

Eve, Zvichanzi Nyemba

University of Zimbabwe

Email Address: evenyemba@yahoo.co.uk

Eve is a doctoral student and lecturer at the University of Zimbabwe in the department of Political and Administrative studies. She lectures on international relations, diplomacy and contemporary political theory.

Zimbabwe's Post – Independence Foreign Policy Trajectory in a Transforming International System

Key Words: Colonisation, Independence, Sovereignty, Indigeneity, Multipolarity, Bipolarity, Unipolarity, Globalization, neo- liberalism, communism, redistributive policies and imperialism.

Abstract

Zimbabwe, formerly known as Southern Rhodesia, gained its independence from British colonial rule on 18 April 1980. The key principles guiding Zimbabwe's foreign policy after independence were national sovereignty and equality among nations, attainment of a socialist, egalitarian and democratic society, rights of all peoples to self-determination and independence, non-racialism at home and abroad, positive nonalignment and peaceful co-existence among nations. This guiding framework focused on Pan –Africanism, reordering of the international economic order, exchange of ideas, culture and trade. The fall of the Berlin wall and the subsequent conclusion of the cold war in 1989 ushered in a unipolar order and culminated in the warming of Zimbabwe's relations with the global North. Conversely, the failure of neo-liberalism, Britain's abrogation of its responsibility for compensation of resettled white farmers, implementation of the chaotic and contested Fast Track Land Reform Programme, economic demise, disputed elections and growing authoritarianism culminated in the escalation of acrimonious relations between the Southern African country and the West. The shifting global balance of power is creating new centres of power and transforming the international order, particularly, the rise of China, India and Brazil and the resurgence of Russia. It is thus, the aim of this paper to analyse the effectiveness of the adoption of the Look East Policy by Zimbabwe amidst shifting global power dynamics. The guiding questions include the following; to what extent has the global financial crisis eroded the West's hegemonic dominance in international economic relations? What are the implications of Zimbabwe's Indigenous Economic Empowerment Policies on its East – West relations? What are the prospects of normalisation of relations between Zimbabwe and the West? Is Zim – West Rapprochement a viable foreign policy option? What should be the guiding framework in the formulation and implementation of Zimbabwe's foreign policy in a transforming international system? Triangulated qualitative methods including inter alia, documentary review and key informant interviews were utilised. Data were analysed through thematic and discourse analysis. It is imperative to note that both the internal and external environment have a plausible impact on Zimbabwe's foreign policy choices. Zimbabwe

should therefore, adopt multilateralism to safeguard its strategic interests in a threatening international system.

1.0. Introduction

Zimbabwe's foreign policy trajectory since her attainment of Independence has had a mixed record. From being the "darling" of the West in the 1980s amidst the consolidation of independence, stability and socio-economic development, the country was in the late 1990s and early 2000's, labelled as a "pariah state"¹ and "an outpost of tyranny"² in the midst of increasing political and economic turmoil, economic decline and rising Zim – West³ tensions. The implementation of indigenous redistributive policies such as the Fast Track Land Reform Programme (FTLRP) of 2000 and the Indigenous Economic Empowerment Act (IEEA), Chapter 14:33, Act 14/2007 attracted an avalanche of criticism from those who deem Mugabe's policies (domestic and foreign) as destructive and acclaims of glory from those who are or were muddled under a crippling sanctions regime⁴, a seemingly, debilitating dependency syndrome and a crumbling unipolar order. The failure of liberal IMF and World Bank economic policies, particularly, the Economic Structural Adjustment Programmes (ESAP) and deteriorating relations between Zimbabwe the United Kingdom (UK), European Union (EU), United States of America (USA), Australia and other like minded nations as well as the suspension and subsequent withdrawal of the country from the Commonwealth in 2003, culminated in the adoption of the Look East Policy, focusing primarily on China as an alternative development partner in the backdrop of the Global Financial Crisis (GFC) and demise of western hegemony in international economic relations.

¹Zimbabwe was termed a pariah state because of its isolationist policies.

<http://www.southerneye.co.zw/2015/04/14/outposts-of-tyranny/>

² "The term, "outpost of tyranny", was popularized in January 2005 by the then United States Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, referring, broadly, to certain countries where repressive governments show contempt for democracy and human rights. Zimbabwe was one of the countries cited by Rice, along with Cuba, Burma, North Korea, Iran and Belarus". Zoot, Zimbabwe: Outpost of Tyranny, a Chronicle of Continuing Abuses of a Regime and a "Coup De Main" To Assist Comrades Working for Change, October 19, 2006

<http://zimbabweoutpostoftyranny.typepad.com/> .

³ The West refers to any country that is significantly shaped enough by European/Western culture that its mainstream society develops a European/Westernised culture. Among these countries are, the United States of America, United Kingdom & Ireland, Western & Central Europe, Denmark, Scandinavia, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and some Latin American countries, Finland, Iceland and to some extent Mediterranean Europe, http://www.answers.com/Q/What_are_the_List_of_western_countries_in_the_world

⁴ Countries like Cuba, Venezuela, Lybia, Russia and China have supported Zimbabwe at some point.

Like any other country, Zimbabwe's foreign policy has been largely influenced by the external and internal environment. It is therefore imperative, to discuss the course of Zimbabwe's post independence foreign policy framework by analysing the impact of the country's colonial legacy on its relations with the West, particularly, the defacto apartheid system and the method of independence, inter alia, the protracted liberation struggle. In the same vein, this paper will analyse the implications of Zimbabwe's domestic policies, particularly, the implementation of the Indigenisation Economic Empowerment Policies on its East⁵ – West relations. The study will focus on the implementation of the FTLRP and the IEEA. It will analyse the effectiveness of the adoption of the LEP by Zimbabwe amidst shifting polarities in the international system. In addition, the paper will assess the facilitating and inhabiting factors towards the normalisation of Zimbabwe – West relations and recommend a viable guiding framework in the formulation and implementation of Zimbabwe's foreign policy in a multi-polar world. This paper will therefore trace Zimbabwe's pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial relations and how these have influenced Zimbabwe's foreign policy making and implementation.

1.1. Research Methodology

A purposive sampling frame guided the study. The study triangulated the qualitative methods of documentary reviews and key informant interviews. A review of keys documents on Zimbabwe's foreign policy was conducted. Foreign policy pronouncements, diplomatic communication, government publications, various texts, journals, articles and archived documents were instrumental in examining the trends, patterns, fluctuations, inconsistencies and imbalances in the formulation and implementation of Zimbabwe's foreign policy. In addition, the history, values, structures, and legacies that have shaped Zimbabwe's foreign policy options were examined using documentary review. Interviews with key informants from select embassies in Harare were conducted to ascertain the determinants and evolving nature of Zimbabwe's foreign policy. Key informants from Zimbabwe's Ministry of Foreign Affairs were also instrumental in providing insights on the shift of Zimbabwe's foreign policy particularly, its deliberate focus of the "Look East' Policy on China and not other

⁵ The East generally refers to Central Asia (comprising Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan), the Far East (comprising mainland China, Hong Kong, Japan, Macau, Mongolia, North Korea, South Korea, and Taiwan in East Asia; Russian Far East in North Asia; plus Brunei, Cambodia, East Timor, Indonesia, Laos etc, <http://blog.dictionary.com/east>.

