

PAN AFRICANISM AND REALISM IN ZIMBABWE FOREIGN POLICY  
(1980-1994)

BY

TATENDA MASHANDA

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of  
WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Communication

May 2021

Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Approved By:

Ronald Von Burg, PhD, Advisor

Allan D. Louden, PhD, Chair

R. Jarrod Atchison, PhD

### **Acknowledgments**

Abiyanguwe kunyora kudopfawa kana uchiona mabiyako. Mungazonditi ndine useye ndikasatenda warairidzi wangu muzvinafundo Ron Von Burg, mukuru awa wadondisimbisa chere pakunyora. Pandidotanga ndainge ndirichiuni asi wadoita kuti zvitekaire. WaAllan Loudon wadoita kuti chinyohwa changu chisaite kunge dehwe mukundungu serima romuzhizha. Jarrod Atchison aibvunza zvimwe zvaichachira munzeru, zuwa raisati bwada ndisina kuzvitongesa kuti yuwini chinyohwa changu chonanga poyi. Mhuri yokwangu idoita kuti ndiite hwombudzi kusunyurira nomagokoro mubani, aiwa itihwai zvidonaka fani. Handisikutaure zveka hizi kuzara, kusvisvana, kana kupesvedzera, imiwoye taimuka tigosvika pakuyenzera tichiita botso romashoko muPolitics & Beyond, zvimwe zvacho zvine gasakasa nogufende asi zvidoita kuti ndinyore nonzeru dzisina kusauka. Ana sawira wangu ndaikufurufushai, ndaikutokonyai, nokukusvorogodai somasvurugudu. Kwedu kukarira kwenje mukasauya mudohwa penyu kamu.

## Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations.....	iv
Abstract .....	v
<b>Chapter One</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Introduction.....	1
Study Justification.....	2
Literature Review .....	7
Structure.....	7
The character of Zimbabwe foreign policy.....	9
Loose Lips Sink Ships .....	14
The Approach .....	17
Why a historical discourse analysis? .....	20
Realism .....	22
Realism and Africa .....	23
Pan Africanism.....	24
Criticism of Pan Africanism.....	27
The Organization .....	30
<b>Chapter Two</b> .....	<b>32</b>
Unbreakable Economic Bonds.....	32
You can choose your friends but not neighbors.....	35
Appeal to the Americans .....	37
<b>Chapter Three</b> .....	<b>44</b>
Crippling Apartheid: Sanctions campaign Against racist South Africa .....	44
A call for a Collective Effort (International Community, Norms, Sovereignty, and Human Rights) .....	49
Economic Pragmatists and Ideologues.....	54
<b>Chapter Four</b> .....	<b>63</b>
Conclusion .....	63
Bibliography.....	70
Curriculum Vitae.....	77

**List of Abbreviations**

ANC	African National Congress
AU	African Union
CHOGM	Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting
EU	European Union
FRELIMO	Mozambique Liberation Front
MPLA	People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola
NAM	Non-Aligned Movement
OAU	Organization of African Unity
RENAMO	Mozambican National Resistance
SADC	Southern African Development Community
UDI	Unilateral Declaration of Independence
UN	United Nations
UNITA	National Union for the Total Independence of Angola
ZANU PF	Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front
ZAPU	Zimbabwe African People's Union

## **Abstract**

### **PAN AFRICANISM AND REALISM IN ZIMBABWE FOREIGN POLICY (1980-1994)**

My thesis critiques Zimbabwe's foreign policy rhetoric from 1980 to 1994. I engage the interaction between the discourses of Pan Africanism and Realism in the country's engagements with South Africa. A rhetorical analysis of Zimbabwe's foreign policy is key in understanding how the country navigated tensions and contradictions between two different foreign policy theories (or at least how they are expressed rhetorically). Central to my analysis are the following questions: what was the rhetorical character of Zimbabwe's foreign policy? What does the foreign policy rhetoric regarding the relationship with South Africa before 1994 suggest about the ideology driving these decisions? How does Zimbabwe's foreign policy rhetoric navigate the ideological commitments of the anti-colonialism of Pan Africanism and Realism pressures of the economic dependence on an apartheid regime? After establishing the character of the foreign policy rhetoric, I investigate how the country's foreign policy establishes a narrative that reconciles Pan Africanism with Realism. I argue that Zimbabwe's campaign against the apartheid system had two important outcomes, the campaign put pressure on the illegal government in Pretoria and elevated Zimbabwe's international status. Zimbabwe's approach to the relationship with apartheid South Africa was indicative of how the country was able to navigate and balance the commitment to ideology and pragmatism. In ideology, the emphasis is on ideas and principles which the administration identifies with and is committed to advancing those ideas. In pragmatism, the government goes beyond idealism and focuses on the practicality of politics and advance national interests. Considerations for discursive elements help to further understand foreign policy formulation and can also work as a complementary foreign policy analysis method. Discourse produces meaning and becomes a source that shapes and reflects policy. I conclude that Pan Africanism and Realism were not incommensurable paradigms in Zimbabwe's foreign policy. Despite arguments that they are, looking at the rhetoric suggests otherwise; that they can be blended to advance both a nation's political and moral interests

## **Chapter One**

### **Introduction**

My thesis critiques Zimbabwe's foreign policy rhetoric from 1980 to 1994. I engage the interaction between the discourses of Pan Africanism and Realism in the country's engagements South Africa. The period in question saw Zimbabwe hatch new relationships, and part ways with other countries. A rhetorical analysis of Zimbabwe's foreign policy discourse is advanced by examining government official documents as well as ministerial and presidential proclamations. The central question is what was the rhetorical character of Zimbabwe's foreign policy? What does the foreign policy rhetoric regarding the relationship with South Africa before 1994 suggest about the ideology driving these decisions? After establishing the character of the foreign policy rhetoric, I investigate how the country's foreign policy establishes a narrative that reconciles Pan Africanism with Realism. How does Zimbabwe's foreign policy rhetoric navigate the ideological commitments of the anti-colonialism of Pan Africanism and Realism pressures of the economic dependence on an apartheid regime?

In this opening chapter, I first I review the literature on Zimbabwe's foreign policy, discussing Realism in general terms, the interaction with African politics, and criticism leveled Realism. I next investigate Pan Africanism, the history, criticism, and its relevance or lack of it in International Relations scholarship and as it relates to Zimbabwe foreign policy. Since 1980, Zimbabwe's foreign policy has espoused commitment to Pan Africanism, non-racialism, and pragmatism. The commitment to racial equality even in foreign policy, Audie Klotz, argues, was

because of the country's fight against the Rhodesian minority government. Klotz adds that the liberation movements' fight against Rhodesian minority rule produced a high international profile in the promotion of mandatory comprehensive international sanctions against South Africa, military defense of neighboring Mozambique in the face of South African sponsored insurgency, and promotion of southern African regional cooperation through SADC (Klotz, 1993)<sup>1</sup>. Klotz reveals in her discussion of race in Zimbabwe foreign policy that understanding the Pan-Africanist regional political agenda is crucial for explaining the motivations for Zimbabwean policy. Furthermore, understanding the policy-making role of its advocates--and their limitations--is crucial for explaining the range of policies implemented (Klotz, 1993). I pay attention to this general caution as I review the literature on Zimbabwe's foreign policy. My analysis draws from these political theories (Pan Africanism and Realism) because Zimbabwe foreign policy has made overtures to both, a discourse analysis predicated on these set of theories helps to shed light on nature and consequently narratives present in the foreign policy.

### **Study Justification**

Zimbabwe, for such a small state, has had a historically recognizable influence in Southern Africa Geopolitics. Zimbabwe shares borders with Zambia, Mozambique, Botswana, South Africa, and Namibia. In geostrategic terms, the country has potential that could either be good or bad for Southern Africa Geopolitics. Historically, the apartheid regime in South Africa was concerned that

---

<sup>1</sup> Southern Africa Community Development Community is a successor organization to the Frontline States (refer to note 3).

the impact of newly independent Zimbabwe with a black nationalist government in power would have a domino effect not only in South Africa but the entire region. Pretoria considered Zimbabwe such a security threat that it resorted to destabilization and choking the newly independent Zimbabwe government.

When Zimbabwe won independence in 1980, the country became an important and unavoidable player in Southern Africa's regional politics. This was in part because Harare was a key member of the Frontline states,<sup>2</sup> location, and the unavoidable influence Robert Mugabe, President of Zimbabwe, had in the region as one of the leading liberation leaders. Stephen Chan notes Robert Mugabe quickly emerged as an intelligent and strong-willed leader in the region and Zimbabwe displaced Zambia by taking the crown of regional leadership against South Africa (Chan, 1992). In *Community of Insecurity: SADC's Struggle for Peace and Security in Southern Africa*, Laurie Nathan points to the relationship and disagreements between Harare and Pretoria as one of the reasons for SADC's failure to get a handle on Southern African Geopolitics (Nathan and Shaw 2012). What was at the heart of a regional Geopolitical and security stagnation was "the tension between Zimbabwe and South Africa, which was both a consequence of historical circumstances and, more fundamentally, a clash of ideas around the strategic orientation of the Organ" (Nathan and Shaw 2012). This historical interaction between Zimbabwe and South Africa in the context of regional Geopolitics and security across different political and indeed different Geopolitical clocks is

---

<sup>2</sup> An alliance of Southern African states that were fighting to end colonial and minority rule in the region. It was made up of Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

grounds enough to write about Zimbabwe's foreign policy. These two countries were important actors in the region during the period of study in this thesis.

