

**CHANGES AND CONTINUITIES IN ZIMBABWE'S FOREIGN POLICY IN THE 21ST CENTURY AND
THE IMPLICATIONS FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

Percyslage Chigora

Midland State University

ABSTRACT

Zimbabwe's interaction with the outside world has come of age since the attainment of independence in 1980. Throughout her existence Zimbabwe has exhibited a rather active role in her interaction with the outside world. This being driven by the desire to attain sustainable economic and political development. The Zimbabwe government has managed to pull through the domestic and international challenges and continued un till today trying to address these challenges. In order to survive in this rather hostile environment Zimbabwe has manipulated its international environment for the purpose of its survival by designing and implementing a rather successful foreign policy which has ensured that it remains afloat on development agenda on the background of harsh international environment largely emerging from failing structural adjustment programme, and sanctions imposed by the western countries and western controlled institutions. It is the purpose of this paper to analyse Zimbabwe's foreign policy in the 21st Century, illuminating on the key aspects of action, reaction and interaction with international actors as it seek to define its development agenda. Given the continued rule of Zimbabwe African National Union Patriotic Front, the paper will give reflections on continuities and changes that are likely to occur beyond 2013 as Zimbabwe continues to steer its development agenda.

Keywords: Foreign Policy, International Relations, 21ST Century, Change, Continuity, Development, Zimbabwe

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Whilst literature is awash with varying definitions of foreign policy and related concepts the paper dwells on defining 3 terms that are critical to comprehending the subject and is not comprehensive in looking at all possible definitions. The three related concepts are international relations, foreign policy and national interest. Like with most of terms in the social science no definition can be exhaustive. However, parameters for the purpose of dealing with the subject area can be established through rigorous analysis of various definitions. This research will endeavour to analyse various dimensions to understanding the meaning of the term foreign policy.

To comprehend the concept of foreign policy it is important to briefly define the main subject of international relations. International relations refers to a web of transactions across state boundaries, by all kinds of groups and individuals, external relations being the same activity from the point of view of these actors as they move outside their own society into dealing with others. Thus the term implies the entire package of actions and attitudes towards the outside world. Independent non state actors are also integral part in understanding international relations and one need to avoid chaining oneself to state business since the other actors are capable of conducting business with the outside world. The way the actions and interactions are conducted leads us to the term foreign policy. Foreign policy is both a term of action and analysis. (Christopher Hill 1993)

Historically, foreign policy studies focused on the quest to maintain and enhance state power and security. Recently, due to globalisation, economic issues have taken a centre stage. Issues have spread to encompass human rights, population growth and migration, food and energy policies, foreign aid, development and the relations between the poor and the rich. (Marijke Breuning, 2007:5-6) The term foreign policy is a 19th century expansion of the idea of policy which had been in use since Chaucer (1343- 1400) to mean a government conduct of affairs. The phrase foreign affairs was increasingly common from 17th century, as growing volume of state business began to compel a clear organisational distinction between home and abroad in secretariat of the royal household (Christopher Hill 1993:312). Foreign policy, like other forms of human activity, takes place in a continuum in which present actions project their effects on the future and in which the past casts its shadow on the present. (George Moldeski 1962:54). In general terms, a country's foreign policy, sometimes termed international relations policy, captures goals outlining how the country or political entity interact with other external countries and entities economically, politically, socially and militarily.

There are three ways of understanding foreign policy. In modern era foreign policy is at once 'a phenomenon, a concept and a major area of study' (Christopher Hill 1993:312). A comprehensive definition therefore has to cover these concrete issues. At most foreign policy seeks to explain choice, decisions and behaviour (Marijke Breuning, 2007:7). For Hill, foreign policy is central to the existence of the state and is often considered the first line of defence of any country and for him foreign policy is 'the sum of official external relations conducted by an independent actor (usually a state) in international relations' (Christopher Hill 2003:3). In addition for Hill Foreign policy is far from the only way in which a given community copes with the outside world, but it is the principal way in which collective coping takes place(Christopher Hill, 2003:233).