Asian countries such as Singapore, Malaysia, and India and to some extent Iran. Data were analysed and presented using emerging themes from the study.

1.2. Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

Chandra (2006:1) defines foreign policy, “as a systematic statement of deliberating selected national interests”. Foreign policy refers to a government’s policy position regarding its relations with other states to promote the aggrandizement of its goals or objectives in the international arena. Rodee (et al 1957) support the above definition when they argue that “foreign policy involves the formulation and implementation of a group of principles which shape the behaviour pattern of a state while negotiating with other states to protect or further its vital interest”. Diplomatic negotiations are an integral part of foreign policy formulation and implementation as diplomacy is a peaceful avenue for the settlement of disputes. Hence, each state posts its diplomatic personnel either they be chancelliers, chargé d’affaires, attaches or minister counsellors to further their foreign policy goals.

Mudyadzo (2011:2) postulates that, “foreign policy involves translating broadly conceived national goals and objectives into concrete courses of action to attain prescribed goals and objectives and prescribe national interests”. This assertion denotes that the domestic environment influences the foreign policy formulation and implementation process. Zimbabwe’s foreign policy has largely been a resultant reflection of its domestic policies. In support of the above assertion, the Zimbabwe Ministry of Foreign Affairs ⁶, notes that,

...the foreign policy of a country can be defined as a set of goals that seek to outline how that country will interface at an official level with other countries of the world and, to a lesser extent, with non-state actors in pursuit of its national economic, political, social and cultural interests.

The definitions above connote that the promotion of a nation’s vital interests is at the heart of the formulation and implementation of foreign policy. Foreign policy is therefore, based upon a general conception of national requirements. Roskin (1994: iii) defines the national interest as a “composite declaration derived from those values a nation prizes most”. Most nations

⁶ Zimbabwe Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2005,
http://www.zimfa.gov.zw/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=105&Itemid=491

value liberty, freedom and security from external and internal aggression which is why Zimbabwe's President, Robert Gabriel Mugabe has often reiterated that "Zimbabwe is a sovereign country and will never be a colony again", Centre for Peace Initiatives (2005:56). Yan Xue-Tong (2002:16) posits that the concept of the national interest was raised by "Nicolo Machiavelli in Italy, Jean Bodin in France, Hugo Grotius of Holland and Thomas Hobbes in England who noted that a state's political behaviour should be subject to concerns of the national interest". Moreover, they elaborated on the rationale for taking the national interest into account in the development of foreign policy. Each state's foreign policy objectives are therefore embodiments of its national interest. Consequently, Roskin (1994: iii) connotes that "national interests are expressed as territorial integrity, economic prosperity, political sovereignty and the survival of a state". Hence each state seeks to maximise its vital national interests to survive in a hostile international environment which classical realist, Hobbes depicted as "a war of every man against every man," Yurdusev (2006:310).

1.3. Historical Overview to Zimbabwe's Foreign Policy

Since 1980 there has been an organic link between the method of independence, that is, the armed struggle (the Second Chimurenga from 1966-1980) for Zimbabwe's independence, its values and beliefs, domestic policy and foreign policy, Patel in Chan and Patel, (2006:175) This organic link underpins Zimbabwe's highly active and visible foreign policy, especially since the chief maker and articulator of Zimbabwe's foreign policy, President Robert Mugabe, and other major policy makers were leaders in the armed struggle. It is therefore imperative, to give a brief synopsis of Zimbabwe's colonial history to understand Zimbabwe's activist pan – Africanist and anti-imperial foreign policy.

1.4. Historical Overview of the Establishment of the State of Zimbabwe

1.4.1. Background to the Establishment of Rhodesia

Zimbabwe acquired its name from constructed stone structures called "Great Zimbabwe" built in stages between 800 and 1500 A.D.⁷. These structures are the second largest in Africa after the pyramids of Egypt. Zimbabwe, formerly known as Rhodesia, attained independence in 1980 from British Colonial rule. Rhodesia, the colonial state, was named after Cecil John Rhodes's pioneer column traipsed into Mashonaland to establish Fort Salisbury, the capital of

⁷ (<http://www.zimembassy.se/history.html>),

Rhodesia⁸. King Lobengula through the signing of various mining concessions and treaties which culminated in the signing of the Rudd concession on 30 October 1888, inadvertently, gave authority to Britain to colonise Zimbabwe. According to Matshobana (2015:1), Lobengula was tricked into signing over his Kingdom to the authority of Cecil John Rhodes, hence the beginning of the colonisation of Zimbabwe⁹. The Rudd Concession was a written concession given by Lobengula to Charles Rudd, James Rochfort Maguire and Francis Thompson, representatives of the British South Africa Company (BSAC), owned by the South African-based politician and businessman Cecil Rhodes (Ibid).

The signing of the Rudd Concession, gave Cecil John Rhodes, exclusive mineral rights and territorial concessions enabling him through a royal charter granted by the United Kingdom, to establish British colonial rule of Matabeleland and Mashonaland between the Limpopo and Zambezi rivers, and prohibited all Boer settlement in the region”. In exchange for exclusive mining rights, the Rudd Concession made provision for the payment to Lobengula of 100 pounds a month, 1,000 rifles, 10,000 rounds of ammunition, and a riverboat. Lobengula hoped that by signing the Rudd Concession, he would limit European incursions, but instead, white settler control increased with the establishment by the BSAC of its own government and laws in 1890. Rhodesia was established in 1895 as a state that “held sovereignty over the region between the Limpopo and Zambezi rivers to the north and south, and between the desert of the Makgadikgadi salt pans to the west and the realm of Shoshangana to the east, the Save River” Matshobana (2015: 1). King Lobengula tried to disavow the Rudd Concession by sending emissaries to meet Queen Victoria at Windsor Castle citing deceit by the concessionaires regarding the settled terms. However, his efforts were unfruitful leading to the first Matabele War (November 1893 – January 1894) and the First Chimurenga War (1896-1897) where the Ndebele and Shona people tried to free themselves from the yoke of colonialism. These Wars

⁸ (<http://www.historytoday.com/paul-moorcraft/rhodesias-war-independence#sthash.b0mX9vab.dpuf>)

⁹ <http://www.bulawayo1872.com/history/lobengula.htm>

...were highly criticized because of the British use of the Maxim gun, a machine gun that the Matabele and Mashona had no match against. This made the wars less of actual wars and more massacres.¹⁰

The failure to win these wars marked the beginning of Zimbabwe's long history of colonialism which began in 1890 up to 1980. At the heart of colonialism, lies the land issue which necessitated the farm invasions in the late 1990s and early 2000s. It is important to note that "land question" was at the centre of the negotiations which led to the signing of the Lancaster House constitution in 1979. The land issue has therefore invariably, been an important component of Zimbabwe- British bilateral relations. It has inevitably, been central to bilateral Zimbabwe – USA relations. Consequently, it has been at the nucleus of Zimbabwe-West relations. Ultimately, the resolution to the land crisis in Zimbabwe, lies at the core of normalisation of Zimbabwe – West relations as shall be discussed in this paper. The following section, will examine how Zimbabwe's colonial legacy has shaped the ruling ZANU PF's revolutionary ideology which has influenced the formulation and implementation of Zimbabwe's foreign policy since the country attained independence.