This is a quest for the Zimbabwe foreign policy's character when it comes to engagement with the SADC region. Hasu Patel describes Zimbabwe's foreign policy as characterized by a commitment to the pursuit of its sovereignty, independence, conflict resolutions, economic and strategic interests, and Pan-Africanism (Patel 1987). Historian Lloyd Sachikonye described the foreign policy as punching above the country's weight geopolitically. Stephen Chan argued that in the late 2000s, Zimbabwe had a confused and inadequate idealism, however, he notes that in the early days, the foreign policy was courageous and daring "not only in resisting South African destabilization insofar as it was visited upon Zimbabwe but by militarily entering Mozambique in the mid-1980s" (Chan and Patel 2006). All these observations about Zimbabwe's Union-Patriotic foreign policy point to a presence of pursuit of national interests, pragmatism, and idealism.

This work attempts to understand how nations navigate tensions and contradictions between two different foreign policy theories (or at least how they are expressed rhetorically). Amitav Acharya, in *Rethinking Power, Institutions, and Ideas in World Politics*, broadly writes about the interaction between IR theories and traditions with non-Western experiences. Acharya's work seeks to broaden our understanding of

Geopolitics. My research investigates one of the undoubtedly salient schools of thought at the heart of African Geopolitical discourse, Pan-Africanism, and juxtaposes it with Realism, one of the main approaches in international

relations. This thesis adds to the ever-growing literature on Southern Africa Geopolitics, foreign policy discourse, and interaction between dominant IR theories with non-Western experiences. In discussing Pan-Africanism and Realism, this is not a declaratory approach to take the two as the only approaches at the heart of Zimbabwe's foreign policy. Rather, I argue that the foreign policy rhetoric that reflects both Pan Africanism and Realism are not mutually exclusive, as the Zimbabwe case study demonstrates. As John Mearsheimer notes, Realism is not 'the' theory of international relations but one of 'the' theories in International relations. Here, I rely on Realism as I have demonstrated earlier that it is best placed to explain national interests, security, and regional interactions; this is not to say that the theory itself does not have shortcomings. Pan Africanism was dominant in the Zimbabwe foreign policy discourse during the period which is in question.

With Zambia under Kenneth Kaunda becoming a hindrance towards the development of a unified Frontline policy (Chan 1992<sup>3</sup>), it made sense for Zimbabwe to become an alternative voice within the Southern Africa region against South Africa and advocate Pan-Africanism for the region's political and security issues. Discussion of Zimbabwe's foreign policy became salient as Zimbabwe had grown in regional status when it became independent; the country cast an image of being strong and capable. The Zimbabwean decision to send troops into Mozambique in 1986, however, staked a claim for Zimbabwean

---

<sup>3</sup> Kenneth Kaunda's approach to South Africa was not as confrontational and militant as other Frontline states would have liked. He was understandably pushing for diplomatic engagement.

preeminence in the region on the basis that some degree of protection against South Africa was possible through Zimbabwe strength (Chan 1992). Zimbabwe was leading in terms of a diversified economy that supported the Southern Africa region and rivaled South Africa.<sup>4</sup> Southern Africa Geopolitics before and during the period of assessment was characterized by liberation struggles, security destabilization, and the creation and deepening of a regional organization. Zimbabwe was one of the main actors, the other actor South Africa dealt with Zimbabwe directly and indirectly in Angola and Mozambique.

During apartheid, South Africa was considered as the chief reason for instability in the region. South Africa was involved in supporting Jonas Savimbi's UNITA in Angola, supporting RENAMO financially and militarily in Mozambique. In the Harare Declaration at the Non-Alignment Movement Conference in 1986, it was noted that "The Heads of State or Government were greatly perturbed by the continuing state of war in Southern Africa. They reaffirmed their view that apartheid is the root cause of conflict in the region which has already jeopardized the peace and security of the sub-continent, and which poses a grave threat to international peace and security" (Non- Aligned Movement, 1986). Zimbabwe was at the forefront of fighting South Africa in the region. In Pretoria, as John Dzimba argued, the apartheid regime saw Zimbabwean independence and black majority rule in 1980 as a major threat to its interests, security, and regional hegemony (Dzimba 1998). The case studies I have selected

---

<sup>4</sup> It is important to note that South Africa was still the biggest economy in Southern Africa. However, Zimbabwe with all the potential and diversified economy was second and a viable option for other black majority led governments in the region.

here within Zimbabwe foreign policy rhetoric present a good opportunity to look at the interaction between Pan-Africanism and Realism, by analyzing the reasons for involvement, the justification discourse involved, and the results of those decisions.

### **Literature Review**

The international relations and foreign policies of Africa at the twentieth century's end consisted of much more than inter-state/regime relations, whether intra-and/or extra-continental (Nathan & Shaw, 2012). Keeping in mind these complexities, I discuss the Zimbabwean foreign policy firstly the structure of Zimbabwe foreign policy making because it impacted not only the decisions but ultimately influenced the rhetoric and narratives. A discussion of structures leads to secondly, interrogating the character and main principles of foreign policy.

### **Structure**

Unlike other newly independent countries in the region, Zimbabwe had numerous citizens in exile who had university degrees and professional experiences that were useful in establishing the ministry of foreign affairs. Some of the early ministers key in leading the ministry were educated from reputable institutions, working with Dr. Witness Mangwende who had experience in International Relations from the London School of Economics and the University of Southampton and Dr. Nathan Shamuyarira a Princeton trained political scientist. These graduates helped to mitigate the lack of policy continuity while transitioning from Rhodesia to Zimbabwe. Stephen Chan however notes that these intellectuals might have failed to deal with the presidential influence in Zimbabwean foreign policy- the question of centrality in policymaking (Chan, 1994). Solomon Nkiwane

disagrees with Chan's observation and notes that most African countries emerged into independence almost overnight, without any trained personnel to handle the very complex affairs of state governance, let alone to participate meaningfully in international affairs (Nkiwane, 1993). He argues the Africans of Zimbabwe, until 1980, were denied not only the right to participate in the governance of their country but lacked the training necessary to cope with the multiplicity of issues in international life. The development of Zimbabwe's foreign policy seems not to have had the benefit or advantages of continuity from the pre-independence experience in international affairs. There was a lack of bureaucratic continuity, the ministry did however have qualified individuals in top positions. These individuals were close in the president's circles and it added to a centralized approach while the ministry itself played an administrative, not strategic role.

Zimbabwe's foreign policy was divided along political, security, and economic departments. The political system was directly controlled by the President and Minister of foreign affairs. Security was administered by the Minister of Defense and Security, Home Affairs, and Central Intelligence. Individuals like Sydney Sekeramayi as minister of State for National security and Emmerson Mnangagwa were key players. Stephen Chan, as noted earlier, concluded that there was presidentialism in Zimbabwe foreign policymaking that is best embodied by the role played by the Office of the President and Cabinet. Though having qualified individuals with the policy-formulation the Zimbabwe relations revolved around Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front (ZANU PF) interests and relations. Indeed, this reality might have manipulated and compromised national

interests. In this regard, the threat of South Africa was more than regional but a threat to national sovereignty and stability and ideals of ZANU PF, which were salient in the country's foreign policy (Nkiwane, 1993). An assessment of how the foreign policy was structured and who constituted the decision-makers directly feeds into the approach and policy narratives.

### **The character of Zimbabwe foreign policy**

What was the rhetorical character and defining principles of Zimbabwe's foreign policy? What were some of the key factors in influencing these principles and shaping the character of the foreign policy? Was there a direct relationship between the structure of Zimbabwe's foreign policy and its principles and character? Foreign policy structure herein refers to administrative processes and individuals who were involved in crafting the foreign policy.

Lloyd Sachikonye noted that by African standards, Zimbabwe is a medium-sized power of 12 million people with a relatively weak economy compared to bigger African powers such as South Africa, Kenya, Egypt, and Nigeria (Sachikonye, 2012). For Sachikonye, Zimbabwe is of limited strategy to a unipolar world and lacks resources to be conferred a geopolitical advantage. However, Stephen Chan argues that during the 1980s Zimbabwe grew in regional stature. The Zimbabwean decision to send troops to Mozambique in 1986, however, staked a claim for Zimbabwean preeminence in the region on the basis that some degree of protection against South Africa was possible through Zimbabwean strength (Chan, 1992). Zimbabwe was filling the economic void in the region; it was the region's most economically diverse country with a remarkable agricultural production.