The aims of foreign policy differ from country to country. However, it possible to discern some conclusions from different countries's expectations. Indeed different components of a country's foreign policy can be directed to towards producing changes or strengthen the existing outcomes, that is, maintenance keeping policies or change seeking policies

(Palmer 2002:9). A successful foreign policy maker seeks to promote a country's strategic interests by devising policies based on brutal realism, bereft of all kinds of illusions, romanticism, and emotions (Shamin 2000:2). Lack of realism thereof will lead to foreign policy failures, thus foreign policy analysis calls for well-trained people in the foreign office with the capability to collect the much needed information as correctly as possible to guide decisions makers.

Whose interests are reflected in foreign policy has been a central question in trying to comprehend foreign policy. For Tetiokin 'it is well known fact that the foreign and domestic policies of any nation reflect both the political and economic interests of its ruling class' (1991:1) This has been widely interpreted and aggregated as national interests. National interest is, therefore, a key concept in foreign policy as it provides a material basis of which foreign policy is made which is intertwined again with national security and the basis for any foreign intervention.

For the purpose of this paper national interest as a concept is used in both political analysis and political action. As an analytical tool, it is employed to describe, explain or evaluate the sources of the adequacy of the nation's foreign policy. It serves as means of justifying, denouncing, or proposing policies. Rosenau argues that the concept of national interest is rooted in values, and is difficult to employ as a tool of rigorous analysis. "Politicians therefore discuss their goals in terms of national interest and are inclined to claim that their goals are the national interest" (1980:239). In essence, goals and interests are value laden since they involve subjective preferences. Thus culmination of national interest into a single complex of values is bound to have problems as observers use different value frameworks. Largely values are not susceptible to scientific proof; hence it is difficult to demonstrate the validity of such assessments that foreign policy actions reflect national interest.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO ZIMBABWE'S RELATIONS WITH INTERNATIONAL ACTORS

To capture the historical issues is a daunting task on its on, however, important aspects, events and issues can be vividly captured in summary form. In comprehending any country's foreign policy, it is important to outline the environment from which the state materialises. This takes cognisance of the overall historical factors that are at play in the coming to existence of the state. The historical issues that call for scrutiny involve the essential actors and their objectives as well as the overall geographical and strategic factors that are at play. These attributes can be traced historically, as states are not born at a particular moment in time but are subject to historical evolution that has shaped a particular geographical entity.

The history shapes the state's perception of its domestic and international environments were three perspectives are dominant. First, is the politics of power and security; second, the politics of interdependence and globalisation; and third the politics of dominance and resistance (Little and Smith 2006). Any state's perception of these political peculiarities defines how it will behave in relation to other actors.

Most developing countries are caught up in a rather precarious position where they cannot fully exercise control over the running of the state affairs. For African countries the gap between what resources they can raise and the demands for what is needed has continued to grow without showing evidence of quick redress. This has exacerbated tensions not only within the state itself but with other international actors.

Manifestations in the international system have presented post-colonial states like Zimbabwe with challenges in dealing with the complexity of interactions that are heavily embedded in historical evolution. In tracing the evolution of

Zimbabwe's interaction with the outside world one needs to grapple with pre-colonial precedents, colonial processes, post-colonial legacies, idiosyncratic factors and economic underdevelopment alongside the dependence that normally accompanies it. Being a small and land locked state one would have expected to pursue an inward looking foreign policy instead it has turned out to be robust and outspoken on international scene. This has been so given the nature of internal and external environment which demand an active role for the state to survive.

Just like other African countries, Zimbabwe has been dominated by overarching constraints that depicts a weak state. This has forced the political elites to use foreign policy to garner political and economic resources from the external environment (Kadiagala and Lyons 2001:4). to ensure survival not only of the state but of the elites. The environment has been dominated by changes that have taken place through privatisation of international relations and rise of inter-African negotiation and mediation. The environment has come to feature enemies and opponents as well as allies and supporters at the centre (Stephen Wright 1999:13). Those in power struggle for the defence and expansion of their interests, contend with their enemies and opponents externally and fight for the defence of their interests within their respective countries. Thus the overall behaviour of the state is influenced by action of both their allies and supporters on one hand those of their enemies and opponents (Ibid). It is no surprise that the history of Zimbabwe's interaction with the outside world would feature cooperation in areas where interest converge and antagonistic where clash of interest exist.

