as additional military activities to facilitate a steady and secure African climate in favor of US foreign policy. The program entails a considerable US military presence in several African countries as a measure of coordinating defense programs in favor of US relations.

There has been extensive controversy regarding the key objective of AFRICOM, with several researchers believing that AFRICOM was exclusively founded to counter-terrorism, secure Africa's oil resources, or to counter China's investment in Africa (Berschinski, 2007; England, 2002). The author thinks that some of these viewpoints are valid, while some others are more idealists. In this context, it can be said that AFRICOM was established to aid African states to develop defensive capacity as a measure of guaranteeing the overall security in Africa. For instance, AFRICOM is capable of facilitating valuable training, consultative and technical aid to the growth of the African Standby Force (ASF). The predominant objective of AFRICOM is therefore to offer support to various African initiatives and leaderships, contrary to going after the African resources as many international agencies perceive. Department of Defense appreciates the leadership responsibility that individual African states, as well as multilateral African agencies, display in enhancing peace, safety, and development in Africa. By conducting a close assessment, the difference between AFRICOM and other commands is evident, not

only from a security perspective but also from non-military interactions including assisting African states to handle terminal diseases such as Human Immunodeficiency Virus and Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (HIV/AIDS), supporting and fortifying conflict resolution attempts and reacting to humanitarian catastrophes (Hanson, 2007). Challenges that exist throughout the continent such as the large ungoverned areas, HIV/AIDS epidemic, corruption, weak governance, and poverty are key factors in the security stability issues that affect every country in Africa (Kevin, 2003).

Nonetheless, Considering the level of effort and devotion offered by the US, it is not well established to argue that achieving establishing regional peace and security and ensuring development goal is not the central aim of the US' program in Africa. Therefore, in support of these objectives, based on a commentary issued by Admiral Moeller in 2008, it is evident that among AFRICOM's key principles was ensuring the smooth flow of African natural resources -distinctively citing "oil disruption"-, mitigating the escalating impact of China's involvement in Africa, as well as fighting the threat posed by terrorism (Sengöz, 2020). Therefore, AFRICOM aims to avoid conflicts, besides being structured as a novel US entity to react to security challenges emerging in African nations, "hence avoiding problems from resulting in crises, and these crises from resulting in catastrophes." Quintessentially, AFRICOM centers on both modern and conventional security threats, concerns, and sources, as well as facilitating and implementing these measures from a military structure perspective. However, challenging on implementing these measures still, pose controversy and compels this study to pose a major question: If AFRICOM centers on ensuring a secure Africa, then what are some of the reasons contributing to diverse perceptions of AFRICOM by African states, with some supporting and others opposing it? From all perceptions, AFRICOM brings forth essential and comprehensive concerns related to Global and African security, US' distant and security guidelines, the objective of the U.S. as the governing hegemonic superpower in a unipolar globe dared by a vague universal security setting.

Furthermore, the structure and execution of AFRICOM appear to have failed to respond to prevailing proposals created by the African Union as an approach to Africa's continental structure regarding security, peace, and development, like the ASF for conflict management and peacekeeping. The US believes that this initiative with Africa still stands a chance to facilitate sizable receptiveness to Africa's rapidly growing continental and regional security structure as well as African states' escalating abilities to synergize attempts in both non-governmental and governmental settings towards tackling security concerns in Africa. Nonetheless, regardless of the opportunities presented by AFRICOM regarding US/African military collaboration, a certain amount of uncertainty regarding the type of the command, as well as its objectives and goals has been evident among some nations.

The creation of AFRICOM signifies a shift of US regional command organization in African states, and largely remains a basis for the escalating strategic significance of Africa to the interest of US national security. In the aftermath of 9/11, the atmosphere and prioritization of counterterrorism in the US, as well as the conventional security concerns in Africa (health concerns, ethnic conflicts, and humanitarian crises) have increased the geographical profile of Africa. Therefore, it is evident that the creation of AFRICOM offers the U.S. a prospect to reorganize its present military presence in Africa, address conventional and rising concerns for US security in the continent, as well as offering security and economic growth for the nations covered by the command.