Zimbabwe was a diplomatic hub in the region under a leader whose rhetoric was 'important' beyond the Southern Africa region. Sachikonye characterized Zimbabwe's foreign policy on the global stage as of limited influence and options. He was defining the foreign policy concerning global powers and their interests, not Zimbabwe's interests and the region which the country occupies. It is sufficient to say there is an array of literature that discusses the foreign policy of small states. Sachikonye concludes that Zimbabwe's foreign policy is distinguished by fiery rhetoric, aggressiveness, and grandstanding (Sachikonye, 2012).

Solomon Nkiwane argued that Zimbabwe's perspectives of the international scene in 1980, and its contributions in Southern Africa and beyond was informed by the decolonization and liberation of the African continent. There was strict adherence to the principles of sovereignty and equality of states; underdevelopment, and the economic plight of Third World states like Zimbabwe; South Africa's apartheid policy and racism in general; and the question of socialism versus capitalism (Nkiwane, 1993). Hasu Patel agrees with Nkiwane and added Zimbabwe's foreign policy as having emphasized non-alignment, African issues, peaceful co-existence, reordering of the international economic order, and exchange of ideas, culture, and trade (H. H. Patel, 1987).

For Hasu Patel, since 1980, there has been an organic link between the method of independence, that is, the armed struggle (the Second Chimurenga) for independence, and its values and beliefs, and domestic policy and foreign policy (Chan & Patel, 2006). The argument here is that Zimbabwe's history of how it became an independent state was instrumental in the country's foreign policy.

Zimbabwe fought the war of independence against colonization and emerged as an independent and revolutionary state in 1980.

In 1980, President Robert Mugabe in a speech to the United Nations, articulated Zimbabwe foreign policy as promoting: national sovereignty and equality among all nations, positive non-alignment, and peaceful coexistence among nations, non-racialism at home and abroad, the attainment of a socialist, egalitarian and democratic society and the right of all peoples to self-determination and independence. There were overlaps between these principles but there was an undeniable commitment to anti-imperialism, Pan Africanism, and sovereignty. These overlaps were historical. Zimbabwe's foreign policy objectives are grounded in safeguarding the country's sovereignty and territorial integrity, the protection of its prestige and image (*Ministry of Foreign Affairs & International Trade - Foreign Policy*, 1980).

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

For Zimbabwe, foreign policy is an extension of its domestic policy. The fundamental principles of national security, national economic well-being, and

the image of the country that transcends the image of the Government of the day, therefore, form the foundation of Zimbabwe's foreign policy (*Ministry of Foreign Affairs & International Trade - Foreign Policy*, 1980). The commitment to national security and economy evidences the pragmatic unlike the total commitment to ideology. Audie Klotz in her work on *Race and Nationalism in Zimbabwe Foreign policy* argues that there was a division between economic nationalists and Pan Africanists. The Pan Africanists were hardliners committed to uncompromising ideology while the economic nationalists exercised caution. Pan Africanists had a transnational conception of national interests while the economic nationalists were concerned with a nation-centric view. These differences were salient in policy decisions and outcomes.

As noted earlier, Zimbabwe had different departments central to foreign policy. The economic department tasked with economic orientation and commitment in the country's foreign policy was not an ideologue outpost. The development and articulation of national interests were a result of competing domestic realities, complex regional politics, and political goals of the government of the day. The concept of national interests itself has not only been used as an analytical tool to identify objectives of foreign policy but also as an all-embracing concept of political discourse to justify particular policy preferences of government (Badza, 2005). At the root of the idea of national interest is the principle of national security and socio-economic wellbeing (Sachikonye, 2012). Badza concluded rightly that the concept of national interest has been open to abuse in Zimbabwe

and points to the neglected role of parliament and civil society in foreign policy-making decisions. In an article for the *Herald Zimbabwe*, I argued that it is illogical to argue that there is a universal understanding of what all Zimbabwean national interests are (Mashanda, 2017). While the ministry makes it clear that there is a connection between domestic and foreign policy, the role of civil society is unhelpful and not suited to deal with matters of national security. Badza is however on point to observe that “Despite its centrality in interstate interactions, the concept of national interests, like that of national security, has occasionally been rendered vulnerable to abuse by the elites...foreign policy is generally perceived as a sole preserve of the ruling party in general and the executive head of state” (Badza, 2005). This is important because national interests and national security are not only treated as policy objectives but at times deployed as a weaponized domestic political narrative.

While deploying various narratives, emphasis in the Zimbabwe foreign policy is on national sovereignty, territorial integrity, and non-interference. For a small newly independent state, this triad was very critical. Zimbabwe defined commitment to Pan Africanism and a realist approach in dealing with South Africa and in part Mozambique. African governments often sacrifice the interests and preferences of their states to conform to the norm’s expectations (Tieku, 2013). While this sounds convincing and indeed Zimbabwe had ideological commitments, they were not overly dominant in the strategies and approaches in dealing with South Africa and Mozambique questions. Whereas Pan Africanism focuses on

solidarity with other blacks and African states against racism and white minority rule, Zimbabwe diverged, in ‘embracing’ and creating a ‘working’ relationship with South Africa to safeguard her economic interests. This was a case of using realist maxims. Zimbabwe needed South Africa to keep the economy operating. Pretoria was aware of this situation and used it when dealing with Zimbabwe. Harare had to tone down the anti-South Africa rhetoric and limited support for ANC. Robert Mugabe’s administration here prioritized the economy and welfare of Zimbabweans ahead of any ideological and rhetorical commitments.

### **Loose Lips Sink Ships**

On one hand, in characterizing the decision-making process within the foreign policy arena, Klotz (1993) notes that after independence Pan-African-oriented populists were committed to garnering support for black liberation movements in South Africa. This was in sync with the struggles Zimbabwe had gone through to win independence. On the other hand, some economic nationalists were concerned about the primacy of the Zimbabwean economy. While Pan Africanists and Economic nationalists differed on how to conceptualize national interests, it is important to acknowledge how those differences were used for political narratives at home. The business community had to rally behind the government in their position on South Africa, otherwise, they risked being labeled as apartheid sympathizers. These differences consequently had powerful narratives deployed not only in foreign affairs but domestically to deal with opposition to a government position.

Zimbabwe was committed to Pan Africanism and non-racialism because of the country's history in fighting the Rhodesian minority regime. This principle was salient in domestic and foreign policy. As noted earlier, there were Pan Africanists and economic nationalists at the heart of Zimbabwe's foreign policymaking. These differences were evident in the approach towards South Africa. A regional problem in the 1980s was the question of what and how can the Front-Line States do to protect themselves from South Africa. Southern African states' economies were linked to South Africa, an all-out imposition and support for economic sanctions would have destroyed them in the process. These complexities meant hardline and overly sanctimonious sanction rhetoric against South Africa would have had bad results for Zimbabwe. To navigate this situation in which rhetoric and an ideological commitment would have made the situation worse, Prime Minister Robert Mugabe did not forcefully act on the sanctions question.

In dealing with South Africa, Robert Mugabe demonstrated that he did not lack in principle the ability to tone down the rhetoric, balance anti-colonial rhetoric, and focus on the demands of economic national interests. Zimbabwe benefited from South Africa oil and lubricants for the industry. While neighbors, these countries were miles apart in terms of systems of governance, values, and principles, yet the administration in Harare found ways to work with Pretoria. When national interests and security is at stake, rhetoric about Pan Africanism and liberation found itself sidelined. The heartbeat of Zimbabwe's economy needed Pretoria despite the strong disagreements. In a 1986 Trevor Phillips' documentary

*Economic War*, Zimbabwe State Security minister Emmerson Mnangagwa observes that “At any time they [South Africa] can strangle us, I can give an example when the turnaround of trains between us [Zimbabwe] and South Africa was once at 13 days and then they increased to 18 days, they increased to 40 days but after some discussions with them they have reduced down to 18 to 20 days. Under Smith, it was 13 days. We must move away from that situation” (Trevor Phillips, 1986). The South African government was determined to destabilize Zimbabwe through military and economic means. In 1986, the Messina-Beit bridge railway carried three-quarters of Zimbabwe’s trade with the outside world, an important trade link that was kept open only when the South Africans wanted it open. Zimbabwe paid 25 million dollars every year to its bitterest enemy to keep the trade route open. This trade route was key in supplying industrial materials without which the Zimbabwe economy would grind to a halt. The leaders knew South Africa had the economy of Zimbabwe by the throat.