The 1980 newly independent Zimbabwe's foreign relations were reasonably good in the first decade of independence with a modest economy with concerted efforts to invest in social services as a component of distribution which has been the key to achieving sustainable development. This relatively stable domestic and international environment was driven by different approaches to policy orientation, some are committed to Marxists Leninist policies, others follow the road of African socialism, and others pursuing capitalist path (Williams and Hackland 1998:ix). The mixture of the ideological underpinnings in the running of the affairs of the state made well acceptable in the international community as the state did not resort to confrontation with some sections of the international community.

However, since independence was won through a bitter struggle and not handed over on a silver platter, posed challenges for the newly independent state. It meant the linkages with the former colonial power had to continue, (Padelford And Emerson 1963:3) whilst at the same time formulate policies that were meant to address the colonial past which required a delicate balance between the theory and the reality that the internal and external environment presented. Reconciling these different heritages, Reed argued, was to become one of the chief foreign policy concerns of Zimbabwe's first independent government (Ulf Engels 1994:59). As such any attempt to understand Zimbabwe's foreign policy must involve an appreciation of the background of liberation and the burdens and opportunities of independence (Patel 1987:1) as such in seeking to disperse dependence Zimbabwe has paid and continued to pay the high price for maintain a determined course of action, the cut in USAID and the continuing target of destabilisation by South Africa (Ibid:3).

History informs Zimbabwe today that beyond 2013 Zimbabwe remains stark in these historical legacies as it moves in the future- remnants of colonialism still dominates the Zimbabwean society and struggle for rationalisation continues- farming land (so far done), other economic sectors still have to be addressed- conservancies, industry, mining and so on. New confrontations or cooperation with outside world depends on how these are going to be handled especially under the indigenisation policy as Zimbabwe continues to define its path towards development.

21ST CENTURY RELATIONS

As Zimbabwe entered the 2000 new millennium drastic changes had occurred in both domestic and international environment which presented challenges to the policy making circles. Zimbabwe in the new millennium has been met with surmounting problems in her the domestic and external environment. Dominating issues were hyperinflation, negative real interest rate, foreign currency shortages, unsustainable levels of both domestic and external debt, fuel shortages, poor health conditions, general apathy, and closure of manufacturing industries- loss of productivity, jobs and exports, decline in agricultural productivity- due to land reform, poor weather conditions, and fall of commodity prizes. These problems were further compounded by sanctions and donor withdrawal and drying up of important sources of foreign exchange, leading to worsening economic performance and decline in relations with other members of the international community.

As Zimbabwe suffered these surmounting challenges the responses from the international community were varied. Zimbabwe has seemingly lost many friends especially those from the West and/or West controlled institutions, through suspension from, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the Commonwealth; the US and the European Union has applied targeted sanctions; Scandavian countries which have supported Zimbabwe's social services, especially health, have cut aid and have threatened to close their missions.

The land reform process in Zimbabwe, which the West strongly criticised from its inception, is an integral feature of Zimbabwe's foreign policy, and the reluctance by some countries to recognise its centrality to economic development and stability has continued to strain relations. From Zimbabwean point of view land will remain the vehicle for the total emancipation and liberation of the nation of Zimbabwe from the yoke of colonialism, settlerism and neo-colonialism in all its forms.

