



DALARNA
UNIVERSITY

Level: Bachelor's

2006-2016: THE GAMBIA'S FOREIGN POLICY

THE GRADUAL SHIFT TOWARD CHINA AND THE GULF

Author: **Amat Jeng** (h15amaje@du.se)

Supervisor: **Docent Amr G.E Sabet**

Examiners: **Docent Amr G.E Sabet & Docent Kjetil Duvold**

Subject/main field of study: **International Relations**

Course code: **SK2010**

Date of examination:

At the Dalarna University it is possible to publish the student thesis in full text in DiVA. The publishing is open access, which means the work will be freely accessible to read and download on the internet. This will significantly increase the dissemination and visibility of the student thesis.

Open access is becoming the standard route for spreading scientific and academic information on the internet. Dalarna University recommends that both researchers as well as students publish their work open access.

I give my/we give our consent for full text publishing (freely accessible on the internet, open access):

Yes

No

Dalarna University – SE-791 88 Falun – Phone +4623-77 80 00

ABSTRACT

After coming to power in a bloodless coup in 1994, Yahya Jammeh gradually established himself as a controversial leader of a country less than half the size of Dalarna, home to the Dalarna University. During the last decades of his rule, he became known for his controversial speeches at the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) and his anti-Western rhetoric. Jammeh broke diplomatic ties with Taiwan after two decades of a marriage of convenience; he became ever more hostile to the West; and sought cooperation with China and the Gulf states of Qatar and Kuwait. At the domestic front, he embarked on establishing an Islamic identity.

This is an explanatory single case study of foreign policy. The aim of this paper is to understand what state-level and system-level variables could have motivated the gradual shift in Gambia's foreign policy between 2006 and 2016.

Why did Jammeh, despite depending so much on the European Union (EU) for financial support, grow increasingly belligerent and uncooperative, leading him to cut ties with the bloc, expel its top-diplomat, and shift Gambia's foreign policy toward China and the Gulf? How can Gambia's foreign policy shift be explained in relation to China's expanding material capabilities and Qatar's growing political and financial influence? What are some of the implications of the reformation and diversification of the foreign aid landscape for the relationship between traditional donors and authoritarian regimes?

Informed by the theory of neoclassical realism, this study has, at the systemic level, looked at the impacts of structural modifiers such as the diversification of the foreign aid landscape, China's relatively growing capabilities, and Qatar's financial influence. At the state-level or unit-level, this study has looked at the three concepts that informed Gambia's foreign policy shift: leadership image, perceptions and misperceptions; the attempt to establish an Islamic identity; and the domestic political and institutional setting.

This study has applied an empirical research method by conducting semi-structured interviews, internet-based research, and by consulting academic literature. Interviews have also been

conducted with former Gambian diplomats, academics at the University of The Gambia (UTG), experts on Gambian politics, journalists and human rights activists. I have also consulted scholarly articles and news reports relevant to this study.

Keywords: neoclassical realism, foreign policy, soft power, politics, foreign aid, international relations, Africa, system-level, state-level, domestic, economic statecraft.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. LITERATURE REVIEW	2
1.2. AIMS AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS	4
1.3. METHOD AND LIMITATIONS	5
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	10
3. ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK	13
4. ANALYSES	16
4.1 ACTOR(S) AND INTERESTS IN GAMBIA'S FOREIGN POLICY MAKING	16
4.2 UNIT-LEVEL INTERVENING VARIABLES	18
4.3 STRUCTURAL MODIFIERS	23
4.3.1. THE DIVERSIFICATION OF THE FOREIGN AID LANDSCAPE	23
4.3.2. CHINA'S GROWING MATERIAL POWER	26
4.3.3. QATAR: SEEKING INSURANCE & INFLUENCE A BROAD	29
5. ECONOMIC STATECRAFT AS AN INSTRUMENT OF FOREIGN POLICY ..	31
6. DISCUSSIONS	33
7. REFERENCES	35

1. INTRODUCTION

The Gambia (sometimes prefixed with ‘The’, because the country is named after ‘The River Gambia’ which runs through the country, dividing it into two parts) is a presidential republic which has always officially espoused a non-alignment foreign policy. Being the smallest country on mainland Africa, with a population of about 2 million, 90% of which is Muslim, the country relies heavily on economic foreign aid and remittances (World Bank [WB], 2017). After independence in 1965 from Britain, it established diplomatic ties with the Republic of China (ROC, Taipei) until 1974 when it broke ties with the ROC and established diplomatic ties with the People Republic of China (PRC, Beijing), which lasted until 1996 after Yahya Jammeh had taken over power in a bloodless military coup two years earlier. Since then, The Gambia had had ties with Taiwan until 2013.

Jammeh ruled the West African state with an iron-fist, winning four executive terms (1996, 2001, 2006, 2011), and enjoying a free-ride on the country’s foreign policy terrain. The European Union (EU) is Gambia’s main traditional aid donor. However, over time, Jammeh grew increasingly belligerent; and his authoritarian nature made him a target for critics, as he was berated for his human rights records. In 2012, Jammeh ordered the execution of death row inmates, making him the first in the history of the country to do so. This ruffled many feathers at home, in Brussels and also in neighboring Senegal, as two of the prisoners executed were Senegalese. Relations with Senegal became ever more strained, as Dakar continued to harbor Gambian dissidents.

The EU grew increasingly intolerant of Jammeh’s iron-fist. Consequently, Brussels withheld millions of Euros to The Gambia. Jammeh fired back by expelling the EU’s top diplomat in the country after he had accused the bloc and human rights activists of conniving to besmirch the image of his government for its stance on homosexuality.

The EU’s reform came at a time when the foreign aid landscape has been inundated with new players with different approaches. This includes but not limited to China, Qatar, Kuwait, to name

but few. This puts many options on the table for aid recipient-countries. This also came at a time when China's material power is relatively increasing, consequently, expanding the Communist state's foreign policy ambitions. Furthermore, Jammeh broke ties with Iran amidst Gambia's deteriorating relations with Senegal, Saudi Arabia's major partner in Africa.

At the state-level or what neoclassical realists call 'unit-level', the country was replete with jeremiads of lamentation, from the decision to commit the death penalty to Jammeh's unilateral decision to establish an Islamic identity, despite the secularity of the country. These unilateral decisions came at a time the country's opposition parties were holding talks for a coalition force – a move Jammeh feared at the time. The nature of the independent variable (the system-level) and the unit-level intervening variables combined, presented a daunting challenge to the dependent variable (Gambia's foreign policy).

1.1. LITERATURE REVIEW

A handful of academics with expert knowledge of Gambian politics have tried to account for Jammeh's *politicking*. Some have looked at how pockets of resistance constrained Jammeh's rule. Jaw (2017) has dwelled on the role of the Gambian Diaspora – a loosely unorganized political force made up mostly of exiled Gambians – in restoring democracy in the country. While the Gambian Diaspora undoubtedly constitutes a powerful political force, Jaw has treated it as an independent external variable.

Saine (2009) has also looked at how the security doctrine espoused by Jammeh enabled him to participate in international affairs through minimal bilateral relations. Saine's work accounts mostly the domestic political variables that helped explain the persistence of poverty and economic crisis in the country, with much attention directed to understanding the lack of political liberalization and its effects on poverty reduction. While Saine has successfully explained that the success of foreign financial assistance lies in the ability of recipient-states to dispense democracy, his work has fallen short of explaining the impacts of the rise of China and Qatar's financial influence on Gambia's foreign policy.

Minteh (2010), in addition to his work on the global shift in the balance of power in which he argues that the shift resulted in multilateralism rather than multipolarity, has become another authoritative academic figure in Gambian politics. His work has focused attention to the effects of economic sanctions on West Africa, arguing that sanctions have brought new state-actors to the region. He has gone on to explain how the presence of such actors is helping in shaping the foreign policy of West African states, *The Gambia included* (Minteh, 2010). While Minteh's work looks at the effect of the coming of new states with strong financial clout to West Africa, the reasons for their coming could have been explored in order to bring into the analyses some of these respective states' relatively growing financial and material capabilities.

However, Minteh and Saine, like Jaw, have not accounted how domestic intervening variables such as leadership image, perceptions, misperceptions, strategic cultural and/or the paradigm shift in development aid have all contributed to affecting the types of decisions West African leaders make. While Minteh has dwelled on the implication of sanctions, his analyses have broadly talked about West Africa as a region, looking parsimoniously at *The Gambia*. Arguing somewhere in an article, though, Minteh (2015) explains shortly about Jammeh's attempt to establish an Islamic identity, looking only at Jammeh's attempt to extract resources from the Gulf. My study has taken this line of argument further, exploring Minteh's proposition that the decision to establish an Islamic identity was financially motivated. This study has also gone further to explain other causal factors that are missed out by Minteh.

Much accessible scholarship on foreign policy has not brought *The Gambia* into the limelight. Arguably, the foreign policies of small, poor and weak states have largely escaped the attention of mainstream International Relations (IR) theorists and scholars. Whether this raises the need for a new and universal approach to IR theorization or not would be an important topic for academic debates. What is undoubtedly clear is that this study will contribute to enriching the debates surrounding the use of neoclassical realism to understand foreign policy decisions taken by small and poor states.