As is evident from this chapter, the U.S. currently enjoys—at some level—excellent security, political and economic associations with a significant number of African states. Nonetheless, several key concerns on security issues have been raised concerning AFRICOM, including but not limited to the following; military personnel: the challenge associated with securing military staff, civilian personnel: acquiring the civilian personnel needed is quite a challenge; several internal conflicts have developed as a result of AFRICOM programs, such as radicalization; several African states are against the program by seeking to solve their issues; AFRICOM has been accused of funding rebellious groups; AFRICOM has been accused of funding authoritarian organizations

Therefore, the subsequent chapters engage a comprehensive study of related literature, and an analysis of these concerns as well as providing feasible remedies to counter these setbacks, hence strengthening the US' commitment to securing the African continent, more so from terrorism threat.

4. GOVERNMENT, DEVELOPMENT, MILITARIZATION, AND HUMANITARIAN AID

Lately, Africa has experienced deep security sector reforms, is among the key constants in peacebuilding. These reforms cannot be termed as novel approaches, due to being integrated into the agenda of development agencies. Among the significant elements in the present developments is the escalating purpose of intergovernmental agencies in this concern. In a study engaged by David Law, the functions of intergovernmental agencies, meticulously emphasizing the European Union (EU), International Monetary Fund (IMF), Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), and AFRICOM, have been extensively documented (Lostumbo et al., 2013). These donors have predominantly considered safety a key concern, showing the significance of having resources sacrificed towards the course of other significant contents in promoting the security of a particular war/threat zone. From this perspective, the debate on the novel perception of threats has resurfaced, and explicitly, the idea of establishing a kind of “think tank” of social researchers and scientists in favor of AFRICOM (Lostumbo et al., 2013). The connection between government, development, and security, considering threats construction through securitization, offers meaning to this military structure reorganization: the plan to establish a platform of social scientists in endorsing and sustaining the information regarding the decision by AFRICOM, in the outline of securitizing the concern of governance and delicate nations coerced by many hegemonic nations, has acquired some development (Isike, Uzodike & Gilbert, 2008).

Several African states under threat of escalating terrorism and insecurity are gradually embracing the work and efforts by AFRICOM towards ensuring the restoration of peace and harmony in Africa. Numerous nations have been compelled by the escalating threat from Al-Shabaab's terrorist initiative as well as the political turmoil, particularly in East African nations such as Southern Sudan, Kenya, East African, Burundi, Somalia, and Uganda. AFRICOM has on its side agreed to work with these nations' military units' shoulder to shoulder to come up with solutions for issues ranging from terrorism to political turmoil (Whitlock, 2012). This section offers a concise summary of some of these nations, in terms of how each nation benefits from AFRICOM 's program, as well as the critics on the same.

AFRICOM endorsed Exercise Africa Endeavour in 2009, permitting a total of 25 African states to examine their potential to converse amongst themselves for 2 weeks. The exercise assessed the states' ICT equipment, to gauge their ability to communicate amongst themselves through the internet, email, and radio. Besides, the command teaches the states how to communicate amongst themselves during external operations (Salih, 2010).

Botswana's BDF (Botswana Defense Forces) had interview sessions with commissioners of the US' OSC (Office of Security Cooperation), as well as local NGOs, based on the State Partnership Program association between the NCNG (North Carolina National Guard) and BDF. These engagements were focused on training, as well as the key advantages realized by BDF as far as training its military under the “International Military Education and Training” project (Whitlock, 2012). BDF (particularly the DCSC (Defense Command and Staff College)) obtains high-class training and curriculum aid from the AFRICOM program. Via the program's Humanitarian Assistance Program, Tebelope, an NGO based in Botswana, offers free counseling and testing services. In equal efforts, the BDF has been highly encouraged by a program dubbed “Operation Survive and Thrive”, presently in operation for more than 6 years and held each year to persuade BDF soldiers to learn their HIV status via Voluntary Counseling and Testing (VCT). AFRICOM has highly supported this program, among other initiatives, by facilitating the needed funding supervised by the AFRICOM's branch office in Gaborone (Dersso, 2010).

AFRICOM commissioners at the U.S. Embassy in Seychelles and Mauritius held a conference with the intent of tackling concerns regarding the use of UASs (unmanned aerial systems) in Seychelles. The

MQ-9 Reaper was the very first unmanned aerial vehicle used by the US Navy and Air Force during their high-altitude and lengthy operations. This technology has since then been very helpful in combating piracy activities within the region.