The finance for land reform was not available- indeed the refusal of the 'international community'- principally Britain and the international donors to assist with the finance of land reform was key among the factors which provoked the land take-overs. Though those in international community that are anti Zimbabwe seem to mention and argue that the central issues centres on issues of democracy and human right abuses, it appears this argument does not hold water. The overwhelming success of Zimbabwe over Britain emerged with conclusions reached in Abuja. The conclusion of the meeting of the Committee of Commonwealth Foreign Ministers on Zimbabwe, Abuja, Nigeria, 6 September 2001 noted that the issue of land was at the core of the crisis in Zimbabwe and the programme of land reform was therefore, crucial to the resolution of the problem. Another success is that the land problem had a political and rule of law dimension and most important of all, that Britain should contribute financially towards the land reform. It was a victory for Zimbabwe as it allowed Britain to act as a partner in the land reform process, and that the process was to continue with international support. This is the reason why immediately following the meeting in Abuja the cabinet considered and adopted the Abuja conclusions. Government then sought and obtained, the endorsement of the Politburo and the central committee on ZANU PF (Mudenge 2001).

However, irrespective of Mugabe's successes, Britain managed to stand on its views on Zimbabwe by managing to bring technically appealing issues of human rights, rule of law, transparency and governance as the issues that had to be considered in settling the land problem. Such issues became central to evaluating the land reform process.

The deterioration of relations is reflected in a number of spheres of interaction between the Zimbabwe and Britain. The diplomatic community was largely affected as their interaction continues to depict a state of conflict and direct confrontation. There was altercation between government officials and the High Commission and embassies involved. These incidences involved, firstly, the opening of the diplomatic bag with Harare accusing the British High Commission of failure to observe international law as it had refused to describe the contents of the bag. Peter Hain, Britain's Junior Foreign Minister, received this with bitterness and remarked, "... this is not the act of a civilised country" (The Standard 2000:8). The whole incident seems to have been started by Britain who wanted to spoil Zimbabwe's image in the watchful eyes of the international community so as to justify that there was no rule of law and that Mugabe's government was acting in a manner contrary to international law hence the need for punishment by the international community.

The strain in relations has been largely presented and commented on in the media. In the context of what has become the Western media's obsession with Zimbabwe over the latter's assertiveness and defence of its nationhood and national economic heritage, the Foreign Policy challenges arising from include the repeated references to Zimbabwe's relationship with its former coloniser, the UK; its relationship with the European Union (EU) and the United States' economically damaging legislation in the form of the punitive Zimbabwe Democracy and Economic Recovery Act of December 2001.

The struggle between Zimbabwe and Britain was exported the European Union Bloc. Zimbabwe-EU relations became strained when the EU imposed sanctions on Zimbabwe on the pretext that the 2002 Presidential elections, which the EU did not observe, were not free and fair. Subsequently, the bloc rejected the verdict of the March 2005 Parliamentary elections which gave the ruling Party a landslide victory and, lately also rejected the results of the June 2008 Presidential run-off election. Since then the West has continued with its attempts at effecting regime change in Zimbabwe, to the extent of even politicising the cholera outbreak so as to justify interfering in the internal affairs of the country. Thus the EU has taken unilateral measures and made unilateral demands without due dialogue or engagement taking place yet Zimbabwe has always been ready to dialogue with it.

United States of America as part of the Northern alliance has followed the British and EU alliance moving further to institute punishment of the Zimbabwean government. Subsequently, enacting the Zimbabwe Democracy and Economic Recovery Act of December 2001 that sought to sanctions Zimbabwe government. Since the US's promulgation in December 2001 of the Zimbabwe Democracy and Economic Recovery Act, Zimbabwe has reeled under tightened economic sanctions that include the prohibition of budgetary assistance by the IMF and the World Bank as well as other sources.

Besides the land issue Zimbabwe has not been in good books with the West because its overall stance and ideological leanings that is contrary to the much held neo-liberalism which is championed and sustained by the west. The revolutionary background of Zimbabwe has broadly defined the Pan-Africanist thrust of its Foreign Policy and relations with other African countries. This is in recognition of the prominent role that the continent played in Zimbabwe's liberation struggle. . In that pretext looking beyond 2013 the outcomes of interaction is self evident.

