Result: American SFA efforts should be prioritized towards Southern Africa (score 18), Kenya, Tanzania, and Angola (each score 11). Although Kenya and Tanzania currently benefit from significant SFA relationshi ps, South Africa has not been a primary partner since the Cold War, nor has the post-Colonial Angolan government. Additionally, the findings suggest a general futility of SFA efforts in Somalia and Central African Republic (each score 2). The large amount of low suitability SFA partners suggests that SFA is unsustainable in all but exceptional circumstances. Therefore, the recommendation of this study is for the U.S. to promote and support regional cooperation efforts such as IGAD and SADC. The U.S. should work through regional leaders such as Kenya and South Africa, and should utilize offshore balancing as a contingency engagement method.

Methods: The primary spatial question is, “What countries in Southern and Eastern Africa are best suited for American SFA partnerships?” To answer this question, this study uses a variety of government and academic sources. Variables 1, 3, and 5 are ranked, whereas 2 and 4 are categorical ‘bonus’ variables that add to a country’s SFA score without over-weighing the variable. The variable sources are listed in order, with appropriate acronyms, in the metadata section. The highest possible composite score is 19. The spread of scores trends heavily towards low SFA suitability, as indicated by the ‘Spread of SFA Composite Suitability Scores’ graph.

There are several limitations to this study. First, data for Southern and Eastern Africa is difficult to gather. Therefore, the most recent year for most variables is 2012, but is impossible to be consistent. Additionally, this study addresses SFA from a geopolitical lens rather than a liberal internationalist lens, thereby ignoring corruption variables. There may also be an inherent bias in the capacity and GDP indices towards resource-rich countries. A refined version of this study should include corruption variables in order to distill the findings, identifying potential financial and other resource mis-management. Notably, this study does NOT include conflict data, because SFA can both be a peacetime and wartime activity—there are benefits to SFA programs at all conflict levels.
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