1.2. AIMS AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Why did Jammeh, despite depending so much on the European Union (EU) for financial support, grow increasingly belligerent and uncooperative, leading him to cut ties with the bloc, expel its top-diplomat, and shift Gambia's foreign policy toward China and the Gulf? How can Gambia's foreign policy shift be explained in relation to China's expanding material capabilities and Qatar's growing political and financial influence? What are some of the implications of the reformation and diversification of the foreign aid landscape for the relationship between traditional donors and dictators?

As a thesis statement, this study argues that although the shift in foreign aid has made aid-recipient states increasingly selective in terms of accepting politically conditioned aid, the gradual shift in Gambia's foreign policy can best be understood by looking at Jammeh's perceptions and misperceptions of the West.

The main aim of this study is to understand what factors triggered the gradual reorientation of Gambia's foreign policy between 2006 and 2016. As a single explanatory case study of foreign policy shift, this study would contribute to our theoretical understanding of how domestic intervening variables can alter states' foreign policy behaviors. So besides helping us to understand actors, events, and phenomena, this particular case study would also help us generate knowledge that would contribute to the debates surrounding the use of neoclassical realism as a theory for analyzing and understanding foreign policy decisions.

At the system level, this study aims to understand the impacts of the diversification of the foreign aid landscape, while also trying to understand how China's material growth and Qatar's financial influence contributed to triggering the change of our dependent variable. At the unit-level, this study has looked at three concepts that informed Gambia's foreign policy shift: leadership image, perceptions and misperceptions; the attempt to establish an Islamic identity; and the domestic political and institutional setting.

The interests to investigate a single case phenomenon in the case of The Gambia are prompted by the lack of sufficient research in the country's foreign policy, especially the type espoused by Jammeh during the last ten years of his rule when he empirically carried out controversial and unpopular foreign policy decisions. This particular case study would also allow us to understand how the shift from hard power to non-coercive soft power has given new dynamism to international politics, given the latter has found expression in Gambia's foreign policy making.

In addition to helping us to generate knowledge that would contribute to consolidating the core arguments of neoclassical realism, this study is expected to draw the attention of IR theorists to cast their nets wide, especially at a time when the globalization of world politics and economy has become ever more ubiquitous. In other words, the lack of much focus by major IR theorists on the behaviors of non-aligned, small and poor countries is a great concern for many students of IR - and this has greatly constrained research into the foreign policies of small and poor states.

1.3. METHOD AND LIMITATIONS

This is an explanatory single case study of foreign policy shift. Since the aim of this paper is not to merely describe the phenomena under study but to explain them, explanatory case study becomes relevant here. This paper, therefore, has used an empirical method to answer the research questions raised. The method we have used in this study is justified by the 'how' and 'why' questions raised. Yin (2009, p. 9) argues that when the questions of 'how' and 'why' are raised in a study, explanatory case study becomes the relevant method, "... because such questions deal with operational links needing to be traced over time, rather than mere frequencies or incidence." In his definition of a case study, Scram (as cited in Yin, 2009, p. 17), writes "[t]he essence of a case study, the central tendency among all types of case study, is that it tries to illuminate a decision or set of decisions: why they were taken, how they were implemented, and with what result."

Given that the phenomena under study are contemporary rather than historical, this type of case study has allowed us to directly observe our phenomena – at least until very recently – and

conduct interviews with the relevant people who have been involved in the events. Yin (2009, p. 11) argues further that “although case studies and histories can overlap, the case study’s unique strength is its ability to deal with a full variety of evidence—documents, artifacts, interviews, and observations—beyond what might be available in a conventional historical study.”

Despite the argument that case study provides little room for generalization (Yin, 2009), it is well noted by scholars that case studies are better at answering certain questions in order to help us generate a rich and detailed understanding of how certain processes work (Lamont, 2015). According to Lamont (2015), when a case study is carefully constructed, it can provide us with insights to help us understand and explain IR more broadly and in general, the world around us.

Since it has been the aim of this study to use neoclassical realism in order to explain our variables, this study has pursued two levels of analyses: the system-level and the state-level or unit-level. Any study of foreign policy shift which fails to employ both levels would offer very parsimonious results. The system as a level of analysis is largely state-centric since states remain the most politically consequential actors in international politics (Ripsman, Lobell & Taliaferro, 2016). As noted by Singer (1961), the systemic level of analysis allows us to be able to describe a phenomenon, while the state-level allows us to explain a phenomenon. So unlike classical realism which shoves away the state-level, neoclassical realism makes use of both levels of analysis - thus relating our chosen theory to our levels of analysis in this study.

By focusing on the system-level, we would be able to understand and generalize some of the variables brought by the system – Yin (2009) calls them structural modifiers – which, one way or the other, affect all actors in the international system (Ripsman et al, 2016). The advantage of using the systemic level is that it enables us to make sense of what Singer (1961) calls the ‘patterns of interactions’ revealed by the system and to generalize about such phenomenon as foreign policy decisions and the external environment. In other words, its ability to absorb the ‘totality of interactions’ brought by actors at the international scene makes the systemic level the most comprehensive level of all levels available (Singer, 1961).

However, Singer (1961) warns that the systemic level has its pitfall as it leads researchers to exaggerate the impacts of the system upon the national actor. As an explanatory case study, this

pitfall has constrained this paper to an extent that the impacts Jammeh had on the system, leading its criticism of his rule, have not been discussed, studied or analyzed. This shortcoming has been discussed in the latter part of this section.

The other method of analysis this study has used is the state-level. By using this level as a unit of analysis, this paper has been able to open up the 'black box' of the politics and society of The Gambia and study in great details the actors and interests within the country. As a single case study, looking at the state-level can help us avert the pitfall associated with generalization by focusing in greater details on the behavior of the actor(s) we are trying to understand and other domestic intervening variables to be explained.

As we are faced with the issue of actors and interests which gave dynamism to Gambia's foreign policy, we are, at the same time, limited by the lack of much inside access to policy-makers or official documentation. Jammeh's government was very secretive that at the midst of the political impasse in 2016 which led to his exile, his loyalists ransacked offices and burned down some documents, including, but not limited to documents on killings, torture, and government financial dealings (Phatey, 2017). Even though it has not been the aim of this paper to examine classified documents, this act by Jammeh's loyalists helps in explaining how difficult it is to get access to insiders in Jammeh's circle of policy-makers. In addition to the erratic nature of Jammeh's foreign policy and the lack of a sense of direction, it has been very difficult for this paper to ascertain what constitutes 'national interests', because of Jammeh's self-aggrandizing approach to foreign policy and his personalization of national resources.

This study has, however, examined official statements and speeches by the Jammeh's government, development partners and the international community. Both national and mainstream international news outlets have been consulted. For the national news outlets, this study is aware of their political leanings, this is why their usage has been limited and selective. The fact that the Press has been a victim of Jammeh's whip, relying too much on them during the interviews would have compromised this study, because of the reductive take that any decision Jammeh took was motivated by his personal-aggrandizement.

By focusing on the system-level, this paper has examined the pattern of interactions between The Gambia and other actors. However, because of the lack of space and time, this study has only focused attention to certain actors, thus limiting the ability to generalize – a criticism often meted out to case studies. Also, The Gambia alone cannot be used as a springboard for measuring the impacts of the diversification of foreign aid on aid-recipient countries, because it is not a top-recipient of financial aid compared to other developing countries. This study, therefore, recognizes its limitations and urges the need for a multiple case study or a comparative inter-state case study in which different countries would be dealt with.

In explaining the shift toward the Gulf, this study recognizes its failure to move beyond Qatar. It could have included in its analyses countries such as Kuwait and UAE than focusing so much on Qatar. This shortfall is a result of the lack of space and time. The lack of tracing and explaining events in a sequential order is another weakness. However, even by analyzing events by year in order to come to the final disintegration of Jammeh-EU relations, we would not be able to give a specific event or year that would mark the *sudden* shift in Jammeh's foreign policy. This is because the shift was a gradual process rather than abrupt or sudden.

Furthermore, even though this study could not deal with the impacts of the shift in foreign policy making brought by both the end of the Cold War and the increasing emphasis on human security, it is aware of the relevance of this issue in contemporary foreign policy analysis, and hopes, therefore, future research will deal with this. In trying to understand why Jammeh has been isolated by the West, this paper is constrained by the lack of deeper assessment of the impacts he had on the systemic actors. This has limited the ability of this paper to explain how his perceptions and misperceptions of the West might have caused some damage at some corners and thereby triggered the latter's criticisms about his style of rule. Instead, our focus has been directed to understanding the impacts of the system on Jammeh – a pitfall Singer (1961) calls 'genuine difficulties' associated with using the system as a level of analysis.

This pitfall is further exacerbated by the large size of the system where the impacts of Jammeh's belligerence and controversial moves could not be felt or measured. For example, the impacts of Jammeh's fiercely-charged speeches at the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) and his

stance on the issue of homosexuality are difficult to measure. The use of the term ‘West’ here encompasses all European countries, but also the United States. This study does not, unfortunately, separate these actors into different states because of the lack of space. Instead, it has treated the West as a bloc whose policies and approach represent the wishes of all its members, the US included – though it is not a member of the EU.

In order to be able to answer the questions raised, this study has pursued a single explanatory case study approach, grounded in empirical studies. Semi-structured interviews have been conducted with former Gambian diplomats, academics at the University of The Gambia (UTG), experts, journalists and human rights activists. Interviews were conducted by e-mail exchange and via Skype. All participants in this data collection, whose name have been mentioned, have agreed to be quoted and referred to by their real names. Those who asked to be anonymous are doing so to protect their careers and contacts.