1.5. The Colonial Period

Zimbabwe's colonial period stretched from 1890 to 1980. According to Mazingi and Kamidza (2009:322),

“the economic inequalities exhibited in Zimbabwe can largely be attributed to the racial dominance of the white settlers in the colonial period and the manner in which scarce resources are being distributed to and accessed by different groups in the post-colonial period. Of the above, the land issue has throughout history remained central to racial, income and gender inequality discourse in the country”.

So central is the land issue to domestic and foreign policy in Zimbabwe that a section of this paper has been devoted to analysing the root of acrimonious Zimbabwe – West relations. Ranger (1981) notes that the BSAC, on a mineral exploration expedition, discovered that the climate and the soils were suitable for agricultural production and therefore, white farmer s from the United Kingdom came to settle in Rhodesia. After the failure of the first and second

¹⁰ <http://zimbabweandrelatedtopics.weebly.com/zimbabwe-under-britain.html>,

Chimurenga, the BSAC expropriated land and massively displacement the indigenous people from the land. They confiscated their cattle and exploited their labour. Racist and oppressive policies and laws were put in place to ensure total subjugation of the indigenous people.

Mazingi and Kamidza (2009:323) note that the inequalities were so acute that the whites on one hand constituted 4% of the country's population but controlled over 90% of the economy in terms of owning the means of production that is land, capital and labour. On the other hand, the blacks accounted for 96% of the population but only controlled 10% of the economy. The Land Apportionment Act (LAA) of 1930 and the Land Tenure Act of 1969 were enacted by the white settler government to entrench the segregation of the black majority (Ibid). These pieces of legislation gave credence to the ownership of about 18 million hectares of the best fertile arable land which is mostly in agro-ecological regions I, II and III, with good rainfall patterns. Most blacks were settled under Tribal Trust Lands with the worst, remote, low lying, in some cases tsetse fly-ridden poor soil, unreliable rainfall and less suitable for meaningful agricultural activities in agro-ecological regions IV and V, was left to black peasant farmers (Fink, 1981).

The Native Land Husbandry Act of 1951 allowed white farmers and cattle rangers to breed an unlimited stock of cattle. Black communal farmers were restricted to breed only 6 herds of cattle per household (Mazingi and Kamidza, 2009:323). Other discriminatory legislation enacted included, the Industrial Conciliation Act of 1934, as amended in 1959 which promoted inequality by creating “a job colour bar” that restricted urban black workers to mainly menial jobs. The Urban Registration and Accommodation Act of 1954 created African townships (ghettos) for black workers in urban areas whose dwelling units were mostly “hostels”, which lacked proper sanitation. The notorious Pass Laws of 1902 regulated the movement of black people in the settler areas (Ibid: 324).

It is against this backdrop of racially-grounded inequalities, discrimination, unequal access to resources, and denial to basic freedoms that led the military wings of the Zimbabwe African National Union – Patriotic Front (ZANU-PF) and the Zimbabwe African Peoples' Union (ZAPU) to fight the colonial regime between 1966 and 1979 (Ibid:323). The liberation war – the second Chimurenga - was protracted and ruthless on both sides. Eventually, Ian Douglas

Smith, who in 1965 had unilaterally declared independence from the British Administration, gave in and negotiated a political settlement at Lancaster House in London, United Kingdom, in 1979, that culminated in the country's political independence on 18 April 1980. However, this agreement gave the new regime limited constitutional options for redressing the "land question" since it was bound by the "willing buyer – willing seller" principle for the first 10 years of independence. The provisions effectively protected the interests of white settlers by maintaining not only the status quo on land, but also their grip on the economy, (opcit, 323).

1.6. The Impact of Zimbabwe's Colonial Legacy on its Relations with the West

To understand Zimbabwe's foreign policy, one has to perceive it as a continuation of the revolution of independence. The domestic environment, particularly, Zimbabwe's political culture has largely influenced its foreign relations. Political culture refers to society's long held and fundamental practices and attitudes that have shaped a country and its citizens (The Centre for Peace Initiatives, (2005:56.) In the case of Zimbabwe, colonial oppression and the liberation struggle have had a profound impact on Zimbabwe's international relations, particularly, the implementation of the revolutionary style FTLRP. Zimbabwe – West relations have soured considerably over the land issue. Chigora, (2007:170) connotes that Zimbabwe received widespread condemnation particularly because of the implementation of "the controversial land reform". The resultant effects included,

the enactment of the Zimbabwe Democracy and Economic Recovery Act in the United States, suspension of Zimbabwe from the International Monetary Fund, suspension and subsequent withdrawal of Zimbabwe from the Commonwealth, suspension of Aid in social services by some Nordic countries, the imposition of sanctions by the European Union and damning reports on human rights abuse, non-adherence to the rule of law and massive rigging of elections (Ibid).

The Zimbabwe Democracy and Economic Recovery Act (ZDERA) was promulgated on 4 Dec 2001. Section 3 (1) of the Act prohibits US assistance to the government of Zimbabwe and Section 3 (2) prohibits cancellation or reduction of any debt owed by Zimbabwe to the US government. It also prohibits US Officials in the Bretton Woods institutions from voting in favour of assistance to Zimbabwe except for humanitarian purposes.

Chingono (2010: 66) asserts that The United Kingdom and United States joined forces in 2002 to call for its allies to impose sanctions on Zimbabwe. On 18 February 2002, following the expulsion of the EU head of election monitoring mission, the Swedish diplomat Pierre Schori accused of interfering with the elections, EU introduced restrictive sanctions on President Mugabe and some senior government officials from travelling in and around Europe and freezing of personal assets and bank accounts. In September 2002, the Howard government in Australia imposed targeted sanctions on members of the Zimbabwe government in protests against the deteriorating political situation in Zimbabwe. These included travel restrictions, arms embargo and targeted financial sanctions. What is unique about the Australian sanctions is that the government went on to remove children of some notable senior government officials who were studying in Australia.

Smith – Hohn (2010:2) states that one of the objectives of the arms embargo was to weaken the capacity of what was seen as an increasingly repressive regime to oppress its own population. As for other international bodies and regional organisations such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), in the case where restrictions were placed on the former Mugabe regime or diplomatic or financial ties severed, these were resumed in the wake of the inauguration of the IG. Moreover, these measures are not to be confused with sanctions, as they were imposed as a result of the actions of the Mugabe regime, (Ibid:3) The IMF, for instance, had severed ties with Zimbabwe for over a decade because of its failure to pay its debt arrears, which currently stand at US\$ 144 million. Similarly, the World Bank (WB), which had provided a total of US\$1.6 billion in assistance between 1980 and 2000, suspended its lending to Zimbabwe in 2000 when the country went into arrears. However, this does not mean that the Bank disengaged from Zimbabwe entirely. It currently provides technical assistance and analysis in the areas of macroeconomic policy, food security/agrarian sector, social sector expenditures and delivery, infrastructure assessment, as well as providing support for the HIV/AIDS programme.