Under the AFRICOM program, Liberia equally enjoys the benefits offered by the AFRICOM Africa Partnership Station initiative, such as global marine experts, incorporating experts from the US, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Portugal, in facilitating help in tackling maritime safety and security concerns.

The above-described nations are not the only African states benefiting from the AFRICOM program, only a sample from the five regions.

5. AFRICOM AND COUNTERTERRORISM

In the setting of US counterterrorism endeavors, it is deemed necessary to prevent poorly governed resources in Africa being abused by Islamic terrorists to facilitate recruiting, training zones and planning for terrorist actions. As noted by the National Security Agency (NSA) of the USA, “Weak states... can pose as great a danger to our national interests as strong states. Poverty does not make poor people into terrorists and murderers. Yet poverty, weak institutions, and corruption can make weak states vulnerable to terrorist networks and drug cartels within their borders” (The White House, 2002). With the likely exclusion of the larger Middle East (including Pakistan and Afghanistan), this analysis was seen to be highly applicable on the African continent where, as acknowledged in the US National Security Strategy (NSS) document, regional clashes resulting from diverse causes, such as lack of proper governance, competing allegations, external aggression, religious and ethnic issues and internal rebellions “all resulted in equal situations: humanitarian catastrophes, failed nations, as well as ungoverned regions prompting training paradise for rebels, terrorists and all sorts of violent extremists.”

Al-Qaeda’s attacks on US embassies in Nairobi (Kenya) and Dar es Salaam (Tanzania) back in 1998, as well as on an Israeli-owned hotel in Mombasa (Kenya) simultaneously with another attack on an Israeli airline in 2002, provided the basis for the US policy-makers to comprehend the reality posed by the violent extremists on the African continent, just as demonstrated by the Algerian extremism group: Groupe Salafiste pour la Prédication et le Combat (GSPC) as a jihad agency in the Islamic Maghreb. Such threats, therefore, were among the key issues compelling the establishment of AFRICOM. From all angles, AFRICOM brings into concern essential and extensive issues relevant to global and African security, US’ foreign and security policy, the purpose of the U.S. as the key hegemonic power in a unipolar world disputed by a vague universal security setting. Perhaps, descriptive variables, for instance, history, tactical state welfare, economics as well as geo-politics, define AFRICOM as a foreign and security mechanism in Africa.

The creation of AFRICOM depicts an essential shift in the US’ policies in Africa. The ongoing debate upon the existence of the USA in Africa continues. Debates focus upon the controversy resulting from the establishment of AFRICOM and its positioning in Africa and whether it derives from the purely cast concerning African security or derives only from the quest for US’ tactical interests. Researchers and scholars additionally consider AFRICOM’s establishment as a burden of a certain version of a moderate peace initiative to defend, or as in the commission of a US empire, given that AFRICOM illustrates the establishment and homogenization of a given security version in Africa (military security). Furthermore, the plan and execution of AFRICOM appear to have assumed the prevailing proposals created by the African Union being a constituent of its novel continental plan for peace and security, like the ASF for conflict resolution and peacekeeping. The developing peace and security outline of the African Union has partitioned the African continent into 5 combat-ready frequent operation zonal standby forces, such as ECOBRIG (West Africa); EASBRIG (East Africa); (Central Africa); NASBRIG (North Africa) as well as SADCBRIG (Southern Africa). Regardless of the confirmation by the AFRICOM Commander on the significance of partnership with African regional agencies in attaining its goals and purposes, the US’ involvement under AFRICOM would be in collaboration with regional actors, it is evident that the

progress and functions of AFRICOM do not collide with the objective and obligation of ASF, but equally simulate their operational activities.

This novel sole central point for US' military involvement with Africa will promote greater receptiveness to Africa's swiftly developing regional and continental security framework and African nations' escalating ability to synergize endeavors in both the legislative and non-legislative agencies to tackle security concerns within the continent (Agostino, et al. 2010). Nonetheless, regardless of the chances presented by AFRICOM for US/African military collaboration, a given intensity of cynicism concerning the command type, in addition to its objective and intentions, has prevailed in some studies (Whitaker, 2010; Whitlock, 2012).