Furthermore, by not limiting the scope of responses to certain questions – as often is the case with structured interviews – I have been able to get different insights from my various interviewees. I have interviewed a total of eight people, ranging from diplomats, journalists, and political scientist, but only a few selected answers have been used. After the interviews have been conducted, I sent back to my interviewees some follow-up questions in order to clarify certain ambiguous answers and asked if they had something they would want to add. This allowed me to be able to cross-reference their various responses in order to ascertain the validity of my data. The sources I have finally used have the scholarly and expert knowledge of The Gambia and have passed the test of cross-referencing and triangulation. However, this is not to say that some of these people whose answers I have finally decided to use are totally free from political subjectivity.

I have also consulted academic literature, scholarly articles and news reports on The Gambia. However, in the use of neoclassical realism as a theoretical framework, this study, because of lack of space, has not been able to bring in the theoretical contributions of all major neoclassical adherents and contributors such as Christensen, Schweller, Asle Toje, Jervis, etc; nevertheless, it recognizes their valuable theoretical contributions. The literature and scholarly articles used

would also enable us to understand the ‘hows’ and ‘whys’ of the global shift in foreign aid and the balance of power which have brought China and the Gulf into the spotlight.

In section 4.3.3 on how Qatar is seeking influence abroad, this paper is limited by its dependence on few academic articles, and the view of my interviewee in Qatar. This paper could have explored this section more. This study would, therefore, recommend future research to look into this area as it is of global significance, given the regional and global roles as well as growing influence of both Qatar and Saudi Arabia, especially in Muslim West Africa.

Part 4.1 looks at the actors and interests which gave dynamism to Gambia’s foreign policy under Jammeh. Part 4.2 examines the unit-level intervening variables which triggered the change of our dependent variable. Part 4.3 looks at the structural modifiers; here we have examined Qatar’s attempt to seek influence abroad and China’s growing influence in Africa vis-à-vis other great powers. In examining the latter, we have also looked at the gradual divorce between Banjul and Taipei. In part 5, we have also briefly examined the diversification of the foreign aid landscape and how this is changing the balance of power influence in aid-recipient countries.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theory of neoclassical realism, first coined by Gideon Rose in his 1998 article to the *World Politics*, is an approach to analyzing and understanding foreign policy, which, unlike classical realism, recognizes the importance of both state-level and system-level variables in making sense of foreign policy. As a tool for foreign policy analysis, therefore, it carries with it a distinct methodological preference (Rose, 1998). The use of neoclassical realism in our case is justified by its ability to integrate both levels. In his criticism of the other subschools of realism, Rose (1998, p. 152) contends that “a theory of foreign policy limited to systemic factors alone is bound to be inaccurate much of the time.”

The idea that domestic factors can produce tensions that may find expression in international politics was first raised in the late 1950s by the neorealist Kenneth N. Waltz in *Man, the State,*

and War. Exploring this argument and citing different approaches, such as the *Innenpolitik* approach by Zakaria, Rose argues (1998, p. 148) that “foreign policy is best understood as the product of a country’s internal dynamics.” Over time, many scholars in the field of International Relations (IR) have found refuge in this line of thinking.

Neoclassical realists do not put the systemic level into a state of oblivion; in fact, they have favored the analyst of foreign policy to start, but not stop, at the systemic level (Rose, 1998). Zakaria, a proponent of *Innenpolitik*, a variant which privileges state-level over system-level, argues that “[a] good explanation of foreign policy should not ignore domestic politics or national culture or individual decision-makers” (Zakaria, 1992, p. 197). Important in this line of thought are also Ripsman, Lobell, and Taliaferro, who, in their groundbreaking work, have argued that the image of a leader is significant because it can affect all other intervening variables (Ripsman et al, 2016). So it is not a coincidence that one of the concepts this study has treated at the domestic level is Jammeh’s image, perceptions, and misperceptions of the West.

In their collective work, Ripsman et al (2016) have gone further than Rose and Zakaria, and have divided neoclassical realism into three strands: Type I, Type II, and Type II. According to them, the first strand of neoclassical realism “sought merely to fix structural realism by using domestic-level intervening variables to explain away empirical anomalies for structural realist theories” (Ripsman et al, 2016, p. 12). Found in this strand are scholars such as Christensen, Zakaria, Schweller, and Wohlforth, whose works Rose reviewed in 1998, leading to the birth of neoclassical realism.

The failure of this first strand of scholars to provide a sufficient ground for the prediction of national strategic choices was what gave birth to the second strand of neoclassical realism which goes to emphasize the importance of “systemic stimuli, moderated by domestic-level intervening variables, to inform an approach to foreign policy” (Ripsman et al, 2016, p. 12). The third strand identified by Ripsman et al is an all-encompassing one in that it does not only deal with the dependent variable (the foreign policy of a state) which the first and second strand deal with, but also “international outcomes that the interaction of these policy choices produces and

the systemic structure itself, which is occasionally affected by international outcomes” (Ripsman et al, 2016, p. 12). The ability of the third strand to bring poor, small and weaker states into the theoretical debates of neoclassical realism makes it a unique approach.

Few elements have helped set neoclassical realism apart from other stripes of realism. First is the ability to explain the foreign policy behavior of non-great powers. Ripsman et al (2016) argue that the third strand of neoclassical realists who are a bit distant from the first and second strands because of their ability to cast their nets wide, offers more than mere explanations of the grand strategic adjustments by great powers. The systemic variables that the third strand of neoclassical realism often utilizes - the relative distribution of power, the clarity of the international system - and the unit-level intervening variables - leadership image and perceptions, strategic culture, and domestic institutions - all shape the external behavior and the patterns of interaction of core, periphery and semi-periphery states (Ripsman et al, 2016).

Secondly, unlike other subschools of realism, neoclassical realism explains foreign policy according to a given context. Where classical realists lump together analyses of all states’ behaviors as a total result of the anarchical nature of the system, neoclassical realists, having looked in great details and “carefully specified their assessment of the international conditions *particular states* face... go on to factor in specific features of a given situation to generate more complete explanations of foreign policy” (Wohlforth, 2012, p. 39) (Italics are mine).

And as an explanatory theory, neoclassical realism occupies another important position in the heart of Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA). As noted by Singer (1969), the primary purpose of a theory is to explain and predict. Neoclassical realism, as Rose shows, can predict the foreign policy behaviors of states in relations to their material power. Thus China’s growing footprint in The Gambia can be seen in relation to its growing material power resource which is helping Beijing to shape the ambitions and magnitude of its foreign policy.

However, despite its strength, neoclassical realism has not been invulnerable to criticisms. Its architect, Rose, writing in 1998, urged adherents to concede the point raised by critics about the

too many qualifications brought by the theory which have made it very difficult to be falsified. In other words, the theory's multifaceted approach has been criticized for not being so easy to falsify. Also due to its too much emphasis on the domestic variables affecting states' behavior, it might face further criticisms for its soft approach to the systemic-level, thus limiting its take on explaining grand strategy.

In this study, both the independent variables (the systemic level) or necessary conditions, as Beck (2012) calls them, and the domestic intervening variables (image and perceptions, strategic culture, institutions, politics) had played some roles in the reorientation of the country's foreign policy (the dependent variable). Jammeh was left to confront a strategic environment which he was highly suspicious of. So the ability of neoclassical realism to use both levels of analysis to understand how systemic pressures are, in Rose's words, "translated through unit-level intervening variables such as decision-makers' perception[s] and domestic state structures" (Rose, 1998, p. 152) makes it a very relevant theory.

3. ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

Walter Carlsnaes, the South African born Uppsala University's professor, argues that, given the nature of the complicated omnipresence of different actors and structures in foreign policy, the need to have an analytical framework as a starting point is of paramount significance (Carlsnaes, 2012). To begin with, we have to make some ontological definitions. The term foreign policy is used here based upon the definition advanced by Weber et al (2013):

Foreign policy is composed of the goals sought, values set, decisions made and actions taken by states, and national governments acting on their behalf, in the context of the external relations of national societies. It constitutes an attempt to design, manage and control the foreign relations of national societies (Weber et al, 2013, p. 3).

And the terms state and country are used interchangeably; so are the terms development aid and foreign aid, defined as "the international transfer of capital, goods, or services from a country or

international organization for the benefit of the recipient country or its population” (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2018).

Given the two levels of analysis mentioned in Part 2, this study has looked at three concepts at the unit-level which have informed our understanding of the phenomena under study; and at the systemic level, we have looked at the diversification of the foreign aid landscape, the material expansion of China, and Qatar’s growing financial strength.

First, in this section, we have briefly looked at the three concepts we have identified at the unit-level: (1) Jammeh’s image, perceptions and misperceptions of the outside world; (2) the attempt to establish an Islamic identity; and (3) the domestic political and institutional setting. While there might be other concepts, these three are the most palpable ones as they helped in determining how Jammeh responded to the external environment. This is why, in our analyses, they are arranged according to their political significance, and in this section, each will be looked at accordingly and briefly. However, these concepts are explored in great details in Part 4.2 under Analyses.

As states become the units of analysis in foreign policy, state leaders become the most important actors in foreign policy, possessing intelligence, carrying state responsibility, and perpetuating the survival of the state. For many IR scholars, therefore, the image of the leader is significant because it can affect all other intervening variables (Ripsman et al, 2016). The concepts this paper has examined are contextual because for other states, the bureaucracy is the most important concept at the unit-level. Neoclassical realists have argued that the types of foreign policy approaches states pursue can best be understood by not limiting our analyses to international variables such as the nature of anarchy or states’ relative power in the system, but by also looking at domestic factors such as bureaucratic politics, ideology, culture, and partisan politics (Zakaria, 1992). Rose (1998, p. 148) argues that the state-level intervening variables can also “determine how countries behave toward the world beyond their borders.”