Zimbabwe's colonial legacy of centralised authoritarianism has largely influenced its foreign relations. The government is concerned about its own survival in power and everything it does from policy making and implementation revolves around the obsession to survive. Internationally or internally, the policy thrust is survival at all costs. According to a key informant from the department of Political and administrative studies,

“Instead of breaking with culture, the new black government could not mutate into a government that serves the people”. In effect, what the government defines as national interest is regime interest.

1.7. The Third Chimurenga

Sachikonye (2005:1) notes that when Zimbabwe gained independence in 1980, the pattern of land ownership indicated that 6,000 white farmers owned 15.5 million hectares; 8,500 black farmers operating on a small scale held about 1.4 million hectares; and approximately 4.5 million communal farmers eked out subsistence livelihoods on 16.4 million hectares¹¹.. Given this background, it is imperative to note that the principal elements of the land question were focused on historical injustice and inequity which necessitated the need for land reform programme.

Sachikonye (2005) notes that the fast-track reform programme (FTRP) that began in 2000 entailed a comprehensive redistribution of land that was accomplished with considerable chaos, disorder and violence. An estimate of 11 million hectares changing hands within a three-year period, it was the largest property transfer ever to occur in the region in peacetime (Ibid). The FTLRP facilitated the replacement of nearly 4,000 white farmers whose land had been transferred by the state to 7,200 black commercial farmers and 127,000 black recipients of small farms by October 2003. These farmers were resettled under a new large-scale farming class under the A2 model and a household-based small-scale farming class under the A1 model.

Defending the implementation of the FTLRP, President Robert Mugabe in a speech to the United Nations Millennium Summit on September 8, 2000 argued that¹²

In Zimbabwe, and only because of the colour line arising from British colonialism, 70 percent of the best arable land is owned by less than 1 percent of the population who

¹¹ <https://www.issafrica.org/topics/conflict-prevention-and-analysis/01-sep-2005-the-land-is-the-economy.-revisiting-the-land-question-in-zimbabwe-lloyd-sachikonye>

¹² Pan. E (2003) Africa: Mugabe's Zimbabwe, Council on Foreign Relations. <http://www.cfr.org/zimbabwe/africa-mugabes-zimbabwe/p7723> (accessed on 8/18/2015)

happen to be white, while the black majority are congested on barren land. We have sought to redress this inequity through a land reform and resettlement program" that will result in "economic and social justice and [adhere to] our constitution and laws.

Patel in Chan and Patel(2006:178) puts it more succinctly by noting that

the promulgation of the indigenization and black empowerment policies, the 1980 – 90 ‘willing buyer-willing seller’ land reform programme, and the fast-track land reform programme since 2000 have resulted in a historically and morally necessary massive redistribution of income, wealth and ownership to the majority population.

Whilst the land reform was conducted in an attempt at redistributive justice, it is important to note that the process which was ridden by anarchy has created a sense of uncertainty among land owners. The lack of proper title deeds and the allocation of 99 year leases to the new farmers, creates problems of lack of access to funding through financial institutions and uncertainty of land tenure.

1.8. Implications of Zimbabwe’s Economic Reform Policies on its Relations with the West

Pan. E (2003) contends that the FLTRP was a controversial program of forced land redistribution seized from white commercial farms to blacks which culminated in economic decline, food insecurity, investor flight, widespread poverty and international alienation. The rationale for land reform has been a cause of debate. Whilst others (Patel in Chan and Patel, 2006:178) claim it was morally justifiable, others claim that it was not. Pan. E (2003) argues that the FTLRP was motivated by the desire to hold on to power by Robert Mugabe, appease a restive population and fine-tune his exit strategy. Britain offered £44 million to the new government for land resettlement projects; critics say much of the money and land went to Mugabe and his cronies instead of the poor (Ibid). Other international donors have stopped funding government land reform for fear of similar outcomes.

According to a key informant who was commenting on the condition of anonymity, The Third Chimurenga (signifying all indigenous economic empowerment policies) was politically motivated to serve the interests of the ruling elite of regime survival and longevity. The FTLRP was usurped by groups close to ZANU PF, particularly, the War Veterans. It was

violent and chaotic, sending a wrong message to the international community of anarchy in Zimbabwe. He reiterated that,

...where there is no guarantee of property; no one would want to risk involvement in chaos. Investors are waiting for the end of Mugabe and his inner circle. The climate is not conducive for investment. The Mega deals have not materialised with China. There is no certainty in the empowerment policies. One moment Mugabe's he says the policies need to be revisited, the next he is solidifying their implementation...

This lack of consistency in policy – making coupled with the ill-managed succession issue have resulted in lack of investor confidence and capital flight.

The Third Chimurenga was fashioned by political considerations. It has benefited the upper echelons of the ruling elite at the expense of the masses. The Indigenisation Economic Empowerment Act (IEEA) whilst necessary in its attempt to empower marginalised Zimbabweans, particularly blacks it has benefited the regime's elites at the expense of the poor masses. The policy promotes the ownership of 51% of all companies by indigenous people pitted against the remaining 49% ownership by foreigners. The IEEA is therefore, unfavourable to investors. In other countries like Dubai, for instance, investors can own 100% of the company; hence their policies are attractive to investors. The implementation of indigenous policies, coupled by the lack of a long term sense of security and transparency in the implementation of the policy, investors have shied away from investing in Zimbabwe as it is not lucrative. History has indicated that there is no certainty in the Zimbabwean policy making and implementation process. Therefore its relations with international investors will remain murky until there is a decisive policy shift in the domestic environment .

2.0. Actors in Zimbabwe's Foreign Policy

The president is the chief maker and articulator of Zimbabwe's foreign policy. In addition, the Politburo and the Central Committee of the ruling party, the Zimbabwe African National Union – Patriotic Front (Zanu – PF), the cabinet, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Office of the President and Cabinet, other ministries, Parliament, the Reserve Bank of Zimbabwe, Central Intelligence Organisation (CIO) and parastatals are active in foreign policy making in Zimbabwe, Patel in Chan and Patel (2006:176). The CIO was central to Mugabe's

breakthrough in Mozambique. According to Chan in Chan and Patel (2006:180), it worked closely, ironically, with the American CIA. When Mugabe went to meet the Mozambican rebel leader, Dhlakama, in Malawi in early 1992, the Zimbabwean Ministry of Foreign Affairs had neither involvement nor even knowledge of what happened until after it had happened (Ibid). This shows that there is centralisation of foreign policy making in Zimbabwe and that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is marginalised in foreign policy making. Chigora, 2007:172 notes that such a position reflects an undemocratic way of governing as power is vested in an individual with no checks and balances, hence the tendency for a dictatorial system of governance.