6. CHALLENGES REGARDING THE ORGANIZATION OF THE AFRICOM

AFRICOM is located at Kelley Barracks in Stuttgart-Moehringen, Germany. AFRICOM sets the conditions for the success of security cooperation programs and activities on the continent of Africa. They perform detailed planning, provide essential command and control, establish and sustain relationships with their partners, and provide timely assessments. They are: US Army Africa (USARAF) - Operating from Vicenza, Italy, USARAF conducts sustained security engagement with African land forces to promote security, stability, and peace US Naval Forces Africa (NAVAF) - Headquartered in Naples, Italy, NAVAF's primary mission is to improve the maritime security capability and capacity of African partners. Personnel is shared with U.S. Naval Forces Europe. USAir Forces Africa (AFAFRICA) - As the air component of AFRICOM, conducts sustained security engagement and operations to promote air safety, security, and development in Africa. US Marine Corps Forces Africa (MARFORAF) - Located in Stuttgart, Germany, conducts operations, exercises, training, and security cooperation activities throughout the African continent. Its staff is shared with US Marine Corps Forces Europe. Combined Joint Task Force-Horn of Africa (CJTF-HOA) is the AFRICOM organization that conducts operations in the region to enhance partner nation capacity, promote regional security and stability, dissuade conflict, and protect US and coalition interests. CJTF-HOA is critical to AFRICOM's efforts to build partner capacity to counter violent extremists and address other regional security partnerships. CJTF-HOA, with approximately 2,000 personnel assigned, is headquartered at Camp Lemonnier in Djibouti. US Special Operations Command Africa (SOCAFRICA), co-located with AFRICOM at Kelley Barracks in Stuttgart, aims to build operational capacity, strengthen regional security and capacity initiatives, implement effective communication strategies in support of strategic objectives, and eradicate violent extremist organizations (Jelinek, 2007).

AFRICOM was established to handle the following concerns: US' policy concerning the African continent, policy for handling terrorist activities in Africa, the Department of Defense's endeavor to plug an organizational lacuna. As of the Second World War, the US military has established an organizational structure to handle its vast, complex, as well as highly resource-dominated, nation besides achieving the objective of defending the US. As a measure of protecting the interests of the US from a global perspective, the Department of Defense has been committed in establishing a chain of command led by the Department of Defense, then down to a chain of integrated commands, each liable for a geographical zone. The primary objective of the US in establishing AFRICOM, besides security concerns, focused on having Africa divided between diverse regional commands.

Regardless of being a military program, AFRICOM has, since its establishment, been subjected to several concerns based on its objective, depiction of its resources and organization, among other leadership qualities, like the location of its headquarters. These concerns have been directly associated with the concerns arising from the earlier command centers, as discussed below.

The primary task of AFRICOM is warfighting, but its present mission has extended to involve humanitarian aid and post-war reforms, even though these were not the detailed objectives posed by the Department of Defense during the establishment of the command program. Unluckily, AFRICOM has since then remained at this level of operation, due to the lack of any other institution with the capacity for such a mandate (Nye & Welch, 2013). Furthermore, Counterterrorism, while being an evident

division of the conventional military mission, is not the obligation of the geographic command programs like AFRICOM. The likely unit for such activities is probably the Special Forces. There have been escalating political concerns and questions regarding the relocation of the AFRICOM headquarters to one of the African States.

As a measure of addressing the challenges above, the following are recommended: The US should consider relocating AFRICOM's headquarters from its current location to another country in Africa. However, the goal of this relocation is to have it close to the State Department, Special Operations Command, and the USAID, hence the US qualifying as the best venue for the headquarters, probably in New York. The US should consider redrafting the mission of AFRICOM to get rid of the present ambiguity facing AFRICOM as far as its mandate is concerned. US Department of Defense should consider establishing "military activities save for war" as the best approach to ensure effective coordination of activities and operations within AFRICOM in Africa, just as previously mentioned by Stephanie Hanson. An inventive, unswerving, and robust organizational perspective and idea should exist among the command itself, African Affairs States Bureau, US of America Agency of International Development as well as the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization, to ensure that AFRICOM remains loyal to its intended mission in Africa. It is necessary to formally redefine the association between AFRICOM and the key leaders of the program, to ensure that the personnel and recruitment procedures abide by the guidelines of the Command, to maximize the performance of AFRICOM, just as mentioned by the chief of mission. It should be elucidated the interagency obligation in the novel command regardless of the opportunity presented by AFRICOM's configuration. So, it can be clarified the prevailing challenges in the future growth of local military commands. The AFRICOM program should be funded properly to keep operations running in full capacity. A proper funding policy can ensure precision in running the operations. It is essential to restructure the policies and guidelines running the agency to ensure not to be supporting rebellious and radical groups financially in any way. By following these suggestions, it is beyond doubt that the common objective of AFRICOM can indeed be better accomplished in Africa. This is to say, minimizing the threats of terrorism and contributing to regional economic, health, education, and development and keeping safe and secure environment in the territory to a certain degree will be considered as a success.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The objective of this study is to analyze The AFRICOM units and headquarters concerning the evolving security challenges in Africa by engaging an organizational perspective in the mean of deployment aspect. This article has comprehensively integrated particularly concentrating on the prevailing security challenges, the African nations under AFRICOM program, the military personnel, civilian personnel, internal conflicts among others. Finally, it has offered a concise summary of the possible recommendations for settlement of command posts according to the necessity and prevailing security and political challenges facing AFRICOM.