As Ripsman et al (2016, p. 62) note, “[A]ll people possess a set of core values, beliefs, and images that guide their interaction with the outside world and their understanding of it. These

‘images’ are highly personalized, as they are informed by the individual’s prior experiences and values.”

This psychological make-up played a significant role in the type of foreign policy Jammeh came to pursue. Ripsman et al (2016, p. 62) have argued further that “to understand a state’s foreign policy choices it is useful to investigate the character and psychological make-up of its political leaders, which are critical intervening variables that can influence the way they respond to systemic pressures.”

The attempt to establish an Islamic identity or to borrow from Ripsman et al (2016, p. 66) “[The] notion of strategic culture such as entrenched beliefs, worldviews, and shared expectations of a society as a whole,” is another important concept examined by this study. The ideological attempt to Islamize the country can best be understood by looking at the actors involved and the interests at stake by the time of doing so. Although 90% of the population is Muslim, The Gambia is one of the most secular countries in the world. But Jammeh’s perceptions of the West’s stance on Islam and his projection of himself as the vanguard of Islamic and cultural values have found expression in Gambia’s foreign policymaking.

On the third concept – the domestic political and institutional setting – we have argued that where leaders are constrained by the nature of bureaucratic politics, we might expect a slow motion of foreign policy decisions; but in an authoritarian setting where the bureaucracy is weak and leaders are not constrained by the nature of the political and institutional arrangement, foreign policy decisions can be swift and erratic. After being in power for more than two decades, Jammeh had accumulated too much power and penetrated every political and social level, from the business sector to the religious and political ones. The country’s parliament – the National Assembly – was a weak gathering of Jammeh’s loyalists. Politically, the country’s opposition had been at a complete state of disarray, but after their 2011 defeat in the polls, it began to gather momentum.

The other level this study has examined is the systemic level. Here the most important structural modifier is the paradigm shift in foreign aid. This shift affects all actors: It affects aid-recipient

countries with poor human rights records, but it also affects traditional donors' ability to influence the political direction of aid-recipient countries.

Another structural modifier is the shift in the global balance of power, which brings states like China, with relatively growing material power, Qatar, and Kuwait, with strong financial power, into the political scene. Neoclassical realists have argued that the increase in a state's relative power will eventually lead to a "corresponding expansion in the ambition and scope" of its foreign policy activity (Rose, 1998, p. 152). So in another way, we have looked at Gambia's foreign policy shift in relation to some of these countries' foreign policy ambitions, especially Beijing's relative capabilities in the international system.

4. ANALYSES

4.1. Actor(s) and Interests in Gambia's Foreign Policy

Actor(s)

To be able to point to the causal factors which contributed to the 'rational' thinking behind Jammeh's foreign policy turn, we have to, first, examine the actor(s) and interests which gave dynamism to Gambia's foreign policy under Jammeh. When talking about actor(s) in the country's foreign policy, Yahya becomes our center of focus. It is true that in a republic, be it democratic or not, it is the state leader who shapes the state's foreign policy; however, wielding overwhelming power and influence over the direction of the state and matters of national interests means reducing all other actors to government functionaries.

By changing ministers occasionally, Jammeh dominated the making and implementation of the country's foreign policy. The Foreign Affairs ministry became what Hill (2016) calls a 'subordinate foreign ministry', reducing the minister himself to a 'functionary'. Furthermore, the main institution, the National Assembly (NA), where issues of national and international interests are supposed to be discussed and debated, was also reduced to a rubber-stamp assembly, highly dominated by Jammeh's loyalists.

Interests

The term *interest* is arbitrary in that it is what justifies the actions of actors who are found navigating through complex domestic and international scenes. What are the interests which helped shape Gambia's foreign policy? While this is an important question, it is equally important to distinguish between what we assume would be the interests of a powerful state – we will take China for example – and a small and poor state like The Gambia. This comparison is important, not because of the close link between national security and foreign policy (Weber & Smith, 2013), but because most scholars in the classical realist camp tend to see foreign policy within the realm of high-politics – a classical view.

Theorists of power transition, an offshoot of the theory of hegemonic stability, would predict a rising China to challenge the global status quo, thus carving a foreign policy that would enable it to find its place in the world. In its annual report submitted to Congress, the US Department of Defense asserts that “China's leaders seek ways to leverage China's growing military, diplomatic, and economic clout to advance its ambitions to establish regional preeminence and expand its international influence” (US Department of Defense [DoD], 2016, I). This would mean China's interests lie on surviving what classical realists call the ubiquitous presence of ‘anarchy’ in the international system (Wohlforth, 2008). In that case, there is a semblance of classical realism's instruments of self-help and survival in China's foreign policy as a result of its relative material power.

Heavily indebted, defined by institutional inertia and an authoritarian terrain with no immediate threats to its borders, The Gambia had empirically had an erratic foreign policy under Jammeh. Writing in the *Strategic Studies Institute*, Steven Metz (2000) argues that the weakness of political institutions and the personality of the leader play an important role in African affairs than elsewhere in the world.

Nowhere is this argument evident than in The Gambia where Jammeh repeatedly denounced the West and insulted human rights activists for what he termed as their ‘ungodly’ advocacy for the rights of homosexuals to be respected. This makes it very difficult to ascertain the national interests of The Gambia under Jammeh.

However, where China faces external threats and competition as a result of its relative material capabilities, The Gambia faces domestic threats as a result of the growing opposition to Jammeh’s style of rule. This makes the national interest of The Gambia highly politicized, leading to what Clapham (1996) calls ‘politics of state survival’. So to locate the interests of Gambia’s foreign policy, we have to start by looking at the domestic political and institutional structures in the country.

4.2. UNIT-LEVEL INTERVENING VARIABLES

Jammeh’s image, perceptions, and misperceptions of the outside world

At the unit-level, the emphasis neoclassical realists put on the actor’s image and a perceptions is what sets the theory apart from other subschools of realism. And the theory’s ability to accommodate decision-makers’ psychological set-up makes it such a preferred theory. Any analysis of Gambia’s foreign policy which fails to capture Jammeh’s image, perceptions and misperceptions of the outside world would very likely render parsimonious results. Ripsman et al (2016) argue that the image of the leader is what guides their interactions with the world beyond their borders.

The fact that Jammeh saw himself as a pan-Africanist and misperceived the West’s interference in Africa as a vestige of neocolonialism, this has helped in justifying his anti-Western rhetoric and reasons to move the country away from the sphere of Western influence. Jammeh had also seen the pressures to decriminalize the law on homosexuality as an attempt to promote Western culture and values that he sternly believed contradict Islamic and African values. He chastised the West at the UNGA, saying “after fighting for our freedom and liberating our continent, we

are being prescribed a religion - democracy, human rights and good governance - by descendants of the same colonial powers” (The Point, 2013).

However, some analysts in Banjul, while not dismissive of his fear, argued that there was more to his political rhetoric than meets the eye. His misperceptions of the West, especially its support to his critics and dissidents who had carried out plots against his regime, and his perceptions of Islam and traditional African culture, became major driving forces in his foreign policy. Jammeh also projected himself as a sympathizer with the Palestinian cause and had never stopped criticizing the West for its role in the Middle East and the war on terror, even though he had participated in the CIA rendition program (Fisher, 2013).

At the unit-level, Jammeh’s image was waning as a result of his unpopular decisions. In 2012, he committed the death penalty, executing 12 prisoners, including two Senegalese; in 2006, it was alleged that he executed coup plotters and misled the country about their disappearance – they were exhumed from a mass grave in 2017, after Jammeh’s departure (Jollof Media Network, 2017). Dueck (2006) contends that policymakers will often choose to frame and modify strategic choice to reflect those acceptable cultural preferences by the population in order to be able to maintain domestic political support. This is often evident in times when the leader’s popularity is waning and political pressures are mounting.

The establishment of an Islamic identity

When we talk about strategic culture and national identity, Hudson (2014, p. 117) argues, we are seeking to answer three fundamental questions that a people of a nation always ask themselves: “Who are ‘we’?” “What do ‘we’ do?” “Who are ‘they’?” I would add one more question: “What do ‘they’ want?” Hudson calls this ‘foundational questions’ as they help define how leaders behave in foreign policy formulation.

The Gambia is a Sunni-Muslim country with a 90% Muslim population. Jammeh’s attempt to create an Islamic identity by bringing the country closer to what Gambian political scientist, Ismaila Ceesay, calls ‘the orbit of the Gulf’, has helped in answering all four questions: First, ‘we’ are a nation of Islam; second, ‘we’ want an Islamic way of life where no one would come

and tell us to do what the Qur'an has forbidden of us; third, 'they' are non-believers and 'descendants of the people who colonized us' – as Jammeh once put it (The Point, 2013) – and whose society has been eroded by nihilism; and fourth, 'they' want to rob us of our religious and societal values – Jammeh was reported to have called homosexuality an 'ungodly' practice (Bennett-Smith, 2016).

In the neoclassical realism school, strategic culture such as entrenched beliefs, shared expectations of how society ought to be can influence the way states response to systemic stimuli (Ripsman et al, 2016). One of my interviewees, a former Gambian top diplomat (henceforth Amadou) now based in Qatar who urged to remain anonymous, told me that Jammeh had always been wary of the West's stance on Islam. He adds: "Jammeh had always told the Arabs during our closed-door meetings that 'It is time we looked after our people and society'."