2.1. Determinants of Zimbabwe's Foreign Policy

Nkiwane (1999:204) identifies five factors that have shaped Zimbabwe's foreign policy since 1980 as being, "decolonization and the liberation of Africa, sovereignty and the equality of states, underdevelopment and economic development in the Third World, combating racism and apartheid and the relative merits of socialism and capitalism". Zimbabwe has placed tremendous emphasis on the safeguarding of its sovereignty and territorial integrity whilst promoting the ideals of non – interference in the affairs of other states. Mugabe at a speech to ZANU-PF Congress on 5 December 2003 reiterated that,

... "If the choice was made for us, one for us to lose our sovereignty and become a member of the Commonwealth or to remain with our sovereignty and lose membership of the Commonwealth, then I would say, then let the Commonwealth go. What is it to us? Our people are overjoyed, the land is ours. We are now the rulers and owners of Zimbabwe¹³".

The statement above depicts that the Zimbabwean government does not tolerate "interference" in its internal affairs. It instead chooses to chart its own destiny even at the risk of international condemnation and isolation. According to an Ambassador who preferred to respond on the condition of anonymity, the suspension and subsequent withdrawal from the Commonwealth of Zimbabwe lowered the prestige of Zimbabwe. It created a negative image of the country pitted against human rights abuses, lack of rule of law, violation of the 1991

¹³ ZANU-PF Congress on 5 December 2003, https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Robert_Mugabe.

Harare Declaration on democratic governance. Commonwealth scholarships are no longer available to Zimbabweans and Zimbabwe cannot participate in Commonwealth games.

Patel in Chan and Patel (2006:176) outlines the key principles of Zimbabwe's foreign policy as enunciated by the then Prime Minister, Robert Mugabe in August 1980 in his speech at the United Nations. These principles include the following, national sovereignty and equality among nations, attainment of a socialist, egalitarian and democratic society, right of all peoples to self-determination and independence, non-racialism at home and abroad, positive nonalignment and peaceful co-existence among nations. A key defining feature of Zimbabwe's foreign policy after independence was non – alignment as it sought to distance itself from identification with either the communist or capitalist bloc during the cold war period. The cold war period occurred between 1945-1992¹⁴ and it refers to contestations “after World War II between the USSR and its satellites and the democratic countries of the Western world, under the leadership of the USA¹⁵”. This rivalry was centred on the struggle for supremacy in ideological, political, military, technological and economic advancement between the two countries.

At the centre of the cold war was the clash of ideologies, of capitalism versus communism. Each ideology was held with almost religious conviction, forming the basis of an international power struggle with both sides vying for dominance and exploiting every opportunity for expansion anywhere in the world¹⁶. Many proxy wars were fought among them, the Vietnam war between North Vietnam supported by the USSR and allies and South Vietnam supported by the USA and allies from 1955-1975, the Angola Civil war between The National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA) rebels led by Jonas Savimbi and the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) led by Jose Eduardo Dos Santos (1974-2002) and the Aghan –Soviet war from 1979 – 1989. The newly independent Zimbabwe, sought to avoid proxy wars to steer her developmental agenda. Notwithstanding this, it was evident that Zimbabwe had close associations with countries such as Cuba which were aligned to the communist bloc which often created friction with the West. However, Zimbabwe's principle of non-alignment ensured that Zimbabwe was not co-opted into cold

¹⁴ <http://www.3ad.com/history/cold.war/timeline.cold.war.htm>

¹⁵ Cold war, Dictionary.com, <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/cold+war>

¹⁶ Trueman, N, 2015, What Was the Cold War? <http://www.historylearningsite.co.uk/modern-world-history-1918-to-1980/the-cold-war/what-was-the-cold-war/>

war rivalries between the USSR and the US. In present day international relations, the principle of non-alignment has lost currency with the demise of the loose bipolar system¹⁷ and the dissolution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) precipitated by the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1991. However, the Non – Aligned Movement (NAM) is still existent and there is great debate among scholars on its relevance in an international system which has since evolved into a unipolar¹⁸ order and is currently transforming into a multipolar international system¹⁹.

As an emerging independent country, the ideals of Pan Africanism were at the heart of Zimbabwe's foreign policy as it sought to assist countries which were not yet independent through the ambit of the Frontline States. Zimbabwe herself had received military, diplomatic, logistical and material support during the liberation struggle from the early members of the Frontline States such as Zambia, Tanzania, Botswana and Mozambique. After attaining independence, Zimbabwe became a member of the Frontline States and she embraced the goal of liberating the rest of the Southern African countries from the vestiges of colonialism. South African efforts to destabilise the Frontline States by funding rivalry parties in Mozambique (through RENAMO), Angola (through UNITA), Zambia (through the Mushala Group) and Zimbabwe (through ZAPU)²⁰ failed as they were concerted efforts by all states to end civil wars and prevent escalation of the crises. South Africa's goal was to dissuade the Frontline states from offering assistance to the African National Congress (ANC) and prevent the dismantling of the apartheid system. However, international pressure including sanctions, and popular resistance from the black majorities culminated in Namibia's independence in 1990 and South Africa's self determination in 1994. Zimbabwe was also instrumental in promoting peace and security in various African like the Democratic

¹⁷ Bipolarity depicted the balance of power system centred on relatively two equal centres of power in the international system. It was premised upon the quest for hegemony by two superpowers, the US and Russia during the cold war.

¹⁸ A Unipolar system describes a distribution of power in which there is one state with most dominant cultural, economic and military influence, <http://politics-themasterscience.blogspot.com/2012/01/unipolarity-bipolarity-multipolarity.html>. After the conclusion of the cold war period, the USA assumed hegemony in international relations. Its leadership in the Gulf wars and control of most international organisations like the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund and World Bank depicts that the USA is a global hegemon.

¹⁹ Multipolarity in international politics describes a distribution of power in which more than two nation-states have nearly equal amounts of military, cultural and economic influence, <http://politics-themasterscience.blogspot.com/2012/01/unipolarity-bipolarity-multipolarity.html>.

²⁰ Bhebhe, N, The Sunday News, Frontline States and African Liberation, Sunday, May 17, 2015, <http://www.sundaynews.co.zw/frontline-states-and-african-liberation/>.

Republic of Congo in 1999. Conversely, during Mugabe's tenure as SADC and AU chair, he has failed to resolve the festering Lesotho and Madagascar crises. This was summed up by Stephen Chan, professor of world politics at the School of Oriental and African Studies at the University of London, who bluntly stated that "I think president Mugabe accomplished very little in his time as chairman of SADC²¹". Consequently, Mugabe has failed to champion the SADC Industrialisation strategy to promote Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) in Southern Africa through , a long-term strategy anchored on value addition and beneficiation of natural resources²². Zimbabwe's policies are simply unattractive to other African countries which have since the early 2000's seen Zimbabwe's continued economic downturn, lack of FDI, a debilitating sanctions regime, acrimonious foreign relations and isolationist policies.

2.2. Zimbabwe's Foreign Policy Objectives

The Zimbabwe Ministry of Foreign Affairs outlines the country's foreign policy objectives as the

...safeguarding the country's sovereignty and territorial integrity; the protection of its prestige and image; the pursuit of policies that improve the standard of living of all Zimbabweans wherever they are; and the creation and maintenance of an international environment conducive for the attainment of these goals".