Despite the commitment to Pan Africanism and non-racialism at home and abroad, Prime Minister Mugabe heeded the calls of economic nationalists and was hesitant to implement sanctions on South Africa. As evident in minister Mnangagwa’s words Zimbabwe’s rhetoric on South Africa was cautious and the approach calculative. The chairperson of Beira Corridor Association Mr. Eddie Cross observed that “We will see massive unemployment and major industries would virtually come to halt export earnings would fall dramatically and quickly even institutions such as the railroad would find it difficult to operate

because of a shortage of essential lubricants” (Trevor Phillips, 1986). Zimbabwe’s economic dependence on South Africa, though bitter enemies, resulted in Mugabe’s cautious and calculative rhetoric that contrasted with date full-throated commitment to Pan Africanism. Pan Africanism rhetoric would have demanded Zimbabwe not cooperate with South Africa to protect and help the African National Congress fight for freedom. However, this posture would have complicated the lives and economic survival of Zimbabwe. Nathan Laurie argues that despite being subjected to destabilizations, Zimbabwe maintained pragmatic relations with South Africa. Zimbabwe denied South African and Namibian liberation movements guerilla bases (Nathan & Shaw, 2012). The country-maintained trade relations but withheld full diplomatic relations with South Africa.

In Realism, Zimbabwe found a working approach to the South African situation. An array of nationalist, pan-Africanism, national interest, and security discourse warrants an investigation into the character and these discourses in Zimbabwe’s foreign policy.

### **The Approach**

I investigate Zimbabwe’s foreign policy discourse through Realism and the Pan Africanism lens. I make use of historical discourse analysis because it is adequate in discussing the foreign policy of a revolutionary and small state. Historical discourse analysis is used generally to trace how the discursive devices found in examined texts or discourses functioned to construct certain normative ideas and views of events and people. Such analyses tend to examine both formal

and informal practices of a given period through the examination of the social, political, legal, and disciplinary codes and their discourses to see how a particular category of subject and subject categories become constructed (Park, 2008). For Lio Yongtao, discourse can be a form of (in)security practice and its social meanings are not naturally given but socially produced. Discourse produces meaning and becomes a source that shapes and reflects policy. A State's foreign and security policy discourse not only articulates certain ideas of that State's policy and strategy but also creates social interactions in IR through conveying meanings to other States (Yongtao, 2010a). The tension between Pan Africanists and economic nationalists is indicative of two different approaches in foreign policy. The Pan Africanists had a transnational conception of interests and commitment to ideology. The economic nationalists were occupied by a national-centric approach that prioritized pragmatic decisions that sought to maximize gains for the country and ensure survival. Historical discourse analysis allows identifying and tracing the discursive tension and transformation in foreign policy.

How do Zimbabwe's foreign policy discourses in the relationship with South Africa before 1994, reflect Pan Africanism or Realism? What was the rhetorical character of Zimbabwe's foreign policy? What narratives and arguments were deployed by the government?

To investigate these narratives and arguments, I rely on Hansard Parliament debates and cabinet meetings that were declassified and made available to the public at the national archives. The debates in parliament and cabinet conversations are key in tracing different supplements and reasoning behind official

decisions. I consider ministerial statements as official government positions in part because Robert Mugabe had a close-knit circle that made decisions, and structurally only ministries that had a stake in foreign policy were allowed a seat on the decision-making table and charged with communicating to the public and the outside world. Discourse analysis allows a close reading of history, analyze narratives, and navigate structural blockades. This navigation is key in understanding cases where the government is blowing smoke, one can identify the gap between rhetoric and reality and analyze the reasons why that particular rhetoric was deployed. These various documents are deposited at the national archives to serve as official government position and policy, it suffices my discourse analysis to consider them as my primary text for analysis. Hansard records and ministerial interviews are indeed valuable potential sources for identifying and analysis of the discursive narratives in Zimbabwe foreign policy. It is upon these documents that rhetoric is built, they are a product of political, historical, and intellectual negotiations.

Historically, realists did not regard discourse as an important unit of analysis. Gordon Mitchell observes “In their long-running and frequently intense disciplinary argument with ;social constructivists,’ realists assert that since the national interests of states are relatively stable and overriding factors driving foreign policy, analysis of these interests should take priority in scholarship” (Mitchell, 2009). However, Robert Payne notes that neorealists implicitly and explicitly embrace presuppositions about the importance of public debate and

political communication that are almost entirely consistent with the premises of critical theory (Payne, 2007). It is not paradoxical to accept the nature of world politics as prescribed by Realism and employ a historical discourse analysis. The acknowledgment here is that while Realism has a lot to say about power and security in foreign policy, the level of analysis should not be limited to those stipulations. I am at pains here to explain the reluctant interaction between Realism and discourse because historically realists have not taken discourse as important. I excuse Pan-Africanism from this analysis because it does not claim that national interests are supreme, and language is secondary. Pan Africanism is accommodative of both national interests' conversations and discourse. It is important to note for my analysis here the question is not whether Pan Africanism or Realism prioritize language, all theories still use language. The language employed has an impact on relations, it reveals ideology, national priorities, narratives, and national identities.

### **Why a historical discourse analysis?**

Discourses are understood as central modes and components of the production, maintenance, and conversely, resistance to systems of power and inequality; no usage of language is considered a neutral, impartial, or apolitical act (Park, 2008). Discourse analysis allows me to investigate the identity and policy relationship which was at the heart of Zimbabwe's foreign policy decisions and narratives. While there are institutions of policy making, it is hard to ignore the role played by the identity and charisma of the revolutionary leaders in policy making.

Stephen Chan described the first generation of African leaders after independence as “hard-headed, they had won independence either through struggle or protracted negotiations. They had a nationalist project to accomplish building a state that was stable and with broad support within the population and delivering tangible benefits of statehood...” (Chan, 2017). Discourse is relevant to unpack identity and sources of power which is key in foreign policy. Language and discourse are viewed not as impartial tools that describe reality, but as constitutive modes of power that construct reality in unequal ways, demarcating the center from the periphery, truth from opinion, and reality from interpretation (Park, 2008). Thus, historical discourse analysis is not only a way of discussing the character of Zimbabwe foreign policy but a convergence for not only Realism and Pan Africanism but rhetorical studies and international relations.

Hans Morgenthau, for instance, viewed public discourse largely in terms of political propaganda, an instrumental tool of state power employed strategically by national leaders, perhaps to rally domestic support for foreign policies (Payne, 2007). While Morgenthau rejected discourse as merely used for propaganda by leaders to drum up support, I find this view inconclusive and dismissive. Discourse is used to communicate a state’s foreign policy. When realists read presidential speeches and ministerial speeches to discuss national interests, they are actively engaging in discourse dialogues. The argument here is that discourse can affect the interaction between states, influence, and communicate foreign policy. There is a space for discursive approaches in national interests. The discourse of the state as

the central actor in foreign policy, as evidenced through ministerial statements, presidential pronouncements, and Hansard record is important in framing and reflecting decisions.

### **Realism**

In Realism, power is the main currency of international politics.

Traditionally Realism has and, in some ways, continues to see powerful countries as the main actors. John Mearsheimer explains that the basic divide in Realism is answered by the question of why states want power. Hans Morgenthau argues that human nature is at the heart of why states want power (Morgenthau, 2005). States as central actors in international politics are governed by humans with this drive for more power. In structural Realism, the need for power is not driven by human nature. Mearsheimer argues 'it is the structure or architecture of the international system that forces states to pursue power. In a system where no higher authority sits above the great powers, and where there is no guarantee that one will not attack another, it makes eminently good sense for each state to be powerful enough to protect itself in the event it is attacked. Great powers are trapped in an iron cage where they have little choice but to compete with each other for power if they hope to survive' (Mearsheimer, 2006). He observed "In the harsh world of international politics, there is no 911 number to call if a state gets in trouble, and even if there were, there is nobody at the other end to pick up the phone" (Mearsheimer, 2010). This is a self-help world order in which states prioritize their security and survival.

Structural realist theories ignore cultural differences among states as well as differences in regime type, mainly because the international system creates the same basic incentives for all great powers (Mearsheimer, 2006). For structural realists like Mearsheimer and Kenneth Waltz, the domestic make-up of a state, whether it is democratic or despotic, is inconsequential in how states interact with each other. It does not matter who is the leader of that state. Realism has three sets of assumptions (1) states (or city-states) are the key units of action; (2) they seek power, either as an end in itself or as a means to other ends; and (3) they behave in ways that are, by and large, rational, and therefore comprehensible to outsiders in rational terms (Keohane, 1986). Realism is appealing in part because of its applicability and pragmatic approach to international politics. The language of Realism rests on power and interests, not morals and ideologies. In his foundational work, EH Carr noted ‘in the international order, the role of power is greater and that of morality less’ (Carr, 2016). For Morgenthau Realism was an interpretive framework that emphasized objective national interests.

### **Realism and Africa**

It has become rather commonplace to read that what is referred to as ‘traditional, western IR theory’, is problematic when taken to the African continent. At best, we are told, IR theory misrepresents or misunderstands African reality, at worst it participates in an exercise of neo-colonial theoretical hegemony (Brown, 2006). Indeed, Realism is not immune to such criticism, in addition to its primary occupation with great powers. In Realism, the state is the central actor with the ability to be rational. Henderson challenges its applicability in Africa arguing that

the legacy of colonialism created state institutions that made borders inviolate but undermined effective rule of law, this post-colonial state was largely neopatrimonialism in which authority was achieved through informal channels parallel to state institutions (Henderson, 2017). He argues that instead of allying with governments, African political leaders have allied with insurgents- a perspective I shall later challenge. Realism has only infrequently been used as an analytical tool for understanding Africa's international relations because of the ideological and moral predispositions of those who study the topic (Clark, 2001). While it might be easy to conclude that Realism does not have relevance in contemporary Africa, a deeper understanding of Realism and African politics can prove otherwise. No doubt Realism has misgivings in explaining Africa international relations. While giving EH Carr memorial lecture Stephen Walt argued that 'One of the strengths of the realist school is its deep commitment to engaging with the real world, rather than focusing primarily on arcane academic disputes', for that reason and others I undertake a historical discourse analysis of Zimbabwe foreign policy through a realist and pan Africanist lens.