By defining an Islamic way of life for the country, Jammeh was at the same time pursuing strategies to ensure he survives the political forces threatening his grip on power. This is why, as Hudson (2014, p. 199-20) argues, "National identity is political and is being shaped and reshaped every moment by society."

The Gambia has always had good relations with Sunni-countries in the Gulf. Throughout Jammeh's rule, politics was Islamized and Islam was politicized in The Gambia. Minteh argues somewhere that "[b]y openly politicizing the Gambia's Islamic identity, Jammeh seeks to strengthen ties with some Middle Eastern [countries] to secure more aid money to stabilize declining state institutions" (Minteh, 2015).

Lamin Jahateh, the Chief Editor of the country's largest newspaper, *The Point*, sums up the attempt to establish an Islamic identity as follows:

While he maintained an iron-grip on the country and repressed its people for a very long time, pockets of resistance, especially from the media, the opposition and some human rights defenders, proved that not all bowed to his brutal rule. When dictators are faced with resistance, however small, they tend to seek the approval of the majority, especially when that majority belong to a major religion.

He also wanted to entrench his rule and to bank on the backing of Gambia's hypocritical Islamic leaders, whom he saw as having a lot of influence on the majority of the population. It was also [a] strategy to be milking the Arab as the developed Western countries and West-backed multilateral organizations withheld all their support to his regime at the time (personal communications, April 20, 2018).

The domestic political and institutional setting

The Type III strand of neoclassical realism, advanced by Ripsman et al, contends that “domestic institutions determine the leadership's scope of authority and the degree to which it must consult or respect the wishes of key societal interests” (Ripsman et al, 2016, p. 77). In other words, where institutions are defined by a strong democratic culture, foreign policy decisions are subject to rigorous deliberations by policy-makers. But in the event of a poor institutional setting, parliament can be reduced to a rubber stamp assembly and ministers can become but functionaries.

The Gambia under Jammeh was not constrained by the bureaucratic hurly-burly which characterizes the foreign policy terrain of big democracies. Analysts in Banjul are agreed that the country's Foreign Affairs ministry was treated as a passive tool by Jammeh. On the one hand, this lack of organizational or rigorous bureaucratic deliberations can make foreign policy decision-making swift, but also erratic. However, on the other hand, this can affect the influence of the Minister of Foreign Affairs and top-diplomats in their efforts to implement an effective foreign policy.

When a president functions both as a head of government and head of state, this gives him more leverage over matters of international concerns. This would consequently undermine the role of diplomats as they “struggle to keep control of their vast portfolio... while they are always vulnerable to interference from their head of government (Hill, 2016, p. 59). In The Gambia, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) had, on several occasions, been left in a vacuum, thereby placing it under the Office of the President. Since 1997, the MFA has been occupied by more than 18 different ministers in more than 20 sworn-in occasions (Rulers, 2018). This qualifies the argument that Jammeh had always had the power to fire ministers at will. In a span of 22 years,

this means less than one year and a half for each minister, whereas, in North Korea, the MFA has been occupied only by ten different foreign ministers since 1948.

This poor institutional structure enabled Jammeh to personify the country's foreign policy. For example, the decisions to leave the Commonwealth and the International Criminal Court were never brought to the NA for debate and consideration because of its lack of influence on Jammeh's foreign policy decisions. Similarly, the decision to Islamize the country, which would require a referendum, was never brought before lawmakers. Former Gambia's Minister of Foreign Affairs, Sidi Sanneh, argues that this decision did not only violate the Preamble of the Constitution of The Gambia which declares that the country is a secular republic, but it was a unilateral decision shaped by Jammeh's personal interests (personal communications, March 13, 2018).

Ripsman et al (2016, p. 76) note that, "it matters whether mechanisms and processes of legislative oversight have been established and how onerous they are, and which body—the executive or the legislature—is responsible for appointing the foreign minister and other key officials charged with making foreign policy." In the case of The Gambia, all of these functions rested on the executive – Jammeh.

Despite being a multi-party republic with periodic elections, the opposition was relatively weak, allowing Jammeh to enjoy a free ride on the country's foreign policy. The opposition had no influence on the country's foreign policy direction; however, this does not mean that there is no causal relation between the domestic opposition as an intervening variable and the country's foreign policy as a dependent variable. Supported by Western donors, human rights activists, and a weary population, by 2013, the opposition had begun to gather momentum towards the 2016 presidential election. Cognizant of the consequences, Jammeh stifled the opposition; the EU called for a loosen grip or impose sanctions on Jammeh by withholding funds bound for Banjul. By loosening his grip, Jammeh would be handing a lottery ticket to the opposition; by stifling critics, he would face sanctions that would largely affect his political patronage. The following section has explored further this dilemma.

4.3. STRUCTURAL MODIFIERS

4.3.1. The shift in foreign aid

This section will explore how the reformation and diversification of the foreign aid landscape presented Yahya Jammeh with the opportunity to turn to new donors with different approaches. The Encyclopedia Britannica defines foreign aid as “the international transfer of capital, goods, or services from a country or international organization for the benefit of the recipient country or its population.” This paper has thus followed this definition, looking only at the transfer of capital. Foreign aid is one of the main aspects of foreign policy. Just like the other aspects of foreign policy, diplomacy and military force, the ultimate goal is to influence outcomes in the recipient-state. These outcomes could range from the need to alter the recipient’s perceptions of the donor (image-building) to extracting concessions from the recipient state.

First, it is important to remind ourselves about what type of aid this study has been focusing on. While it is not the focus of this study to explain the different types of aid, it is, however, important to draw some ontological differences between multilateral and bilateral aid. While the latter is given directly by a government to the government of another country, the former is provided by many governments who pool funds to international organizations such as the EU. Both are considered elements of soft power, and soft power can be both coercive and uncoercive.

Given that foreign aid is a very – but not the only – effective change-seeking policy available to states, evidently, it has been used more by wealthy states or states increasing in power. As of 2016, Official Development Assistance (ODA) from developed countries, mainly member countries of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) reached \$142 billion compared to \$85 billion in 1990. However, despite this trend, aid to Africa fell to 0.5% in 2015 (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2017). There are many explanatory variables, but empirically, the European Union has reformed its development aid landscape, while many foreign donors have also emerged, coming with completely different approaches.

Scholarship in the aid domain observes that during the Cold War, aid, in general, was used as a geopolitical instrument to advance the political goal of the donor state (Friedman, 1958; McGuire, 1952). Friedman (1958) observes that the role of aid was to win the hearts and minds of underdeveloped nations that chose to pursue non-alignment. Friedman's argument reinforces McGuire's (1952, p. 343) earlier argument that during the Cold War, aid "was an instrument designed to strengthen the power of the United States in the world struggle with the Soviet Union." The arguments that aid in the Cold War period was motivated by the geostrategic goals of the ideologically dyadic struggling powers – the capitalist West and the Communist bloc of the Soviet Union – were bolstered by empirical studies which observed a decline in aid the following years after the Cold War (Boschini & Olofsgård, 2005).

The end of the Cold War brought with it a new paradigm shift in foreign aid, focusing more on development-oriented goals such as human rights, education, and poverty reduction. This shift from geostrategic politics to the promotion of human security marked the beginning of what would be decades of a new foreign aid modus operandi. Even though this new approach has not succeeded in eliminating dictatorial rule in aid recipient countries such as The Gambia, it has nevertheless contributed to economic growths and political reforms in some quarters (Bearcat & Tirone, 2010).

In an effort to reform its much widely criticized foreign aid landscape, the European Union, a traditional foreign aid donor to The Gambia, adopted a new development policy in 2011. Under the theme 'Increasing the Impact of EU Development: an Agenda for Change', the bloc observes that the "objectives of development, democracy, human rights, good governance and security are intertwined" (European Commission, [EC] 2011). This policy puts the respect for human rights, including the freedom of the Press, the rights for politicians to hold rallies, the protection of LGBTs, etc., as prerequisites for development aid. Jammeh, who had always been at loggerhead with human rights activists, was constrained by this major policy shift. Human rights activists in particular, had been lobbying heavily the international community to sanction Jammeh for his grip on power. As observed by Madi Jobarteh, the Deputy Director of the Association of Non-Governmental Association (TANGO), the biggest gathering of NGOs in the country, the

“pressures that Yaya Jammeh faced from the West, the UN and human rights NGOs were almost unbearable (personal communications, March 21, 2018).

The reformation of the DAC’s foreign aid landscape came at a time when many players have emerged in this domain. This ‘age of choice’ or the diversification of the foreign aid landscape leaves some hope for authoritarian regimes and allowed Jammeh to search for new donors with different norms, values, and systems of accountability. Countries such as Qatar, Kuwait, and China, also known as non-DAC donors, fall in this categorization. It is important to mention that Kuwait and China are not relatively new donors; the latter has been offering assistance to Africa from the late 1950s, evident in its role in the Suez Canal crises (Yitzhak, 1979).

This new EU’s development assistance framework, known in the foreign aid parlance as ‘targeted development’, is aimed at promoting human development beyond EU borders in order to insulate the bloc’s citizens from the spillovers of underdevelopment. On the other hand, the non-DAC donors, China in particular, largely unaffected by the recent waves of immigration, provide aid “without Western lectures about governance and human rights” (The Economic, 2010). However, this is not to say that China’s aid is purely motivated by altruism. In fact, as Dreher and Fuchs (2011) note, the drive to seek international legitimacy and support in international fora are amongst the key drivers of Chinese aid.