A close analysis of the above objectives indicates that the principles guiding the formulation and implementation of Zimbabwe's foreign policy have not changed fundamentally. The only significant change to its objectives has been the removal of the objective of positive non-alignment as a result of the conclusion of the cold war period signified by the fall of the Berlin wall in 1989. To support this view, the Zimbabwe Ministry of Foreign Affairs²³ indicates that,

²¹ Phiri. G, Mugabe to Surrender SADC Chairmanship, Daily News, 12 August 2015, <http://www.dailynews.co.zw/articles/2015/08/12/mugabe-to-surrender-sadc-chairmanship>

²² Ibid.

²³ http://www.zimfa.gov.zw/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=105&Itemid=491

...in the creation and pursuit of these objectives, Zimbabwe is guided by its belief in self-determination and support for liberation movements; adherence to the principle of national sovereignty; respect for territorial integrity of all countries; promotion of the principle of equality among nations; belief in non-discrimination, whether based on colour, creed, religion or other forms; and the promotion of peaceful settlement of disputes and non-interference in the internal affairs of other states”.

2.2.1. Self – determination and Support for Liberation Movements

Zimbabwe has continued to support the Saharawi Arab Democratic Republic (SADR) also known as Western Sahara in its quest for independence and self – determination. Director for Africa, Asia and the Pacific at Zimbabwe Foreign Affairs Ministry, Mr. Jonathan Wutawunashe reiterated that,²⁴

Zimbabwe’s position in defending the legitimate right of the people of the SADR “is strict and unchangeable”.

The SADR is a former Spanish colony. It is involved in a territorial dispute with Morocco which claims that the SADR is part of Morocco. Morocco pulled out of the OAU in 1984 and is the only African country which is not a member of the African Union (AU) primarily because the AU recognises SADR as a state. President Robert Mugabe as the Chairperson of the African Union noted that,

“Africa’s failure to decolonise Western Sahara would be a negation to African ideals and principles”.

In addition to supporting The Polisario Front’s cause to independence, Zimbabwe has in the past supported other liberation movements. In the 1980s, Zimbabwe supported the FRELIMO government against RENAMO forces in Mozambique. Zimbabwe was the mediator which led to the signing of the Rome Accords in 1992 ending the 17 year civil war in Mozambique. Zimbabwe also supported liberation movements in South Africa, Namibia, Angola, East Timor and Palestine, Chan & Patel, (2006:177).

²⁴ <http://www.spsrasd.info/en/content/zimbabwe-renews-constant-support-legitimate-rights-saharawi-people>

2.2.2. Safeguarding its Sovereignty and Territorial Integrity

In Safeguarding its sovereignty and territorial integrity, Zimbabwe implemented the Third Chimurenga against the United Kingdom. This culminated in the implementation of the much contested Fast Track Land Reform Programme in 2000 following invasion of white farms by the war veterans and British abrogation (though contested) of its responsibility to compensate white farmers (Ibid). The March 2005 elections were declared as the anti Blair elections in protest to regime change allegations that the major opposition party, the Movement for Democratic Change was being funded by the UK and its western allies, particularly the United States of America.

2.2.3 Improving the Standard of Living of all Zimbabweans Wherever They Are:

2.2.3.1. The Look East Policy

The Look East Policy which was adopted in 2003 had “its contemporary roots are in the 1992 ‘economic thrust’ to Zimbabwe’s foreign policy based on the premise of the success of the Newly Industrialising Countries (NICs), particularly, the rise of China. According to Patel in Chan and Patel (2006:182), the Look East Policy was officially announced in 2003, but had been a decisive move by Zimbabwe since 1992 because of its “anticipation that future trade, investments, joint ventures and tourists would come from the East. Zimbabwe’s Look East Policy involving emphasis on relations with China, especially, and with Malaysia, India, Pakistan, Singapore, Indonesia, Thailand and Iran (Ibid).

The adoption of the Look East Policy was adopted by the Zimbabwean government as an attempt to find a new international identity after the dispute and stalemate with West over the implementation of the FTLRP, human rights abuses and electoral irregularities. According to Dikgang Moseneke and Sisi Khampepe, two South African High Court judges, in their electoral report²⁵,

These [Zimbabwe] elections [of 2002], in our view, cannot be considered to be free and fair.

²⁵ http://www.kas.de/wf/doc/kas_39859-1522-2-30.pdf?141208160227

The two judges highlighted that these elections did not meet international standards of free and fair elections. They cited pre – election violence and intimidation which curtailed freedom of speech and assembly. The judges noted that the electoral laws had been “drastically amended and manipulated by executive decrees”²⁶. The results of these elections led the EU to suspend cooperation with Zimbabwe under article 96(2)(c) of the ACP – EU Partnership Agreement. According to EUROPA,

These measures included the suspension of financing of budgetary support and support for projects, as well as the suspension of the signature of the 9th EDF National Indicative Programme, but explicitly did not affect the contributions to operations of a humanitarian nature and projects in direct support to the population, in particular those in social sectors, democratization, respect for human rights and the rule of law. They also included the suspension of Article 12 of Annex 2 to the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement, concerning current payments and capital movements, in so far as required for the application of further restrictive measures, and in particular the freezing of funds.²⁷

This political conditionality towards developing countries has been heavily criticised by Zimelis (2011:396) as being ineffective in promoting policy change in the countries affected. Zimbabwe is a case in point as the sanctions have had little or no effect in bringing transformation in Zimbabwe’s policy making and implementation. It is important, however, to note that Zimbabwe has lobbied for the lifting of the restrictive measures citing that the election was relatively peaceful, free and fair. SADC supported this view though they could not endorse the elections as “fair”²⁸. The African Union endorsed the elections as “free, honest and credible”²⁹.

²⁶ http://www.kas.de/wf/doc/kas_39859-1522-2-30.pdf?141208160227

²⁷ EUROPA, Zimbabwe and the European Union, Restrictive Measures, http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/zimbabwe/eu_zimbabwe/political_relations/restrictive_measures/index_en.htm

²⁸ SADC described the election as “free and peaceful” but reserved judgment on its fairness, <http://www.legalbrief.co.za/article.php?story=20130815084009119>

²⁹ Zimbabwe poll was ‘free, honest and credible’ – African Union”, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-23546050>

The European Union High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Baroness Ashton, said

...the EU is concerned about alleged irregularities and reports of incomplete participation, as well as the identified weaknesses in the electoral process and a lack of transparency.³⁰

These divergent views about the elections have necessitated the upholding of sanctions by the EU and the West in general with a few incidents of lifting travel bans against Mugabe as he assumed his position of Chairperson of the African Union. The sanctions by the West have necessitated the perpetuation of the application of the Look East Policy by the Zimbabwean regime.

In defence of the policy, President Mugabe declared, “It is very important for us in Zimbabwe to develop the “Look East” Policy because that is where people who think like us are, people who have the same history of colonialism as ourselves, people who have started developing their economies, are more advanced than Africa, and relations with them will be reciprocal and rewarding”, (Gore 2005:2). The implementation of LEP was set to improve the standard of living of Zimbabweans as it was deemed the much needed FDI would come from the East, “where the sun rises” (Ibid). However, this has not been the case as the much needed FDI has not trickled in from China as expected, leaving Zimbabwe with no option but to start pursuing normalisation of relations with the West.