### **Pan Africanism**

Pan-Africanism is a [theory] within Africa that recognizes that the world is racially characterized, colonial, patriarchal, imperial, colonial, heteronormative, and capitalist global social order. It offers a counter worldview to the dominant hegemonic Eurocentric worldview (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2013). Pan-Africanism is, above all, an international phenomenon and, as such, it should deal with power and interest and their dynamics in the international arena: international political forums

and international political economy (Lumumba-Kasongo, 1994). Pan-African thought is by its very nature international thought and its focus on African unity necessarily entails the question of how Africa and Africans fit – and should fit – into the world, and hence by implication the question of international relations and world order (Abrahamsen, 2017).

Although there were many variations, the two main camps within Pan Africanism aligned with Kwame Nkrumah who wanted a strong Federation of African states, and Julius Nyerere who was a gradualist; though different approaches, both leaders agreed about unity being at the core of Pan Africanism. There were fears that a federation of African states would compromise the national independence and sovereignty of individual states. Consequently, the structural embodiment of the Pan Africanism Organization of the African Union (AU) was a product of compromise. Sabelo Ndlovu-Gatsheni observes that the camp that advocated for “absolute equality and sovereignty of African states, the right to existence of individual states and freedom from annexation by another state, voluntary union of states, principles of non-interference in the domestic affairs of African states and prohibition of one state harboring a dissident from another state won” (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2013). Whatever the characterization of Pan-Africanism, there is no absolute consensus on issues that are related to governance and foreign policy. While unity, solidarity, and opposition to imperialism African leaders had the freedom to define Pan Africanism in ways that benefited their states. Zimbabwe certainly was no exception, as a revolutionary state when it was admitted in OAU it

was in absolute sovereignty, non-alignment, and voluntary membership in unions. Zimbabwe was a member of the Non-Alignment Organization, and in the foreign policy prided itself in the commitment to anti-racialism and sovereignty of African states.

Africa's current security predicament illustrates clearly how the continent's politics is simultaneously global. Understanding Africa's insecurity certainly requires specific knowledge and country expertise, but these issues are also at the heart of the most pressing contemporary global challenges regarding peace, democracy, freedom, tolerance, and so on (Abrahamsen, 2017). Pan Africanism is critically positioned as a theory and ideology to provide a lens for interpreting Africa international relations. Zimbabwe had a leader who believed in Pan Africanism and often deployed it in dealing with other countries. Zimbabwe as a revolutionary state which had successfully fought white racism and minority rule was committed to black liberation and solidarity in Southern Africa and beyond. Investigating how Pan Africanism as a theory and ideology influence the country's foreign policy is not a foolhardy enterprise. The seriousness with which the Zimbabwean government advocated and implemented its new Pan-Africanist-oriented regional policies, including partial sanctions against South Africa, cannot be understood merely by considering the country's military or economic position vis-a-vis South Africa, that is, through either realist or dependency structural analyses. Opposition to apartheid cannot be dismissed as mere rhetorical flourish (Klotz, 1993).

International Relations scholars have rarely taken Pan-Africanism seriously, whether as a political movement, a theoretical approach, or as a body of scholarship. Standard introductions to IR at best make a brief mention of Pan-Africanism and African intellectuals, perhaps in discussions of regionalism and as an illustration of regionalist ideals sacrificed at the altar of national sovereignty (Abrahamsen, 2020) A good theoretical account of Africa's international relations must at the very least recognize that Africa's international relations are distinct from international politics of the so-called great powers which have been the main focus of traditional IR. It is distinct in the sense that it is not driven by power, and individualist ideas (Tieku, 2013).

### **Criticism of Pan Africanism**

Like any other ideology, theory, or movement, Pan Africanism has faced many challenges. Toyin Falola and Chukwuemeka Agbo argue that among the many setbacks to Pan-Africanism is the absence of unity on the continent. One of the key foundations of Pan-Africanism is African unity. However, Africa is far from being united. The peoples of Africa are divided oftentimes along many lines; religion and ethnic affiliation are among the most common causes of disunity in Africa (Falola & Agbo, 2019). I find this characterization of the division simplistic. Though conflicts exist, most of these are because of different interests political and economic which often are concealed under the religious or tribal banner. There is an absence of a continental unity at the state level; it is the presence of different national interests and approaches which countries want to pursue that are contextual and give them maximum benefits.

Valery Ferim argues that Pan-Africanism is partly rooted in the inaccurate assumption that all black people share solidarity with the continent (Ferim, 2017). Ferim highlights that perhaps the objectives have not been achieved internally because of different conceptions of what Pan Africanism is, and different countries' approach to international politics. What happens when the pursuit of Pan-Africanism stands in the way of a state's interests when dealing with another country? These national interests vary at the regional and state level. While there is a common need to have economic development or enhance security on the continent, states have been pursuing more bilateral routes by-passing continental commitments and routes. Arguments have been made about an African foreign policy and a common position under the African Union. While the African Union can take an aggregated position in international politics, like the European Union position and foreign policy, it is increasingly difficult to make the same argument about Africa. For starters, EU members commit to the same system of governance and there are penalties and incentives. African Union members do not have the same level of commitment to a single governance template. There is no incentive for the members to give up on their sovereignty.

It must be stressed however that, while the realist and Pan Africanism are being investigated in the character of Zimbabwe's foreign policy, one cannot ignore the revolutionary nature of a state. Thus, some of the discussion here borders on purely treating Zimbabwe's foreign policy as revolutionary. On this concept, I am indebted to Stephen Walt's work on Revolution and War. While the central question in his work was to investigate the relationship between revolution and

war, his discussion of the identity of a revolutionary state and ultimately the character of revolutionary foreign policy is useful in the Zimbabwe context. Walt defines a revolution as the destruction of an existing state by members of its society, followed by the creation of a new political order (Walt, 1997).

Zimbabwe had a mass revolution that resulted in more than a rearrangement of administrative apparatus. A new political order was created, which ultimately forced South Africa to change from a cooperative to a destabilizing mode towards Zimbabwe. There is no doubt about the influence of the protracted liberation struggle on Zimbabwe's foreign policy when the Robert Mugabe government took power in 1980. Expectantly in the early years of engagement with other countries it shaped national identities and set parameters of subsequent political activity. While this history shaped Zimbabwe's foreign policy adopting a Pan Africanist character that was anti-racialist and anti-imperial, this too had limits. Zimbabwe had to deal with an antagonistic South Africa that was determined to prevent Harare's influence in the region. Kenneth Waltz's Realism helps explain the causal primacy of a reactionary policy from Zimbabwe. It was about the power distribution within the region. Walt correctly pointed out that revolutionary states normally moderate their rhetoric (Walt, 1997). In defining the revolutionary nature of Zimbabwe foreign policy [within Realism] Hans Morgenthau's version is more useful here. Morgenthau acknowledges how domestic factors can influence foreign policy. While indeed Zimbabwe had to react to South Africa's destabilization, it adjusted

because of domestic consequences. A heavily confrontational approach would have bled the Zimbabwean economy and grounded the industry to a halt.

In my analysis, it is also important to note that though an important voice in Southern Africa regional politics Zimbabwe still qualified in the small state status. There is no consensus on what constitutes a small state, what is clear is that material capabilities alone are not enough. Zimbabwe lacked the exercise of power that can change global politics, however by having a ‘revolutionary’ foreign policy and a strategic location at the heart of Southern Africa did have important regional influence. The small state category here is deployed to put Zimbabwe’s global power and influence in context. While Zimbabwe is a small state like the rest in the Southern Africa region, the foreign policies and options are very different. Small states have different national interests, while there are points of convergence in Pan Africanism, it must not be taken to conclude that these small states do not have distinct competing interests.

### **The Organization**

In discussing the interaction between Pan-Africanism and Realism, my research analyzes some of the arguments put forward by key writers of Zimbabwe’s foreign policy like Stephen Chan and Hasu Patel. I use ministerial statements and statements from President Robert Mugabe or his trusted inner circle as the government position. This research takes the form of detailed narrative

history and is hard to explore and discuss Pan Africanism and Realism in the case studies without an in-depth consideration for history.