Writing on the effect of the diversification of aid on The Gambia, Michelle DeFreese notes that this had made recipient countries more “selective in terms of accepting politically conditional aid. Non-aligned countries [such as The Gambia] have a greater selection of potential donors [now] than in the past, with opportunistic countries challenging conventional paradigms of aid conditionality” (DeFreese, n.d). So rather than conforming to the new foreign aid approach initiated by traditional Western donors, Jammeh was of the rationality that it was time he shifted his country’s foreign policy, after he had earlier accused the West of supporting his critics, and the US in particular for sympathizing with coup plotters (WikiLeaks, 2006).

The fact that China and the Gulf do not ‘lecture’ recipient countries on democracy and human rights made them the next destinations for Jammeh’s foreign policy. It is important to note that the dilemma presented by this systemic modifier coincided with China’s promise to provide

Africa with US \$1 trillion financing and the launch of China's most ambitious project in the century, the One Belt and One Road Initiative (Shih, 2013).

Like previously mentioned, Qatar and Kuwait have also joined the foreign aid landscapes; the latter's total aid exceeds the combined total aid of five European countries – Malta, Estonia, Croatia, Latvia, and Lithuania (Wikipedia, 2016). So in the summer of 2015, after talks in Brussels to release 13 million euro withheld-funds to The Gambia had failed due to Jammeh's rights abuses, Jammeh expelled EU's top diplomat from the country (BBC, 2010). But this was not until he had visited Qatar and Kuwait where he was reported to have secured funds (Hussain, 2014). This diplomatic racket was part of many unilateral decisions that Jammeh initiated: He had earlier pulled The Gambia out of the Commonwealth and submitted an application to leave the International Criminal Court, calling the former an “an International Caucasian Court for the persecution and humiliation of people of color, especially Africans” (BBC, 2016).

Whereas European donors believe that human rights and development are intertwined, the Gulf and Beijing flout human rights in their foreign aid approaches. Gambia's former Foreign Minister and Diplomat, Sidi Sanneh, says he was not at all surprised at the posture towards the Gulf and China, given that these actors do not follow “conventional forms of financial assistance and accountability” (personal communications, March 13, 2018).

4.3.2. China's Growing Material Power

Some scholars and experts in Sino-Africa relations often tend to reduce Sino-Africa relations to dyadic *explanans*: Africa needs China for its financial and infrastructural needs; China needs Africa for the continent's abundant raw materials. Some analysts have gone far to draw an analogy between China's footprint in Africa and colonial powers' footprint on the continent. Any scholarship which tends to limit itself to these explanations would render very parsimonious results.

While China has an eye on Africa's vastly unexploited natural resources, it does this with the combination of other political motives. Thus, any understanding of China's foothold on the continent would first have to start with an understanding of the actors or forces which shape

China's foreign policy. China's foreign policy, according to Webber et al (2013), revolves between two institutions in Beijing: the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and the People's Liberation Army (PLA). While the latter is credited for Chinese military engagements, including but not limited to China's huge financial and military contributions to peace-keeping missions (the UN in particular) and the opening of a Chinese military base in Djibouti, in the horn of Africa, the former is the brainchild behind the success of China's soft foreign policy, which The Gambia falls into. Today, China contributes a significant amount of both money and troops to UN peace-missions as Beijing's economic and military interests have become intertwined in some way (Fung, 2016).

The opening of the first Chinese military base in Africa in the summer of 2017 heralded a new era for Chinese foreign policy. As China's economic and political ambitions continue to grow, the Djibouti base is expected to help in the maintenance of continental peace and security where necessary, in order to enhance Beijing's continued growth around the world, Africa in particular, where China has become the continent's largest trading partner (Albert, 2017). Neoclassical realists such as Zakaria (1992) would argue at this point that economic outcomes, be they the results of inflation, sanctions, or growth, would affect the way a country behaves beyond its geographical frontiers.

Rose (1998, p. 167) contends that the increase in a state's relative power will eventually lead to a "corresponding expansion in the ambition and scope" of its foreign policy activity. As Webber et al (2013, p. 309) argue, "[T]he more influential the need to create stability to enhance China's economic growth, the more China is seen as emerging, responsible world power, which is learning the rule of the international game."

China's current global outreach, in The Gambia in particular, could be seen as part of the relative increase in its economic power and legitimacy. In responding to its global outreach and to be able to make other states to jump on the bandwagon and support its growing influence, China, neoclassical realists would observe, would have to 'seek more influence abroad' (Rose, 1998). So in this case, Gambia's foreign policy turn toward China can be viewed in relation to China's grand overarching strategy to alter the status quo of global politics in Beijing's favor.

Whereas the PLA carves China's military foreign policy, the MFA is charged with the soft power dynamic in China's foreign policy. Under the former's directives, China had had diplomatic ties with The Gambia beginning in the 1970s, a period when Beijing won back its permanent seat at the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), after an unprecedented vote in which African countries represented more than one-third of yes-voters (Sun, 2014). This marked the beginning of what would be a long period of legitimacy-building for Beijing. However, when Jammeh came to power, he broke ties with the Communist state and in 1996 reoriented his foreign policy toward Taiwan which had since then been a major patron for the regime in Banjul until 2013.

After more than two decades of a marriage of convenience, in 2013, Jammeh announced that Banjul was breaking ties with Taipei. This came at a time China is increasingly consolidating its foothold in Africa. With the resurgence of China's economic engagements on the continent, coupled with the already deteriorated relations with Taipei and the suspension of aid, for Jammeh, China was a viable candidate to fill the positions left by foreign aid donors. China, unlike Taipei whose foreign Affairs office was mired in corruption, following the charges against its former president, Chen Shui-bian (Zeldin, 2009), was open to using its noncoercive soft power to restore ties with The Gambia by meeting Jammeh half-way.

At the foreign office in Taiwan, Chen Chun-shen, the Director General of the Department of West Asian and African Affairs said that Jammeh was desperate for funds to finance his political campaign. He was cited as saying "Jammeh needs financial support from outside, as the country is scheduled to hold a presidential election later this year" (Cheng-chung, W., Kuei-hsiang, W., & Hou, E., 2016). But for Ismaila Ceesay, a political science lecturer at the University of The Gambia (UTG), the reorientation of the country's foreign policy is both a question of international recognition and the desire to tap into financial aid. "It is logical that a more Eastern oriented foreign policy will not make sense if China, with all its clout and financial muscle, is excluded. Secondly, China, unlike Taiwan, has a veto power in the UNSC. Being an ally with China was more beneficial for Jammeh, and, besides, China's seductive diplomacy was quite irresistible, evident in what China is doing in other African countries" (personal communications, March 15, 2018).

In Beijing, Jammeh found a player with a shared historical experience: a victim of colonization and Western imperialism. China is also a burgeoning non-Western country, seen as a paragon for rapid economic transformation; and as Sun argues, a player whose “unique economic approach to Africa meets the African countries’ needs for funding and infrastructure projects” (Sun, 2014, p. 1). And due to its internal human rights records, Beijing fits the type Jammeh was looking for to replicate the Brussels’ withheld funds. China’s overreach around the world, Africa in particular, should not be merely seen as a result of the continent’s endowment with natural resources, rather it should also be seen as a result of China’s relatively growing material influence and image around the world vis-à-vis the West, and as a strategic attempt to be part of those shaping the direction of global politics.

4.3.3. Qatar: Seeking Insurance & Influence Abroad

Qatar is a small country with incredible economic prowess which many Middle Eastern analysts think is punching above its weight. Bordered by both Iran and Saudi Arabia, Qatar has emerged as an influential player in the global political arena. And because of its geostrategic location and financial prowess, it has continued to play an important role in shaping the politics and society of the Gulf. Qatar’s rapid emergence in the global political and economic scenes with a strong financial clout has made it a very attractive player for cash-strapped countries, especially Muslim countries in West Africa; but also an important political player for the Arabian Peninsula.

Writing in the *Institute for Security Studies*, Berouk Mesfin, a researcher in Conflict Prevention, says that Qatar’s foreign policy is a product of its geographic location – bothered by Saudi and Iran. “Qatar’s political leadership wants to shape its own foreign policy and it does not want to submit to either of its neighbors” (Mesfin, 2016, p. 4).

Amadou (my anonymous interviewee in Qatar), who had held different positions for Jammeh in the Gulf, starting with Iran until 2005, says Qatar’s attempt to forge partnership with The Gambia can be viewed as an attempt to counter Saudi’s influence in Muslim West Africa where Riyadh has forged partnership with important players in that region, such as Senegal.

Mesfin (2016) argues that Doha's foreign policy accomplishment abroad, including its huge economic investments, building a huge media empire – Al Jazeera – is aimed at buying insurance for its coming 'Arab spring'. Amadou adds that the Al Thani family is aware of what happened to Gaddafi when he was left to hang out and dry by the majority of African countries. Given that the Qatari identify themselves with Sunni-Islam, they have found some commonalities in Jammeh, especially after ties with Iran had been severed in 2010, despite Jammeh's support for Iran's right to acquire nuclear weapons (the BBC, 2010). With Iran gone, Saudi having good relations with Senegal, Qatar saw in Jammeh someone who could provide it with the political support at gatherings such as the ones held at the UN, the African Union, and the ECOWAS. "The phone rang a day or two later after we had dumped the Iranians. It was the Qatari. Well, here are people who have the resources, the support from the West, and who were aware of Saudi's influence in neighboring Senegal," Amadou adds, during our Skype interview from Doha.