Internationally, Zimbabwe has continued to champion the domination of the most powerful states, especially the role of NATO led coalitions intervening in sovereign states and effecting regime change. In its contribution to the on-going debate on UN reform, Zimbabwe maintains that the UN should be more representative, democratic, and accountable and development oriented. It should be the main advocate and custodian of multilateralism in the face of growing

unilateralism. Africa must be fully represented in the Security Council. Zimbabwe fully identifies with the African position or the Ezulwini Consensus on UN reform whose main elements include the allocation to Africa in the Security Council of two permanent seats and three more non-permanent seats; and either scrapping of the veto for all permanent members or extension of the same to all members. It should be noted here that Africa is the only continent without the veto in the present set up. Given the outcome of the 2013 elections this agenda remain at the core of Zimbabwe's foreign policy

International financial institutions have not been left behind, in fact they have led a way in refusing bailing of the Zimbabwean government. In May 2000 World Bank halted all funding to Zimbabwe government, and placed Zimbabwe on non payment status in October 2000 (Linda Van Buren 2009:1290). Zimbabwe fell behind payment in February of 2001 and IMF declared Zimbabwe ineligible for general and PRGF borrowing and in June 2002 the IMF proclaimed a 'declaration of non-compliance' and suspended technical assistance. (Ibid).

In December of 2003 the IMF initiated compulsory withdrawal procedures against Zimbabwe, citing the government's lack of active co-operation and the failure to address the country's economic problems with comprehensive and consistent policies. The IMF Executive Board in July 2004 postponed until January 2005 deliberations on a recommendation for Zimbabwe's compulsory withdrawal from the institution. The IMF closed its Zimbabwe office in October 2004 in a decision not linked to the country's considerable arrears. Beyond 2013 resumption of funding will much depend on how Zimbabwe will coin its economic policy so that it will be able to repay the owed funds for resumption of borrowing.

Commonwealth is another multilateral institution that has been at the raw with Zimbabwe. Shortly after the March 2002 presidential election, the Commonwealth suspended Zimbabwe from leadership councils for one year after the Commonwealth's election observer team found the conduct of the election seriously flawed. After this suspension was upheld in December 2003, Zimbabwe withdrew from the Commonwealth. 2013 election and beyond the same leadership is still in place reapplication for admission seem to depend on changes within the commonwealth in terms of UK stance on Zimbabwe situation. Resolution of the Zimbabwe-Britain raw will eventually led thawing of relation within the Commonwealth which might be the basis for Zimbabwe's return.

The situation for Zimbabwe in relations to the West has continued with no much change till today. Though thawing of relations has been expected hinged on 2013 elections no change was witnessed in terms of lifting of sanctions and maintenance of cordial relations between Zimbabwe and the West. Clash of interest seem to have continued with new 2013 Zimbabwean government. Mending of relations seem to be dependent on the moment the parties sees the necessity of working together should see the thawing of the strained relations

Not only did the critique of the happenings in Zimbabwe been subjected to critique by Western countries and institutions. Other countries in the developing world have raised issues with Zimbabwe government seen to be a daunting task for the concerned parties. Examples has been the government of Wade in Senegal but later changing stance, Zambia under' Levy Mwanasa broke ranks with others condemned the obtaining situation in Zimbabwe. So were echoes from Botswana's government under the current leader. Botswana threatened to boycott the 16 August 2008 African Union Summit in Cairo, Egypt if Mugabe was attending. The same threat came from then Zambian President, Levy Mwanawasa who criticised the Zimbabwean leadership for oppressing its people. Botswana had already, before this threat, came out right and slammed president Mugabe urging its neighbours not to recognise him as a leader and also called for his suspension from SADC and African Union.

Botswana's call for suspension was as a result of widely condemned one-sided sham of a run-off election that Zimbabwean voters encountered after opposition leader Morgan Tsvangirai's had withdrawn from the contest. By the time 2013 elections were held in Zimbabwe relations has been restored to normalcy without altercations- Wade visiting Zimbabwe, passing on of Mwanawasa and the change of government in Zambia, nothing negative coming from Botswana. Zimbabwe has now gotten support from SADC and African Union countries- after observation of the 2013 elections have concluded that there were free and fair.