Generally, it can be said that in the settlement of AFRICOM a holistic approach has been adapted in the formation of military and non-military structures. The combination of AFRICOM is realistic considering its mission. The overall structure of AFRICOM makes it possible to react and to adapt proactively to a range of challenges. AFRICOM combines under a single unified command all but one of the countries conventionally considered as African. AFRICOM is a unified command with the sole responsibility of Africa. A four-star general commands AFRICOM with approximately 400- 700 staff members. It is located in Stuttgart, Germany. AFRICOM is more than just an administrative change within the Department of Defense; it responds to Africa's increased geopolitical importance to the US' interests. America is also interested in Africa's natural resources, especially with regard to energy security. As instability in the Middle East grows and international demand for energy soars, the world, and the US in particular, will become increasingly beholden to Africa's ability to produce oil, an inelastic commodity. Central Intelligence Agency estimates suggest Africa may supply as much as 25 percent of imports to America by 2015 (Shaun, 2007). AFRICOM is to supervise an array of missions that are a hybrid of security and development that makes command different from other US of America's other

Commands. For this reason, AFRICOM is the most civilian-heavy unified command in the history of the US of America. In this respect, the Command Headquarters coordinates joint efforts and allocates more resources for civil projects than a classical headquarters. Therefore, it is possible to compare the command to a diplomatic institution or commercial company rather than a military structure. From this perspective, the command has a hybrid structure and its administrative structure can be explained by a broker type organization. AFRICOM is a unified combatant command that means it combines military and civil functions. Though AFRICOM is to be led by a top-ranking four-star military general, unlike other regional commands, its deputy commander is a State Department official. That's why AFRICOM brings together intelligence, diplomatic, health, and aid experts. The Staff of AFRICOM is chosen and assigned from all branches of the military, as well as USAID and the departments of state, agriculture, treasury, and commerce. These non-military staff is being funded by their departments as well as the Department of Defence (Nye & Welch, 2013).

Throughout this study, it is evident that, regardless of being a military program, AFRICOM has, since its establishment, been subjected to several concerns based on its objective, depiction of its resources and organization, among other leadership qualities like the location of its headquarters. The primary task of AFRICOM focuses on warfighting, but its present mission has extended to include humanitarian aid and post-war reforms, although these were not the detailed objectives posed by the Department of Defense during the establishment of the command program. Unluckily, AFRICOM has since then remained in this level of operation due to the lack of any other institution with the capacity for such a mandate (Nye & Welch, 2013). Additionally, Counterterrorism, whilst being an evident division of the conventional military mission, is not the obligation of the geographic command programs like AFRICOM. The likely unit for such activities is probably the Special Forces. Actual, there have been escalating political concerns and questions regarding the relocation of the AFRICOM headquarters to one of the African states. Therefore, as confirmed in this study, AFRICOM aims at avoiding conflicts besides being structured as a novel US technique to react to security challenges emerging in African nations, "hence avoiding problems from resulting in crises, and these crises from resulting in catastrophes." Quintessentially, AFRICOM Centres on both modern and conventional security threats, concerns, and sources, as well as facilitating and implementing these measures from a military structure perspective. Furthermore, the structure and execution of AFRICOM appear to have failed to account for the prevailing proposals by the African Union as an approach of Africa's continental structure regarding security, peace, and development, like the ASF for conflict management and peacekeeping. The US believes that this initiative with Africa still stands a chance of facilitating huge receptiveness to Africa's rapidly growing continental and regional security structure, as well as African states' increasing abilities to synergize attempts in both non-governmental and governmental settings towards tackling security concerns in Africa. There are some challenges that such an organization naturally reveals. In this context, this study offers some helpful suggestions regarding the possible means to handle the prevailing political and security concerns facing AFRICOM.