Jammeh's Gambia would provide the moral support and in turn would have petrodollars from Doha flow into its coffer. At a Commission of Inquiry in post-Jammeh Gambia, the country's former Minister of Economic Affairs (MEA), Mambury Njie, confirmed that Jammeh took a grant from the Qatari and personalized it (The Point, 2017). Jammeh did not only use the money for his personal use, but he redirected all communications from Qatar to his office.

Unlike China which creates employment for its citizens abroad through its building projects, Qatar would be a goldmine for Jammeh as the latter showed the willingness to support Doha's ambition. This begs the question: What ambition? Although Qatar is a relatively new strategic player in global politics, it has become a center of focus recently due to what many see as its attempt to counter Saudi's growing wing through its investment, forging of partnership and driving an independent foreign policy unique to the Gulf.

The Gambia under Jammeh had always been in a technical state of conflict with Senegal, and the two barely shared any common foreign policy goals, despite their geographical, social and

cultural commonalities. When Saudi embarked on building a coalition against the Houthis in Yemen, Senegal pledged to deploy troops, but The Gambia did not (Tharoor, 2015). In recent years, Saudi has consolidated its relations with Senegal through the building of mosques, Quranic schools and the offering of pilgrim packages. The Qatari, on the other hand, has also used their petrodollars, image, and neutrality to gain influence in Jammeh's Gambia, but to also increase their influence in Africa.

5. ECONOMIC STATECRAFT AS AN INSTRUMENT OF FOREIGN POLICY

Known in the foreign policy parlance as *soft power*, economic statecraft as an instrument of foreign policy has been used by states to achieve foreign policy objectives, including but not limited to altering the domestic politics of the target state (Beach, 2012). In this paper, so far, we have raised two elements of this approach: positive (the carrot) and negative (sticks) economic statecraft. In the case of The Gambia, the EU applied the stick while Beijing and other non-traditional donors went for the carrot.

Some scholars have tended to explain soft power away from coercion – that economic statecraft as an instrument of foreign policy is but a tool for cooperation, not for coercion. Joseph S. Nye (2004) refuses this line of argument, contending that even financial aid can alter the behavior of the receiving state, thus coercing it to think otherwise, especially when sanctions are on the table. This section will be brief and will direct attention to the use of the economic stick, similar to the one applied by the European Union to The Gambia, and to what degree such approach can affect the influence the West has had in aid-recipient countries.

When compared to the French and British who both used their economies, languages and cultures in the 17th and 18th century as instruments of soft power to assert their influence abroad (Nye, 2005), China and the Gulf, the latter in particular, can be considered as relative latecomers in the use of economic soft power as an instrument of foreign policy. However, with the end of

the Cold War, foreign policy began to witness a new paradigm shift and much emphasis on the use of the economic carrot (Hill, 2016; Mastanduno, 2012). The global threats imposed by economic and social deprivations have not only shoved away the significance of *hard* foreign policy, but have brought with them the renewed interest and frequency of economic sanctions such as financial sanctions, monetary sanctions, investment restrictions, and the withholding of aid (Mastanduno, 2012).

No matter which of the tools mentioned above is used, the primary aim of economic statecraft by states is motivated by an ambition to achieve foreign policy objectives. In The Gambia, the EU withheld an earmarked 33 million euros (\$37 million) for development projects, after Gambia's Jammeh propelled lawmakers to enact and pass a new law against homosexuality (Farge, 2015).

Beach (2012) argues that for any sanctions to be successful, the consequences of the punishment have to be higher than the consequences the target state would face if it refuses to heed pressures about reforms. However, where the effects of sanctions are less severe than the effects of reforming the target country's domestic politics, such an attempt would fail. This is what happened in The Gambia. With China and the Gulf willing to offer the carrot, Jammeh did not only refuse to implement reforms, but he declared the EU's top-diplomat in the country *persona non grata*.

The implications brought by the presence of different actors to the West's influence on aid-recipient countries can be unprecedented. Hill (2016) observes that the complexity of the international system, especially the one brought by the West's policies of economic and political reforms has "given China the opportunity to use its own new wealth to offer deals to developing countries without such derogations of sovereignty" (Hill, 2016, p. 156-157). In addition to the West's reduced political influence on aid-recipient countries, the ubiquitous presence of different actors has also enabled states like China, Qatar, and Kuwait to use their "sovereign wealth funds to great effect, giving them investment holdings around the world and implicit political leverage" (Hill, 2016, 156).

China's economic clout has given it the capacity, as Hill (2016) notes, to penetrate every part of the globe, and this has become a window of opportunity for states pursuing checkbook

diplomacy to tap into its easily accessible financial reservoir. Given the weakness of Gambia's financial muscle, it becomes rational and convincing that a partnership with China would serve Jammeh's interests – however such interests are defined. In such case, even though the financial dividend China expects would not be realized in the short run, this would nonetheless shape its image internationally.

6. DISCUSSIONS

Foreign policy, writes Hudson (2014), just like Clausewitz's famous phrase that 'war is the continuation of politics by other means', is simply "the continuation of domestic politics by other means" (Hudson, 2014, p. 141). Hudson's dictum is a fundamental one in the political lexicon of neoclassical realists. With the help of neoclassical realism, this study has looked at the domestic political and cultural variables, and the systemic variables that led Yahya Jammeh to choose new friends with different approaches to foreign aid and foreign policy. To understand Gambia's shift toward China and the Gulf, this study has started its analysis by understanding Jammeh's perceptions and misperceptions of the West, the domestic political structure, and the strategic culture in the country. These concepts are not only significant in our case, but they occupy an important position in the heart of neoclassical realism.

This study, after carefully analyzing its data, studying the systemic and unit-level variables, has found that Jammeh's (waning) image, perceptions, and misperceptions of the West are the most important concepts which can help explain his erratic foreign policy and even decisions taken at the unit-level. Jammeh's image and his distrust of the West would find expression in the country's foreign policy. He feared there was an attempt to undermine his government, because of his controversial image as a proponent of Islamic values and as an anti-imperialist.

The attempt to establish an Islamic identity in particular, can be said to be motivated, first, by his distrust of the West and its stance on Islam; and second, it was in line with his fundamental values, as he projected himself as a traditionalist on a mission to protect Islamic and African values; and third, it was an attempt to discredit the opposition which Jammeh feared would

mortgage the country's Islamic values in exchange for EU-aid. Arguably, some analysts believed his rhetoric were mere lame excuses to distract the country from key domestic problems and to get financial assistance from the Arabs and China, thus the attempt to establish an Islamic identity.

The argument goes that Islam was highly politicized, making it an instrument to garner support from the masses, despite the secularity of the country. The presidential election in the country was due in a month (November, 2011), and to open up the political environment to the opposition and critics to thrive would be amounting to a political suicide; to accept LGBTs in a country with 90% Muslims, would be tantamount to handing over a lottery ticket to the opposition as it would be seen as a departure from the country's norms and values.

However, analysts in Banjul are agreed that some of his unpopular domestic and foreign policy decisions which many believed were motivated by self-aggrandizement, became rallying calls for the opposition to unite, thus exerting more pressures on Jammeh. The alleged extrajudicial killings of coup plotters in 2006, the executions of death row inmates in 2012, the decision to withdraw the Gambia from the Commonwealth, and the attempt to stifle dissents, were few of the decisions that eroded his image.

It is conventional knowledge in foreign policy that authoritarian regimes are the ones most likely to pursue self-aggrandizing foreign policy, because, unlike big democracies, they are not often, if ever, constrained by the ubiquitous nature of bureaucratic politics. However, this does not mean that they are not constrained by other domestic structures and systemic pressures. In fact, as neoclassical realists have argued, foreign policy is the product of both unit and system level forces.

Jammeh could have loosened his grip on power, but with the fragmentation of the development aid landscape between the Western-liberal worlds on the one hand and the Gulf and China on the other hand, Jammeh, instead, crafted a new foreign policy approach known in foreign policy parlance as *checkbook diplomacy*. The turn to the Arab was a result of his perceptions of Islam,

but also the strategic attempts to both tap into their financial wealth and to also win the sympathy of the masses at home.

At the systemic level, patron states jumped in to rescue Jammeh's increasingly isolated regime. To look at their engagements with the Gambia by using the common dyadic explanation that China, for example, needs Africa for the continent's raw material, and Africa needs China for its infrastructural development objectives, will result to a narrow and parsimonious analysis. Banjul has little to offer to Beijing, but Banjul's geographical and legitimate existence would help in shaping China's place in the world vis-à-vis other global competing powers. Jammeh's desperate search for new patrons came at a time China is expanding its global outreach in order to alter the global balance of power and to establish new arrangements that reflect Beijing's place in the world.