Some sections of the international community have aided and sympathised with Zimbabwe offering different tools of support, ranging from diplomatic and political sympathies to economic aid. Zimbabwe's situation was hotly contested up several times and on some occasions referred to the UNSC for sanctioning. Help from the powerful countries in the Security Council helped Zimbabwe a lot. The Chinese and Russian government with veto powers managed to aid Zimbabwe. Indeed the West was 'surprised' because a few days before the Security Council meeting, the US thought the Russians were on their side. The US diplomat was the most surprised after the resolution collapsed,

"The U-turn in the Russian position is particularly surprising and disturbing. Only a few days ago the Russian Federation was supportive of a G-8 statement which said, and I quote, 'We express grave concern about the situation in Zimbabwe'" (wet online).

In fact, through its Look East Policy Zimbabwe has managed to court friendship across the world which has enabled it to survive and address some of the challenges it has been facing. Countries like China, Russia, Iran, Brazil, India, Libya have lead some investment in Zimbabwe and some have provided some needed resources enable the government to implement its development programmes. Forging allowance with Libya in 2001 which saw Libya supplying 70% of petroleum with Gaddafi visiting Zimbabwe in July of 2001 (Richard Brown 2009:1288). If the West remains hostile the look east policy is going to be the lifeblood of Zimbabwe beyond 2013

In addition a number of multilateral institutions have stood by Zimbabwe offering moral and even material support. The ACP states, Non Aligned Movement, G77 have become a platform through which Zimbabwe has articulated her issues which seem much more understandable as members of these groupings share some common history and challenges and have more lessons to learn from the Zimbabwean situation.

The African Union and SADC have stood by Zimbabwe thus not only threatened to boycott international summits when Mugabe is not invited, but has also had to face the converse music when some African countries have refused to attend its Summits if Mugabe was to attend too. AU stood in support of Zimbabwe to be invited to planned meeting between African leaders and European leaders. In fact Patel noted

'let me emphasise that SADC feels that any kind of sanctions on Zimbabwe would not be welcome to the region. Our organisation does not support sanction for two reasons. Firstly sanctions have been known to hurt the ordinary poor vulnerable citizens which they are ostensibly expected to serve. Secondly, sanctions on Zimbabwe will affect the whole of our region negatively. We should use all means to this resolved' (Lilian Patel 2001).

Zimbabwe has taken an active interest in the activities of the Organ on Politics, Defence and Security Co-operation set up by SADC to deal with inter and intra-state conflict resolution while recognizing the sovereignty and territorial integrity of member states. Zimbabwe takes pride in this milestone and other institutions and mechanisms that include the SADC Mutual Defence Pact and the formation of the SADC Brigade. To that end it became a forum through which Zimbabwe's

crisis and eventual resolution was carried out. Mbeki was appointed mediator to Zimbabwe at an emergency meeting held in Tanzania and the same meeting calling for the lifting of sanctions which appeared a united stance on the relation between Zimbabwe and the outside world.

Under the stewardship of Mbeki and subsequently Zuma, South Africa chose not to take a hard-line stance despite having more economic muscle to suffocate Zimbabwe. The reason is clear and straight forward. Zimbabwe remains an important state to South Africa for a number of reasons - both are neighbours and members of SADC. Both states are major trading partners of one another. As a landlocked country Zimbabwe is dependent on South African harbours. The political events in Zimbabwe have an impact on the South African economy. Zimbabwe imports about 20% of its power from South Africa and has not paid its bills since 1999. It owns Eskom more than US\$ 20m in arrears (Jo-Ansie van Wyk, 2002:17). Sanctioning Zimbabwe will have a hit back effect in terms of revenue and accruing benefits of trade. Retaliation by Zimbabwe could make the situation even worse.

The Zimbabwean situation seems to have favoured Zimbabwe. SADC and the African union have become united on dealing with the Zimbabwean situation and have agreed that sanction imposed on Zimbabwe by some sections of the international community have to be removed. Beyond 2013 there is a united front to see sanctions go and resumption of cordial relations between Zimbabwe and the adversaries. Success is dependent on how the adversaries are going to give in. It appears the West have lost on Zimbabwean situation Zimbabwean's resources are finding their way to other markets outside the West's influence. Even in the western states Zimbabwe has been scoring some success.