2.2.4. Background to the Establishment of Zimbabwe – China Relations

Zimbabwe – People’s Republic of China (PRC) relations can be traced back to “over 600 years ago during the Ming and Qing dynasty when the Chinese established relations with the Munhumutapa empire, based on trade and cultural exchange” (Manyeruke and Mhandara, 2011:87). Zimbabwe PRC political relations date back to the liberation struggle when the People’s Republic of China (PRC) supported Zimbabwe guerrilla fighters with weapons and training (Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung 2004:1). These relations were further strengthened during the cold war period, fuelled by the PRC – Soviet rivalry. “Seeking to emerge from the Soviet shadow to establish itself as a credible international player, especially with regard to Third World states, the PRC positioned itself as the leading patron of the global South by

³⁰ <http://news.yahoo.com/eu-concerned-lack-transparency-zimbabwe-election-162147814.html>

countering Soviet moves and supporting groups that opposed Soviet-sponsored liberation movements” (Taylor, 2004:616). The Zimbabwe African National Union Patriotic Front (ZANU PF) led by Robert Mugabe took advantage of the split between the PRC and Soviet Union to gain international support. “The Soviet Union backed ZANU’s rival, the Zimbabwe African People’s Union Patriotic Front (ZAPU PF) whilst the PRC offered its military support to ZANU PF, thereby gaining an important ally in Southern Africa and thumbing its nose at Soviet foreign policymakers” (Eisenman, 2005:9).

Zimbabwe – China ties were cemented when China established diplomatic relations with Zimbabwe on her independence day on 18 April, 1980. However, during the 1980’s, Sino-Zimbabwe ties cooled as China focused on the West for business opportunities as it began abandoning socialist ideals for capitalism in pursuit of economic growth. China focused on the West as Africa had little to offer for its development. Meanwhile, Zimbabwe turned to and received support from other states, particularly Sweden (Schraeder, Hook, and Taylor 1998:314–315). Support from Sweden and other Western states coincided with a change in Zimbabwe’s international identity: instead of being feared as a radical Marxist leader, Robert Mugabe was widely recognized and praised in Western foreign-policy circles for his pragmatism and acceptance of democracy and capitalism (Gevisser 2002; *New Internationalist* 1990; Robinson 2000). This fit very well with the notion that Zimbabwe has no permanent friends but permanent interests as it began to look westwards in line with the realist paradigm.

Like China, The United States of America (USA) was quick to extend diplomatic relations with Zimbabwe on 18 April 1980, Zimbabwe’s Independence Day. During the 1980’s and 90’s relations with western countries were cordial with “Mugabe being extremely popular in the West” (Collier and Gunning 2003:2). During this period, Zimbabwe, like any other country in Africa seeking economic reform, implemented the then popular pro-west Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) which led to further dismal economic failure. According to Collier and Gunning (2003:2), “these programmes were poorly conceived and quickly led to increased unemployment and broad social unrest”.

Zimbabwe – West relations soured with Zimbabwe’s military involvement in Mozambique in 1982-1992 (Mlambo 2012:3), its deployment of troops in the DRC war in 1999 (Rupiya

2003:93), its implementation of a neo-Communist land reform programme in 2000 (Eisenman 2005: 1) and its undemocratic tendencies in light of its waning political support. Zimbabwe's foreign policy, largely influenced by domestic factors and the realist world view, has been met with hostile western policies like UK's threat to suspend aid in the 1980s and USA's actual aid cut in 1986 (Patel in Chan and Patel 2006:177), the 2001 Zimbabwe Democracy Recovery Act (ZDERA), the 2002 EU-ACP suspension under article 96 of the Cotonou agreement for irregularities in the 2002 elections, EU targeted, smart sanctions, restrictive measures and an arms embargo, suspension and subsequent withdrawal from the Commonwealth in 2003 (Patel in Chan and Patel 2006:177) as well as targeted sanctions. Faced with hostile relations with the West, Zimbabwe decided to look east for new friends and partners since the country has "no permanent friends but permanent interests" (Zimbabwe Centre for Peace Initiatives 2005:51).

Zimbabwe – PRC political relations were solidified in 1989, when Zimbabwe led other African states in defending the PRC for its Tiananmen Square crackdown on protesters citing the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign state" (Younde, 2006: 9). Subsequently, the PRC reciprocated Zimbabwe's gesture when in 2008, "it vetoed a UN Security Council Resolution which intended to invoke Chapter XVII imposing sanctions on Zimbabwe because of a flawed presidential election" (American Journal of International Law, 2008:895-896). This serves to show that Zimbabwe - PRC relations have been reciprocal and governed by anti – colonial struggles, anti - Western hegemony and the need to strengthen South - South co-operation. This view is supported by Alden, 2005:147 who outlines "Jiang Zemin's May 1996 Five Points Proposal for Africa – PRC relations as reliable friendship, sovereign equality, non-intervention, mutually beneficial development, and international cooperation", all of which are embodied in Zimbabwe's foreign policy pronouncements.

2.2.5. The Effectiveness of the Implementation of the LEP

The implementation of the LEP has met with an avalanche of criticism, with some dubbing it as a political slogan (Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung 2004:1). Although the policy was adopted as a survival foreign policy option, it has not yielded the anticipated FDI inflows and economic growth. China has been viewed as Zimbabwe's new imperial master with President Mugabe accused of "virtually mortgaging Zimbabwe to the Chinese" (MISA 2012:1). The

asymmetrical relations of Zimbabwe and China, have benefited China mostly, which has secured raw materials and markets for mass produced low quality goods (Alden 2005:147-164). Consequently, the Chinese expansionist policies in Latin America, Australia and Africa have been met with scepticism, especially its desire to cultivate strong relations with states that overlook its human-rights record and are human rights violators themselves (Taylor 2004:143).

The LEP has been effective to a lesser extent. China has made very little investments in the extractive industries amidst allegations of plundering of unprocessed minerals. A Key informant who decided to comment on the condition of anonymity reiterated that there is no evidence of value addition. Chinese investments have been modest investments characterised by joint ventures with highly connected individuals. The benefits of LEP have accrued to individuals and not the masses. The celebrated deals are still on paper as the Chinese are unwilling to invest considerably in an investor averse climate typified by unpopular indigenisation policies and a volatile succession crisis. It is imperative to note that while China is an important development partner, Zimbabwe should not perceive its relations with the rising economic power as alternative but rather complimentary to its relations with the West. Although there has been the dispersal of economic power internationally, ushering in a multipolar order by the rise of China, the BRICs and the NICs, the West, particularly, US and the EU can still project their power globally in economic terms, hence they are vital global partners. Zimbabwe has managed to survive in the current international system because it is a multipolar system which would have been unlikely under a unipolar system with one centre of power. However, Zimbabwe needs to engage with all potential development partners if it is to improve the standard of living of all Zimbabweans wherever they are.