7. REFERENCES

Albert, E. (2017). China in Africa. *Council on Foreign Relations*. Retrieved 2018 May, 02 from <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/china-africa>

BBC. (2015). EU anger over expulsion of top diplomat from The Gambia. Retrieved 2018 March 22 from <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-33035570>

BBC. (2010). Gambia cuts ties with Iran and orders diplomats to go. Retrieved 2018 April 18 from <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-11819143>

Beach, D. (2012). *Analyzing Foreign Policy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bearce, D., & Tirone, D. (2010). Foreign Aid Effectiveness and the Strategic Goals of Donor Governments. *The Journal of Politics*, 72(3), 837-851. Doi: 10.1017/s0022381610000204

Bennett-Smith, M. (2016). Yahya Jammeh, Gambia's President: 'Satanic' Homosexuals Who Visit Nation Will Regret Being Born. Retrieved 2018 May 21 from https://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/04/02/yahya-jammeh-homosexuals-gambia_n_3000249.html

Boschini, A & Olofsgård, A. (2005). Foreign Aid: an Instrument for Fighting Communism? Retrieved 2018 April 30 from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.584.4526&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Carlsnaes, W. (2012). Actors, Structures, and Foreign Policy Analysis. In Smith, S., Hafield, A., Dunne, T (Eds.) *Foreign Policy* (2. Ed., p. 133-128). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cheng-chung, W., Kuei-hsiang, W., & Hou, E. (2016, March 18). The Gambia needs financial aid from mainland China: Taiwanese official. *Focus Taiwan*. Retrieved 2018 May 12 from <http://focustaiwan.tw/news/aip1/201603180019.aspx>

Clapham, C, S. (1996). *Africa and the International System: The Politics of State Survival*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DeFreese, M. (n.d). Gambia in the ‘Age of Choice’. *Huffpost*. Retrieved 2018 April 30 from https://www.huffingtonpost.com/young-professionals-in-foreign-policy/the-gambia-in-the-age-of_b_13353824.htmlhttps://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/publication-agenda-for-change-2011_en.pdf

Dreher, A., & Fuchs, A. (2011). Rogue aid? The determinants of China’s aid allocation. Research Paper. Retrieved 2018 May 10 from <https://www.princeton.edu/politics/about/file-repository/public/Rogue-Aid-China-Aid-Allocation.pdf>

Dueck, C. (2006). *Reluctant Crusaders: Power, Culture, and Change in American Grand Strategy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

European Commission (2011). *Increasing the Impact of EU Development: an Agenda for Change*. Retrieved 2018 April 30 from https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/publication-agenda-for-change-2011_en.pdf

Farge, E. (2015, June 17). EU to keep withholding aid from Gambia after expulsion: diplomats. *Reuters*. Retrieved 2018 May 09 from <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-gambia-eu-aid-idUSKBN0OX2HZ20150617>

Fisher, M. (2013, February 5). A staggering map of the 54 countries that reportedly participated in the CIA’s rendition program. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved 2018 May 14 from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2013/02/05/a-staggering-map-of-the-54-countries-that-reportedly-participated-in-the-cias-rendition-program/?utm_term=.135bc047e334

Friedman, M., & Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace. (1995). *foreign economic aid: means and objectives*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, Stanford University.

Fung, C. J. (2016). China's Troop Contributions to U.N. Peacekeeping. *United States Institute for Peace*. Retrieved 2018 April 20 from <https://www.usip.org/publications/2016/07/chinas-troop-contributions-un-peacekeeping>

Hill, C. (2016). *Foreign Policy in the Twenty-first Century* (2nd Ed.). London: Palgrave.

Hudson, V. M. (2014). *Foreign Policy Analyses*. Lanham, Maryland: Roman & Littlefield.

Hussain, M. (2014, December 10). Middle East funds Gambia as EU cuts aid over human rights concerns. *Reuters*. Retrieved 2018 May 11 from <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-gambia-rights-donors/middle-east-funds-gambia-as-eu-cuts-aid-over-human-rights-concerns-idUSKBN0JO19520141210>

Jaw, S.M. (2017). *Restoring Democracy in the Gambia? An Analysis of Diaspora Engagement in Gambian Politics*. (Master's thesis, University of Bergen, Bergen). Retrieved 2018 March 15 from <http://hdl.handle.net/1956/16030>

Jollof Media Network. (2017). Gambia: Bodies of Killed Coupists Exhumed. Retrieved 2108 May 05 from <https://www.jollofnews.com/2017/04/02/gambia-bodies-of-killed-coupists-exhumed/>

Krasner, S. D. (1985). *The Third World Against Global Liberalism*. California: University of California Press.

Lamont, C. (2015). *Research Methods in International Relations*. London: SAGE publications.

List of development aid country donors. (2018). In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved 2018 April 18 from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_development_aid_country_donors

Mastanduno, M. (2012). Economic Statecraft. In Smith, S., Hafield, A., Dunne, T (Eds.) *Foreign Policy* (2. Ed., p. 204-221). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McGuire, C. (1952). Point Four and the National Power of the United States. *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 11(3), 343-356. Retrieved 2018 May 10 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3484279>

Mesfin, B. (2016). East Africa's Report: Qatar's Diplomatic Incursions into the Horn of Africa. *Institute for Security Studies*, issue 8. Retrieved 2018 May 14 from <https://issafrica.s3.amazonaws.com/site/uploads/ear8.pdf>

Metz, S. (2000). Refining American Strategy in Africa. *Strategic Studies Institute*. Retrieved 2018 March 28 from <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/00192.pdf>

Minteh, B. (2010). *Rethinking the Military and Democratization: The Gambia 1994- 2010: A hanging Foreign Policy, Sanctioned Aid and Insecurity*. International: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.

Minteh, B. (2015, Dec. 18). The Enigma of a Gambian Islamic State: Leadership Policy Rationale in Context. *The Freedomnewspaper*. Retrieved 2018 May 10 from <https://freedomnewspaper.com/2015/12/18/gambia-the-enigma-of-a-gambian-islamic-state-leadership-policy-rationale-in-context/>

Nye, J. S. (2004). *Soft power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs.

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2017). Development aid rises again in 2016. Retrieved 2018 May 15 from <http://www.oecd.org/newsroom/development-aid-rises-again-in-2016-but-flows-to-poorest-countries-dip.htm>

Phatey, S. (2017, August 23). Dozens of documents showing Jammeh's transaction missing. *Smbc News*. Retrieved 2018 May 16 from <https://gambia.smbcgo.com/2017/08/23/dozens-documents-showing-jammehs-transaction-missing/>

Ripsman, M, N., Taliaferro, J. W & Lobell, S. E. (2016). *Neoclassical Realist Theory of International Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rose, G. (1998). Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy. *World Politics*, 51(1), 144-172. Retrieved 2018 March 6 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25054068>

Rulers. (2018). Foreign ministers E-K. Retrieved 2018 April 21 from <http://rulers.org/fm2.html>

Saine, A. (2009). *The Paradox of Third-Wave Democratization in Africa: The Gambia under AFPRC-APRC Rule, 1994-2008*. Lanham, Maryland: Roman & Littlefield.

Shih, T, H. (2013, November 18). China to provide Africa with US\$1 tr financing. *South China Morning Post*. Retrieved 2018 May 9 from <http://www.scmp.com/business/banking-finance/article/1358902/china-provide-africa-us1tr-financing>

Sillah, B. (2017, September 22). 'Jammeh took money from Qatar as personal funds'. *The Standard*. Retrieved 2018 May 17 from <http://standard.gm/site/2017/09/22/jammeh-took-money-qatar-personal-funds/>

Singer, J. (1961). The Level-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations. *World Politics*, 14(1), 77-92. Doi: 10.2307/2009557

Sun, Y. (2014). Africa in China's Foreign Policy. *Brookings Institute*. Retrieved 2018 March 04 from <https://www.brookings.edu/research/africa-in-chinas-foreign-policy/>

Tahroor, I. (2015, May 05). Why Senegal is sending troops to help Saudi Arabia in Yemen. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved 2018 May 18
https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2015/05/05/why-senegal-is-sending-troops-to-help-saudi-arabia-in-yemen/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.ea824c795cfe

The Economist (2010). The China model: The Beijing consensus is to keep quiet. Retrieved 2018 March 15 from <https://www.economist.com/node/16059990>

The Gambia: AF DAS Thomas-Greenfield's Meeting with President Jammeh. (2006, July 6). In *Wikileaks*. Retrieved 2018 March 3 from
https://search.wikileaks.org/plusd/cables/06BANJUL422_a.html

The Point Newspaper. (2013). Jammeh tells UN General Assembly gays a threat to human existence. Retrieved 2018 May 19 from <http://thepoint.gm/africa/gambia/article/jammeh-tells-un-general-assembly-gays-a-threat-to-human-existence>

The World Bank. (2017). Gambia: Country Overview. Retrieved 2018 March 22 from <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/gambia/overview>

US Department of Defense. (2016). *Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China 2016* (2016 RefID: 117FA69). Washington: Pentagon.

Webber, M., Smith, S., Allen, D., Collins, A., Morgan, D., & Ehteshami, A. (2014). *Foreign Policy in a Transformed World*. Third Avenue, New York: Routledge.

Wohlforth, W. (2008). Realism and Foreign Policy. In Smith, S., Hadfield, A., & Tim Dunne (Ed.), *Realism in Foreign Policy* (p. 35-53). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yitzhak, S. (1979). *The Middle East in China's foreign policy, 1949-1977*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zakaria, F. (1992). Realism and Domestic Politics: A Review Essay. *International Security*, 17(1), 177-198. Doi: 10.2307/2539162

Zeldin, W. (2009). *Taiwan: Former President Given Life Sentence on Charges of Corruption*. Retrieved 2018 May 05 from the website of the Library of Congress:
<http://www.loc.gov/law/foreign-news/article/taiwan-former-president-given-life-sentence-on-charges-of-corruption/>