In chapter two, I discuss how the Geography and proximity of Zimbabwe to South Africa was a factor in influencing the foreign policy rhetoric and actions. In addition, the country had a strong bond with South Africa which also the newly independent government had to consider. I discuss how these economic, geographical, and historical realities played an important role in influencing foreign policy rhetoric. The sources and literature I engage are primarily on Zimbabwe's foreign policy character. The conversation about Pan Africanism and Realism is deployed at all levels from reasons for Zimbabwe's involvement, the course of the war, and the outcomes.

Chapter three deals with Zimbabwe's sanctions campaign against South Africa. Zimbabwe inherited relationships and trade realities which proved problematic to the sanction's campaigns. The administration in Harare appealed to the International Community and Western countries, in particular, to put pressure on South Africa. I end the chapter by discussing the differences between economic pragmatists and ideologues and what that meant for Zimbabwe's foreign policy rhetoric. In Chapter four, I conclude by discussing the findings of my thesis, summarizing the arguments, and discuss the implications of the study for those interested in studying Zimbabwe foreign policy, and for communication scholars, how to study a nation's foreign policy rhetoric when it has to navigate competing perspectives.

## Chapter Two

### Unbreakable Economic Bonds

This chapter examines the economic history, structural arrangements, personalities, and external realities that shaped Zimbabwe's foreign [and economic] policy rhetoric towards South Africa. I trace the history and evolution of the foreign policy discourse over time from 1980 till South Africa became independent in 1994, when apartheid fell. I start by discussing the economic linkages between Zimbabwe and South Africa, which have roots in the colonial era. Political independence does not mean an economic one as well. It is important to untangle the depth of the intertwined web of the economic relationship between Pretoria and Harare. An understanding of the trade and economic situation is important in situating the foreign policy and consequently the rhetoric of Zimbabwe towards South Africa. After laying out the historical groundwork, I proceed to analyze the language in Zimbabwe's foreign policy statements toward South Africa. My discussion is not exhaustive about every little detail on Zimbabwe's foreign economic policy towards South Africa. Rather, I am looking at foreign policy statements and speeches that directly address how Zimbabwe navigates the economic realities of needing to deal with South Africa and the ideological commitments of condemning apartheid policies.

I have premised my analysis on some of the important issues in the interaction of the two countries. Much has been written about this relationship that it serves no purpose for any work to dwell on the chronicles, thus my analysis is an

attempt to parse through the language and how rhetoric shapes and constraints foreign policy choices<sup>5</sup>. In dealing with foreign relations, how did Zimbabwe communicate policy? In times of potential economic crisis, how did Zimbabwe mitigate the conflict with South Africa through foreign policy? In what ways do we see the realists and/or Pan Africanist discourse playing out in Zimbabwe's interactions with South Africa?

In my analysis, I make no distinction between the presidential proclamations and ministerial statements. After independence, Zimbabwe's foreign policy was not decentralized. In 1981, the Foreign Affairs Minister Witness Mangwende told the trainee diplomats that "All Zimbabwe's diplomats must understand that the Prime Minister defines foreign policy; the Minister of Foreign Affairs articulates that policy; and under Minister's direction, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs implements the policy or the dispensation from the top" (Mangwende, 1981). As shown, the Prime Minister was the center of attention and the most important individual in foreign policymaking, every other proclamation and statement at any government level with regards to foreign policy must have been authorized by the Prime Minister himself.

Zimbabwe inherited foreign relationships, some of which were economical, from the successor state Rhodesia. The country was torn, divided along race, class, ethnic groups, and the gap between rural and urban development was immense. In line with fulfilling the demands of the liberation struggle, the new government had

---

<sup>5</sup> Refer to John Dzimba's *South Africa's Destabilisation of Zimbabwe, 1980-89*. Pretoria considered Zimbabwe's independence as a threat to South Africa's regional hegemony and engaged in military and economic destabilization programs against Zimbabwe.

to address these problems. Domestically, the new government inherited a dramatically unequal society, heavily damaged by years of civil wars (Gallagher, 2017). The liberation war had damaged some of the economic infrastructures, and some areas were blatantly neglected because they were black areas. Of importance, the economy and social reality in Zimbabwe had a dualist identity. There was a capitalist economy in which the private sector was largely white and poor subsistence one for blacks. This reality influenced the new government's domestic and foreign policy. When Rhodesian Prime Minister Ian Smith signed the

Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI) in 1965, severing ties with the British empire he landed Rhodesia in South African political orbit. This started a *South Africanization* of the Rhodesian economy. In addition to a deep connection in a shared belief in white supremacy, the Rhodesian and South African economies become more deeply intertwined than before.

Declaration of UDI started a long journey of economic dependency on South Africa and limitations for the new Zimbabwean government in 1980. The Rhodesian period of unrecognized independence<sup>6</sup> is an important comparison for the post-1980 period. Structural approaches to regional politics of the 1980s are premised on previous changes in regional relations in the 1960s (Klotz, 1993). Any serious work that seeks to explore the foreign economic relations between Zimbabwe and South Africa must consider the Rhodesian connection. It is nearly

---

<sup>6</sup> Rhodesia's UDI was not recognized by the British government and consequently remained an illegal political entity in the international community.

impossible to analyze the foreign economic policy discourse without situating it in the context of previous international relations.

### **You can choose your friends but not neighbors**

At independence in 1980, South Africa was Zimbabwe's major trading partner instrumental in the import and export of goods (Hanlon & Staff, 1986). Though Beira in Mozambique was being renovated, South Africa was still important for Zimbabwe's trade. The Beira corridor<sup>7</sup> was key in the South African-Zimbabwe relations. Pretoria provided investment links, a market for Zimbabwean goods, and a transport link to the international markets. South Africa's investments in Zimbabwe were second to none in the region. In 1970, five out of the ten largest manufacturing companies were wholly or partly South African owned and at independence, 75 percent of the international debt was owed to South Africa (Johnson, 1986). In the mining sector, the major players were South African. It is impossible to gauge the exact share of minerals production controlled from South Africa because the shareholdings are widely scattered, making it difficult both to collate them into a percentage of the sector's assets and to determine which constitute controlling interests, which are strategic stakes, and which are minor investments (Lines, 1988). South African firms own about one-third of all publicly quoted companies in Zimbabwe with the breakdown of control in the mining sector as follows: domestic 15 percent, South African 45 percent, British 30 percent, and other foreign 10 percent (Hanlon & Staff, 1986).

---

<sup>7</sup> The Beira Corridor is one of Southern Africa's main transport routes. It is a road and rail network linking large parts of Zambia, Malawi, Zimbabwe, and Mozambique to the port of Beira on the Indian Ocean

Anglo-American, a South African mining company, was deeply involved in Zimbabwe's economy. The extent of the company's involvement is difficult to fully untangle from the Zimbabwean economy. In 1980, eighty-two Zimbabwean companies in which the group had one or more directors related to the Anglo-American company (Johnson, 1986). These economic ties made Zimbabwe vulnerable to destabilization from South Africa. Destabilization has targeted the destruction of Zimbabwe's economy and security by South Africa. John Dzimba argued that the 1980-89 destabilization of Zimbabwe and other states in Southern Africa was the product of a long period of political preparation and intensive militarization in South Africa, dating back to the 1970s (Dzimba, 1998). The destabilization program involved the bombing of key military facilities in Zimbabwe, destruction of the Beira railway line, and delaying Zimbabwe's goods from South Africa.

Zimbabwe's economic rhetoric shifted with changes in the destabilization program. The administration in Zimbabwe bought out a newspaper with South African links in a bid to control the rhetoric in the relations. There was attention from the Zimbabwean government on how discourse was key in foreign policy. In 1981, during an Interview with Jonathan Kapstein, Robert Mugabe noted that "Again, you have a similar situation here as we had in respect of the press, except that in respect of the press we are a little worried that you had a South African group of companies owning newspapers here and therefore dictating policy to those papers here, hence having an instrument with which to manipulate the minds of our people" (R. G. Mugabe, 1981). This deliberate acquisition was motivated by the

need to control discourse in the relationship with South Africa and have the government articulate issues without hostile foreign interests' hindrances.

In 1980, shortly after winning elections, Robert Mugabe went to pains in his calculative language to calm South Africans and the white community in Zimbabwe. He realized they were important in terms of economic development. He argued "the republic is a geographical and historical reality. And our reality is that we must coexist with South Africa. Future relations would be conducted based on mutual recognition of the differences which exist between us, Zimbabwe would not interfere in South Africa's internal affairs" (H. H. Patel, 1987). The language was assuring to the business and private sector. This decision, however, resulted in the business and economy continuing in the hands of whites, this resultantly constrained his discourse and actions on South Africa. Fully aware of the economic dependence on South Africa, Zimbabwe opposed the constellation policy, joined the Frontline states. The Frontline States were actively working within Southern Africa to reduce dependence on Pretoria. The reconciliation and noninterference in the 1980 independence speech allowed Mugabe to join the Frontline states with ease though to the annoyance of South Africa.