Divisions have emerged in the EU leading to Zimbabwe to exploiting them to its full advantage. Portugal and France have managed to host EU-ACP conferences going against the EU sanction provision through inviting the Zimbabwean government. Recently, Belgium has allowed the sale of Zimbabwe Diamonds.

Zimbabwean situation has also favoured other members of the international community. Zimbabwe has brought success to the developing countries in their interaction with the west. Britain under Brown has since agreed to set aside funds in Uganda for land reform and compensation of war veterans who fought alongside the British. It seems the Zimbabwean situation might be replicated else leading to the hurting of the interest of the West to the benefit of the indigenous people as well as other powerful actors who takes advantage of the situation. That fear seem provide a solution for states with a like-minded situation as Zimbabwe.

The Zimbabwe's situation has since provided a lesson learnt in international relations. A small and land locked developing country is not as vulnerable as conventional wisdom seeks to portray. Instituting a policy measures to counter measures that can hurt the state or even leading to regime change can lead to the survival of the state in a rather hostile domestic and international environment. Courting other powerful states and reliance on like-minded states groupings is the source of power for a small and vulnerable state.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE OF FOREIGN POLICY IN ZIMBABWE

In order to realise sustainable development for any country success of in foreign policy ensures the flow much needed resources especially for a developing country like Zimbabwe. The foreign policy making in Zimbabwe reveals that the domestic policy plays an important role in shaping its relations amongst other nations. The desire to remain sovereign and independent has been the core principles of Zimbabwe's foreign policymaking and has had a bearing on its

interaction and actions in relation to the outside world. As Clapham has noted, for the third world as elsewhere, is very largely concerned with immediate problems of management and survival.(Clapham 1985). Addressing these problems will ensure that sustainable development policies will be achieved through interacting with other international actors. The actors are at the core of either providing resources to facilitate development or facilitating exploitation which detrimental to sustainable development for developing countries like Zimbabwe. It remains that foreign policy making in Zimbabwe will remain confrontational to the Western actors that it views as detrimental to achievement of its domestic policies of land reform and economic empowerment. This has to remain until probably there is change of regime or changes in the internal and external make up the environment and the actors involved in foreign policy making. For Zimbabwe' it has been proven that both the external and internal environment plays an important role in foreign policy making. Domestic policy reflects the national socio-political and economic structures, which underlie the relationship between the antagonistic social forces constituted by their socio-economic system, on one hand, and foreign policy reflecting the adjustment of external actors' conditions so as the achieve the intended objectives.Over the years the Zimbabwean case has demonstrated limits of world powers in influencing domestic outcome in individual country, least of all, a small land locked country, on the part of Britain, her allies and international institutions were they wilds power. The Mugabe government has endured all the pressures give the economic and political crisis. The powerful sections of the international community have attempted to deal with the situation with the available tools of economic sanctions, manipulation, propaganda, and subversion but with some less considerable success. Pointing to the fact that, in the international community at large; a combination of limited interests, conflicting objectives, and lack of pressure, left Zimbabwe largely untouched by the international community (Princeton N. Lyman, 2007:98) to succumb to pressures of complete collapse.

In summary, Zimbabwe's relations with the outside world can best be described as a mixed balance of antagonism, cooperation and competition depending on issues on the development agenda. Where she has seen her national interest negatively affected on Zimbabwe has pursued a policy of antagonism as the case of her relations with the West and western controlled institution demonstrated. Where national interests were not threatened a policy of cooperation has been pursued as demonstrated under the Look east policy. Where it has seen advantageous in has sought competition so as to gain fully from such an interaction. The choosing of foreign policy agenda is largely influenced by the need to achieve sustainable development in Zimbabwe and avoid exploitation by other actors in the international system.