3.0. Prospects for Normalisation of Relations between Zimbabwe and the West

a. Facilitating Factors

The international Community is prepared to engage with the Zimbabwean government. What they are waiting for is a mindset change in the regime policy making and implementation processes. It is important to point out that the regime needs to change its ideology to suit the transformation in the international system.

The 2013 elections were generally peaceful but marred with irregularities. However, the EU has shown a willingness to reengage Zimbabwe since the conclusion of the elections as they were relatively peaceful as compared to the 2008 June Run Off election, which Masunungure has described as a “militarised election”.

In spite of the above, normalisation initiatives towards Zimbabwe by international institutions such as the International Monetary Fund have just begun. The IMF Staff Monitoring Programme was introduced at the beginning of the year 2015 in Zimbabwe which is a positive sign. Ultimately, however, it is imperative to note that reform in Zimbabwe’s indigenous policies is vital if any normalisation of relations is to occur in the country.

b. Inhibiting Factors

The populist ideology of the regime which is concerned with mobilising support for the government and securing regime longevity in power is prohibitory to the normalisation of relations with the West.

According to a key informant from the department of Political and Administrative Studies, the ruling elite is the biggest stumbling bloc to Zim West Rapprochement. A diplomat who commented on condition of anonymity lamented that, the Zimbabwe – West Crisis has “become personal” and therefore no meaningful shift in the status quo is expected until the exit of President Mugabe.

4.0. Conclusion

The foreign policy of any given country is influenced by the domestic and external environment. No state can live in an island. It is not in the interests of any one nation in a multipolar framework, to focus on one part of the globe and condemn the other. Zimbabwe therefore, needs to engage with all progressive nations of the world if it is to experience economic recovery and growth. She needs to create and maintain an environment that is attractive to investors. Zimbabwe and the West have to choose a diplomatic solution to normalise their relations. The West needs Zimbabwe and Zimbabwe needs the West. Zimbabwe needs the East and the East needs Zimbabwe. Ultimately, it cannot be over-

emphasized the only option for Zimbabwe and the West is to map an agreed operating framework which creates a win – win and not a winner takes all solution.

4.1. Recommendations

- Zimbabwe should progressively work towards the normalisation of her relations with the West.
- Article 8 of the Cotonou Agreement provides for a dispute settlement mechanism. The EU and Zimbabwe should resolve the diplomatic crisis through the application of that mechanism.
- Zimbabwe's LEP must be complimentary and not an alternative foreign policy framework.
- Zimbabwe should adopt friendlier rhetoric towards the West if it is to be perceived as serious in its efforts to reengage the West.
- Zimbabwe has to formulate and implement attractive policies which attract FDI inflows into the country.
- The formulation of foreign policy must be decentralised. The civil society should be engaged in foreign policy making.
- To ensure Zimbabwe regains its voting and administrative rights at the IMF
- To lobby the international community for the removal of sanctions

5.0. Bibliography

5.1. Books

- Baylis. J, Smith. S and Owens. P, The Globalisation of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations, 5th Edition, Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Clapham, Christopher, Sub-Saharan Africa, In Foreign Policy Making in Developing Countries, Farnborough, Saxon House, 1977.
- Kegley and Witkopf, World Politics Trends and Transformation, 6th Edition, St. Martin Press Inc, New York, 2004.
- Milner. H and Moravcsik, Power, Interdependence and Non-State Actors in World Politics, Princeton University Press, Princeton and Oxford, 2008.
- Nkiwane. S, Zimbabwe's Foreign Policy In African Foreign Policies, edited by Stephen Wright, Boulder, Westview Press, 1999.
- The Centre for Peace Initiatives, Zimbabwe: The Next 25 Years, Benaby Printing and Publishing, Mt. Pleasant, Harare, 2005.
- Yan Xue-Tong, Analysis of China's National Interests, Monterey Institute of International Studies, East Asia, 2002.

Journals

- Alden, Chris, "China in Africa", Survival, 2005, pp.147–164.
- American Journal of International Law, "United States Seeks Zimbabwe Sanctions: Russia and China Veto", Oct 2008, Vol. 102 Issue 4, pp. 895-896.
- Chan.S and Patel. H, "Zimbabwe's Foreign Policy: A Conversation", The Round Table, Vol. 95, No. 384, April 2006, pp.175 – 190.
- Eisenman, Joshua, "Zimbabwe: China's African Ally", China Brief, 5 July, 2005, pp. 9–11.
- Jeremy Youde, "Why Look East? Zimbabwean Foreign Policy and China", Africa Today, Indiana University Press, 2006.
- Manyeruke. C and Mhandara. L, "Zimbabwean Views on the Current Transformation of the International System", Global Review, March 2011, pp85-91.
- Yurdusev. N, "Thomas Hobbes And International Relations: From Realism To Rationalism", Australian Journal Of International Affairs Vol. 60, No. 2, Pp. 305- 321, June 2006.
- Zimelis. A, Conditionality and the EU-ACP Partnership: A Misguided Approach to Development, Australian Journal of Political Science, Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 23 August 2011.

Articles

- Collier. P and Gunning. J, "The IMF's Role in Structural Adjustment", WPS/99-18, World Bank, Washington DC, Centre for the Study of African Economies, Oxford, June 1999, pp. 6-7.
- Gore Innocent, "Zimbabwe: President to Retire in 2008", The Herald, Harare, 22 April, 2005.
- Roskin. M and Cowling. M (ed), "National Interest: From Abstraction to Strategy", Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College, 1994, pp i-15.

Websites

- Mlambo. N, “Raids on Gorongossa, Zimbabwe's Military Involvement in Mozambique 1982-1992”, The Southern African Centre for Defence Information (SACDI), Defence Digest, Working Paper No.3, (<http://ccrweb.ccr.uct.ac.za/archive/defencedigest/defdigest03.html#Biblio>), retrieved on 20 March 2012
- New Internationalist, “Country Profile: Zimbabwe”, www.newint.org/issue209/profile.htm, retrieved on 16 November 2005.
- Media Institute for Southern Africa, “Sino – Zimbabwe Relations: Who Benefits?”, <http://www.thezimbabwean.co.uk/comment/38907/sino-zimbabwe-relations--who-benefits.html>, accessed on 15 July 2012.
- 3ad.Com Staff, A Concise Time-Line of the Cold War 1945-1992 Including Aftermath, With A 3rd Armoured Division Perspective, <http://www.3ad.com/history/cold.war/timeline.cold.war.htm>, accessed on 8/25/2015.
- Bhebhe. N, The Sunday News, Frontline States and African Liberation, Sunday, May 17, 2015, <http://www.sundaynews.co.zw/frontline-states-and-african-liberation/>, accessed on 8/25/2015.
- <http://www.zimbassy.se/history.html>),
- (<http://www.historytoday.com/paul-moorcraft/rhodesias-war-independence#sthash.b0mX9vab.dpuf>
- Matshobana (2015: 1), (<http://www.bulawayo1872.com/history/lobengula.htm>).

Acts

- Indigenisation and Economic Empowerment Act (IEEA) Chapter 14:33 (2007)