### **Appeal to the Americans**

While accepting the reality of South African economic dominance, Robert Mugabe argued in a *Foreign Affairs* article that "Our dependence on South Africa has not come about by accident. It has been a strategy carefully worked out over many years" (R. G. Mugabe, 1987). Writing to the international community, Mugabe carefully packages the struggles with South Africa in rational ways that do

not scream knee-jerk criticism of South Africa merely because they are white. He supports his arguments with economic facts, clearly detailing how South Africa has destabilized Zimbabwe and the region. Arguing purely in economic national interest terms, the gospel of black solidarity and commitment to socialism seems to recede to the background. Robert Mugabe concludes "...and militarily, economically and socially we are paying an enormous price. Since 1980 the direct and indirect cost of South Africa's destructive actions against its neighbors has been well over \$20 billion." Robert Mugabe needed to be well-read and advised on US foreign policy in the region and use it against South Africa. Though articulating Zimbabwe's interests, the government of Zimbabwe had a habit of speaking on behalf of frontline states. Mugabe in the same *Foreign Affairs* article, which echoed sentiments he has shared elsewhere, does not only criticize the US foreign policy in the region but suggests reasonable alternatives. He argued, "More than half of the United States purchases of a dozen minerals considered strategic or critical are imported from South Africa. Most of the strategic minerals, however, can be purchased elsewhere in the region. For example, although South Africa accounts for about one-third of the world's production of chrome ore, my country contains most of the known deposits of high-grade chrome ore" (R. G. Mugabe, 1987).

In an act of rhetorical genius, Robert Mugabe pragmatically praised the United States' efforts and aid to Southern African countries. "We take note of the Reagan Administration's commitment to operating within our regional consensus. But we remain concerned that the main objective of the Administration's policy planners is not to stem Pretoria's regional aggression; rather, their main fear is that

the people of the region may turn toward communism and the Soviet Union” (R. G. Mugabe, 1987). The language in Mugabe’s appeal was very cautious. In acknowledging the competition between the US and Soviet Union within the region, his language demonstrated an appreciation of Geopolitics and statecraft. On economic issues, Robert Mugabe’s discourse was pragmatic which allowed flexibility in dealing with South Africa. International Relations expert Julia Gallagher noted that “Mugabe’s international standing was huge. He was hailed for his ability to bring about racial harmony after the civil war, for his government’s ambitious social Programme and his statesmanship in international matters” (Gallagher, 2017). The Prime minister was able to wield influence and credibility regionally, as highlighted by Stephen Chan in Chapter One Zimbabwe quickly replaced Zambia as a regional voice.

In his *Foreign Affairs* article, Mugabe was attempting to appeal to American foreign policy concerns by demonstrating an understanding of what was at stake and knowledge of American interests. He wittingly cited the U.S. Secretary of State's Advisory Committee report on South Africa, noting that "the active collaboration of the South African government, whatever its ideology, is *not* an important factor in protecting the Cape sea route." Mugabe was striking a rational code in his rhetoric using American foreign policy as a way of dealing with South Africa. His language was not naïve or dismissive, he was aware of the US economy and business in South Africa. Appealing to the United States was also an admission that Zimbabwe was limited in dealing with the regional prowess of South Africa and that Pretoria needed action from a superpower to change. The language was

cautiously reminding the US of the leverage the country had on South Africa. South Africa considered Washington as an ally and an important trading partner.

As a statesman, Mugabe needed not establish his credibility in *Foreign Affairs*, rather he was providing evidence to persuade his audience that he is not a reckless and angry Marxist as has been suggested elsewhere<sup>8</sup>. Mugabe “pursued a high-profile and rational foreign policy, promoting the idea of ‘African diplomacy’ in the lead he took against South Africa’s apartheid regime, and the crucial and skillful role he played in helping bring an end to civil war in Angola and Mozambique” (Engel, 1994). While advancing Zimbabwe’s issues in foreign policy, the administration always took an opportunity to speak on behalf of the region. In his appeal to Americans to arm-twist South Africa, Mugabe’s language was rational focusing on interests albeit casting doubt about American commitment.

In dealing with South Africa, Robert Mugabe demonstrated that he did not lack in principle the ability to tone down the rhetoric, balance his anti-apartheid rhetoric and focus on the demands of economic national interests. Zimbabwe benefited from South Africa oil and lubricants for their domestic industrial sector. While neighbors Zimbabwe and South Africa were miles apart in terms of systems of governance, values, and principles, yet the administration in Harare found ways to work with Pretoria. When national interests and security are at stake, rhetoric about Pan Africanism and liberation became secondary. The reality is Zimbabwe’s

---

<sup>8</sup> In a Washington Post in November 1984 titled Mugabe Bucks Area's Diplomatic Trend, Glen Frankel described Robert Mugabe as Southern Africa’s last angry man

economy needed Pretoria despite the strong disagreements. In a 1986 Trevor Phillips' documentary *Economic War*, Zimbabwe State Security minister Emmerson Mnangagwa observes that "At any time they [South Africa] can strangle us, I can give an example when the turnaround of trains between us [Zimbabwe] and South Africa was once at 13 days and then they increased to 18 days, they increased to 40 days but after some discussions with them they have reduced down to 18 to 20 days. Under Smith, it was 13 days. We must move away from that situation." (Trevor Phillips, 1986). The South African government was determined to destabilize Zimbabwe through military and economic means. In 1986, the Messina-Beit bridge railway carried three-quarters of Zimbabwe's trade with the outside world, an important trade link that was kept open only when the South Africans wanted it open. Parts and lubricants essential for industry, without which Zimbabwe would grind to a halt, traveled through this railway. Zimbabwe paid 25million dollars every year to South Africa to keep the trade route open.

As evident in minister Mnangagwa's words, Zimbabwe's rhetoric on South Africa was cautious and the approach calculative. The chairperson of Beira Corridor Association, Mr. Eddie Cross, observed that "We will see massive unemployment and major industries would virtually come to halt export earnings would fall dramatically and quickly even institutions such as the railroad would find it difficult to operate because of a shortage of essential lubricants" (Trevor Phillips, 1986). Zimbabwe's economic dependence on South Africa, though bitter enemies, resulted in cautious and calculative rhetoric that did not rely on a naive commitment to anti-apartheid. Nathan Laurie argues that despite being subjected to

destabilizations, Zimbabwe maintained pragmatic relations with South Africa (Nathan & Shaw, 2012). Zimbabwe denied South African and Namibian liberation movements guerilla bases. Zimbabwe maintained trade relations but withheld full diplomatic relations with South Africa. In assessing a hardline approach towards South Africa which might have included closing borders and cutting economic ties, Hasu Patel concluded, “for Zimbabwe, the real world presented an acute dilemma between principle and the geopolitical reality of a border with South Africa and the inherited multi-faceted dependence” (Chan & Patel, 2006). In language and practice, Zimbabwe avoided a potentially costly decision to hastily cut ties with South Africa.

In 1981, the Minister of Foreign Affairs Witness Mangwende argued that “It is, of course, true that economic independence often imposes severe constraints on the extent to which an under-developed and dependent state particularly a land-locked state like Zimbabwe can pursue a genuine policy of non-alignment without compromising...it is also an accepted fact that while nations are free to choose their friends (and occasionally their enemies too) they cannot, however, choose neighbors” (Mangwende, 1981). This was an admission to the minister in front of a military audience of the limitation to Zimbabwe’s approach towards South Africa. The inherited political economy was so deeply intertwined with South Africa that language had to be guarded. This pragmatism towards South Africa paid off, the government favored discussion behind the scenes even though both countries were on polar ends in ideology and system of government at the time. While South Africa was going through its political metamorphosis, the administration in

Zimbabwe knew it had to survive. This survival was heavily dependent on cooperation with South Africa in the meantime, while also searching for new routes to the sea. While castigating South African bullish behavior, Zimbabwe's rhetoric had diplomatic prudence undertones. Naturally as a small dependent state, sometimes the approach to South Africa was reactive but seldom reckless. Unrestrained nationalism on steroids can easily ruin foreign policy options and expose the country to potential economic and security problems.

## Chapter Three

### **Crippling Apartheid: Sanctions campaign Against racist South Africa**

Using Pan Africanism as an analytic framework, this chapter focuses on the Zimbabwe government sanctions discourse against South Africa. I look at various discursive constructions to identify themes in sanctions discourse. There are several thematic issues present in the sanctions discourse, but the most salient to this analysis are appeals to sovereignty, human rights, the international community, and solidarity. This analysis demonstrates that the sanction campaign had a dual function, putting pressure on South Africa and elevating Zimbabwe's status in international affairs. Before I discuss the reasons why Zimbabwe waged a campaign against South Africa or look at the sanctions discourse, it is important to first describe the Pan Africanism analytic framework with specific reference to the Zimbabwe situation. Rita Abrahamsen, a scholar on African Geopolitics from the University of Ottawa, identified a tripartite of various conceptions of the world order within Pan Africanism. She argued there is a world of continental unity and transnational solidarity; a world of national sovereignty; and a world of racially defined units (Abrahamsen, 2020). These contending 'camps' within Pan Africanism are not absolute silos; they often overlap in conceptions and approaches. The value of this approach is its ability to demonstrate how Pan-Africanism constitutes a patterned way of thinking about international politics that confers meaning and legitimacy on political strategies and actions, as well as how

different configurations of Pan-Africanism can be invoked by different political agents with varied political ends (Abrahamsen, 2020). Pan Africanism's analytic lens ultimately has multiple meanings and interpretations depending on the country's history and intended goals in a policy. Rhetoric is reflective of ideology. Rhetorical choices belie ideology. Ideology is a way of organizing values and norms, and formulating ways of articulation. Ideologies provide actors with a series of locally established 'commonplace' arguments which must be adapted to the demands of the situation. The rhetorical acts that emerge are not merely manifestations or expressions of the ideology but part of what it is (Finlayson, 2012). Thus, Pan-Africanism has a nature of rhetoric that draws on arguments of sovereignty, human rights, and anti-colonialism.