REFERENCES

Percyslage Chigora is an Associate Professor, Department of Politics and Public management Midlands state University, Zimbabwe, e-mail chigorap2000@gmail.com.

¹ A Paper was first presented at a conference on Zimbabwe's Trajectory Beyond the 2013 Elections: Problems, Opportunities and Prospects, organised by Konrad Adeneur-Foundations Zimbabwe and Mass Public Opinion Institute, 17 December 2013

Breuning Marijke. (2007). *Foreign Policy Analysis: A Comparative Introduction*, New York :Palgrave Macmillan.

Brown R. (2009). Revised by, Christopher Saunders, Zimbabwe Recent History in Iain Frame (ed) *Africa South of Sahara*, 38th Edition, Routledge: London and New York

Clapham C. (1985). *Third World Politics: An Introduction*, Croom helm:London,

Hill C. (1993). Foreign Policy, in Joel Krienger (ed) *The Oxford Companion to Politics of the World*, Oxford University press, Oxford..

..... (2003). *The changing politics of Foreign Policy*, Palgrave: New York.

..... (2003).What is to become? Foreign Policy a site for Political action, *International Affairs*, Vol. 79 no.2 March: 233-256

Khadiagala G M and Lyons T. (2001). Foreign Policy Making in Africa: An Introduction, in Gilbert M. Khadiagala and Terence Lyons (ed) *African Foreign Policies: Power and Processes*, Lynne Rienner publishers, Boulder: London,.

Little R and Smith M. (2006). Introduction, in Richard Little and Michael Smith (ed) *Perspectives of World Politics*, 3rd Edition, Routeledge:London/New York

Modelski G. (1962) *A Theory of Foreign policy*, Pall Mall Press:London.

Mudenge I S G (2001) Opening of the commonwealth ministerial meeting on Abuja Initiatives, 25 October.

Padelford N J and Emerson R (ed). (1963) *Africa and World Order*, Preager: New York

Patel H.H. (1987). No Master, *No Mortgage, No Sale: The Foreign policy of Zimbabwe*, Working Paper No. 2, CREDU:Nairobi/Harare.

Patel L. (2001). MP minister of foreign affairs and international cooperation at a meeting of the Ministrial Task force on Developments in Zimbabwe, 10th-11th December , Harare, Zimbabwe. Final communiqué of SADC MINISTERIAL Task force on development in Zimbabwe 10-11 December Ministers received presentation from Farmers unions (CFU, ZFU), war veterans, chiefs, churches, General Agriculture and Plantastion workers Union, political parties (ZANU PF. MDC), Business associations (AAG, CZI), Media (public and private).

Palmer et al. (2002). Give or take: Foreign policy and foreign aid Substitutability, *Journal of Peace research*, Vol. 39 no. 1.

Rosenau, J N,Rosenau, J N. (1980) *The Scientific Study of Foreign Policy*, Francis Pinter: Machester.

Shamin Shadid M. (2000). *Pakistan's Foreign Policy: A Reappraisal*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

The Reporter, (2000) *Standard*, 18 August.

Tetiokin S. (1999). *Soviet policy on South Africa: Past, Present and Future*, Centre for Southern African Perspectives, University of western Cape: Bellville.

Ulf Engels. (1994) *Foreign Policy of Zimbabwe*, Institute of African Affairs: Hamburg.

Van Buren L, Zimbabwe: Economy, in Iain Frame (ed). (2009). *Africa South of Sahara*, 38th Edition, Routledge: London and New York.

van Wyk J. (2002). The Saga Continues...The Zimbabwe Issue in South Africa's Foreign Policy, *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations*, Volume 1 Number 4.

Welt Online, Zimbabwe Crisis: UN sanctions against Zimbabwe blocked by Russia and China. <https://www.welt.de>, date accessed, 18 October 2014

Williams G and Hackland B. (1998). *The dictionary of contemporary politics of Southern Africa*, Routledge: London.

Wright Stephen. (1999). *African Foreign Policies*, West View Press, Boulder Company.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR:

Percyslage Chigora is affiliated with Midland State University