US should consider relocating AFRICOM's headquarters from the current location to the US or at least to a country in Africa. Other proposals include: elucidating the interagency obligation in the novel command: regardless of the opportunity presented by the AFRICOM's configuration, the prevailing challenge evident in the future growth of local military commands is worth clarifying; funding the AFRICOM program to the maximum: presently the program faces insufficient funds to keep operations running accordingly (there is the need to ensure a smooth running of the operations by ensuring the program is fully funded); as well as restructuring the policies and guidelines running the agency, to ensure rebellious and radical groups are not supported or funded in any way.

REFERENCES

- Berschinski, R.G. (2007). *AFRICOM's dilemma: Capacity-Building, humanitarianism, and the future of US security policy in Africa*. Retrieved from <http://StrategicStudiesInstituteUSArmy>.
- Crawley, V. (2007). *U.S. creating New Africa command to coordinate military efforts*. USINFO. US Department of State.

- Dersso, S. A. (2010). *The role and place of the African standby force within the African peace and security architecture*. Institute for Security Studies. Paper no. 209.
- England, A. (2002). *US officer vows that the US-led task force will eradicate terrorism in horn of Africa*. Associated Press Worldstream.
- Handbook of the Economics of Peace and Conflict, Oxford University Press (2017)
- Hanson, S. (2007). *US Africa command, New York: Council on foreign relations*. Retrieved from <http://cfr.org>.
- Isike, C., Uzodike, U., & Gilbert, L. (2008). The AFRICOM: Enhancing American security or fostering African development?. *African Security Review*, 17(1), 20-38.
- Jelinek, P. (2007). *Pentagon setting up new U.S. command to oversee African missions*. Independent Record. Associated Press.
- Keller, E.J. (2006). Africa and the United States: Meeting the challenges of globalisation, in Donald Rothschild and Edmond J Keller (editor). *Africa-US relations: Strategic encounters, boulder*. CO: Lynne Rienner, pp 1–20.
- Kevin, A. (2003). *Headlines over the horizon: AIDS and African armies*. Atlantic Monthly 292 no.1.
- Lostumbo, M., Mc Nerney, M., Peltz, E., Eaton, D., Frelinger, D., Greenfield, V., & Worman, S. (2013). *Overseas Basing of U.S. Military Forces: An Assessment of Relative Costs and Strategic Benefits*. RAND Corporation. Retrieved from <http://jstor.org>
- Morgan, W. (2019). *Behind the secret U.S. war in Africa*. Politico. Retrieved from <http://politico.com>.
- Myers, J. M. (2008). Singular vision: A plan to enable CentCom and state to work together. *Armed Forces Journal*, March 2008, p. 43.
- Nye, J. S., & Welch, D. A. (2013). *Understanding global conflict & cooperation: Intro to theory & history*. U.S.A: Pearson.
- Salih, M. A. M. (2010). In David J Francis (Ed.), *US Strategy in Africa: AFRICOM, terrorism, and security challenges*. Oxford: Routledge. pp. 78–91.
- Schoeman, M. (2003). *The African union after the Durban 2002 summit*. Centre of Development Organization of African Unity.
- Scott, W. R. (1992). *Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Sengöz, M. (2020). *National security paradigms of Turkey: establishing internal and regional security and peace*. UTAH/US: American Academic Press.
- Shaun, B. (2007). *Africa opposed to U.S. command base*. BuaNews. Retrieved from <http://buaNews>.
- Turse, N. (2018). *The U.S. has more military operations in AFRICA than the middle east*. Vice News. Retrieved from <http://viceNews.com>.
- Whitaker, B. E. (2010). Compliance among weak states: Africa and the counter-terrorism regime. *Review of International Studies*, 36, 639–662.
- Whitlock, C. (2012). *U.S. expands secret intelligence operations in Africa*. Retrieved from <http://washingtonPost>.