There was a relationship between race and nationalism that influenced Zimbabwe's sanctions rhetoric against South Africa. The support for anti-apartheid sanctions was a commitment to norms of non-racialism, black independence, and equal rights. South Africa is an undeniable geographic and economic reality which Zimbabwe relied on for major trade, this reality influenced Zimbabwe's discourse and approach. Race and racial superiority were at the heart of why the apartheid system existed in South Africa and minority rule in Rhodesia. Apartheid was about white racial superiority and crushing everything that was opposed to that system of governance. South Africa had a mutually dependent relationship with Rhodesia, Zimbabwe's predecessor state which affected how foreign policy towards South Africa was articulated after independence. Zimbabwe's strained relations with South Africa were influenced by the need to balance national economic interests

and a commitment to non-racialism and nationalism in the region. Previously, South Africa played a role in a series of meetings to convince Ian Smith to accept the Henry Kissinger Accords.<sup>9</sup> Pretoria pushed Ian Smith to accept the demands of the Kissinger Accords to protect the citadel of apartheid from collapsing.

A protracted violent liberation struggle would inspire blacks in South Africa and South-West Africa to rise against the white minority rule. Zimbabwean political actors were aware of South African intentions. To Kissinger's credit, neighboring black states agreed not to let in any more foreign armies.<sup>10</sup> After the Geneva talks failed, the South African government reverted to a reckless *White laager* mentality and stopped exerting pressure on Smith's minority government. The talks failed because there was a gap between the demands of the liberation struggle leaders (black majority rule and universal suffrage) and Ian Smith who was opposed to black rule. Frontline states in 1977 recognized ZAPU and ZANU forces as the only legitimate voices in Zimbabwe.

Ian Smith argued that they were a 'Marxist-indoctrinated minority' (Michel, 2016). South Africa sided with Ian Smith and his plan to negotiate with 'moderate' blacks which included Rev Abel Muzorewa. This was by no means altruistic moves by South Africa but a desperate attempt to save the white minority and protect

---

<sup>9</sup> Sometimes referred to as Kissinger proposals, the United States was supposed to use its influence to persuade or coerce South Africa into tightening economic and security screws on Rhodesia forcing Ian Smith into negotiating a settlement with ZANU and ZAPU nationalists. Rhodesia was supposed to accept majority rule and set up an interim government with a council of state and ministers made up of blacks and whites. The plan fell through because Ian Smith was not committed to black majority rule and nationalists wanted the transfer of power to the majority, not a soft-landing for Ian Smith.

<sup>10</sup> During the Cold war, the United States was preoccupied with countering the influence of Soviet Union.

white interests. Liberation struggle leaders who became important policymakers in independent Zimbabwe were vehemently against the South African regime. It is not surprising as a matter of foreign policy that a liberated Southern Africa was not complete without a black majority in South Africa. In nationalists' perception, Muzorewa was a sellout and puppet for South Africa, and Ian Smith was not fully committed to the struggle. All these realities were a prelude to an incoming difficult relationship between South Africa and Zimbabwe.

Ian Smith's declaration of Rhodesian independence from the British empire in November 1965 complicated South Africa's position in the world. Supporting Rhodesia meant on one front the world would focus on the Southern Africa region potentially beaming attention to racial disparity and problems in South Africa, and on the other relations between Pretoria and London would be strained. South Africa had trade and political relations with both Rhodesia and London. In the end, South Africa stood with Ian Smith who was very popular among white South Africans as a defender of their race and ideals. Besides, South Africa chose not to support sanctions against Rhodesia. While Rhodesia was not diplomatically recognized by South Africa, trade continued as usual between the two countries. South Africa allowed Rhodesia tobacco exports to get out and imports destined for Rhodesia to get in and could pay but scant regard to either British or international opinion on this issue (Farley, 2008). For the South African regime supporting actions against white Rhodesia would have resulted in a similar campaign against the apartheid regime. South Africa refused to cooperate with UN sanctions against Ian Smith, this resulted in sanctions to dismantle Ian Smith's regime as a failure. When South

Africa was siding with Rhodesia, the liberation struggle was intensifying in Rhodesia. Nationalist leaders who after independence became leaders in the independent Zimbabwe government were participants in the failed peaceful attempts to end minority rule and eventually military campaign against Smith. It is therefore not surprising that South African actions infuriated the liberation struggle leaders and after independence did not see it as an honest player in regional politics.

In 1980, Zimbabwe had an unquestionable commitment to Pan-Africanist rhetoric which shaped the position it took on South Africa. As argued earlier in this chapter, there was a world view within Pan Africanism that perceived world order in racialized terms. For Zimbabwe, this was the situation with South Africa. The sanctions campaign was to put pressure on the regime to concede to black majority rule, consequently, Zimbabwe's status as a defender of equal rights grew in the process. The primary reason for the sanctions campaign was to force the collapse of Pretoria and in the process alleviate the economic and security problems bedeviling the Southern Africa region. SADC executive secretary Dr. Simba Makoni argued South African aggression and destabilization had cost the region \$10 billion since 1980, and \$1.6 billion in war damages (Trevor Phillips, 1986). There was a realization that sanctions were going to hurt the region, which as shown below was the reason for some of the disagreements and perhaps mediated rhetoric on South Africa. Mugabe saw South African racism as the underlying cause of regional tensions and instabilities which resulted in the diversion of resources from development to defense (Klotz, 1999). Apartheid was perceived as a direct threat to

the regime rather than merely a distant evil; such perceptions spurred the government towards overt and active opposition to South Africa (Klotz, 1993).

### **A call for a Collective Effort**

#### **(International Community, Norms, Sovereignty, and Human Rights)**

Upon assuming independence, the Zimbabwe government articulated a foreign policy that was opposed to all forms of injustice, imperialism, and oppression. The government affirmed the reverence to multilateral and institutional governance as an avenue to pursue these foreign policy goals. Zimbabwe quickly joined the Frontline States in their efforts to challenge South Africa's regional hegemony and constellation policy.<sup>11</sup> This signaled Zimbabwe would be working in solidarity with other countries to find a solution in South Africa. It is not surprising that in various addresses Zimbabwe condemned South Africa and called for economic sanctions meant to cripple the apartheid regime. The administration in Harare, cognizant of its vulnerability to Pretoria, used its new role in international affairs to campaign against South Africa.

The Zimbabwe government packaged the problem of South Africa in regional terms. "For us in Southern Africa, the universality of human rights remains limited as long as those rights are denied to our brothers and sisters in South Africa. Indeed, we in Zimbabwe, and the sub-region generally, are painfully experiencing very serious limitations to our human rights because of the gross violation of those rights caused by the Pretoria regime's destabilization policies and

---

<sup>11</sup> Proposals for a union of Southern African states militarily and economically dominated by South Africa, South Africa wanted legitimacy and recognition, the black neighbors would in return get aid and other trade-related preferences.

actions ” (R. Mugabe, 1989). This allowed the players within the government to invoke the international community rhetoric. This appeal to the international community had a carefully calculated norms language that appealed to a diverse coalition in the United Nations General Assembly. The international community is referred to here as a family of sovereign states bound by international law. In such a reality, it is assumed every member of the family knows the values and rules of the community. Zimbabwe understood the discursive power the term ‘international community’ had, the government was not concerned by the composition (identity, who constituted it) but were appealing to the functionality of the community. Zimbabwe was leveraging on international community language. The appeal to universality of international law and rights issues, which are generally agreed upon but differ in context, enabled Zimbabwe to not isolate any country’s efforts which constituted the international community apart from South Africa.

While there is no consensus on the meaning of the international community, I use it here to refer to a community of nations bound by a set of values and norms. Invoking the international rhetoric is useful in pushing policy goals, legitimizing a cause, and ensuring a collective action from states and beyond. Zimbabwe emphasized the importance of the international community. This practical approach was influenced by Zimbabwe’s relative power and military as compared to South Africa. In an address to the United Nations General Assembly in October 1986, Robert Mugabe noted that “this Assembly must, as did the recent Harare eighth Summit Conference of Non-Aligned countries, strongly condemn the Pretoria regime for this and for recruiting, training, financing, directing and infiltrating

bandits and mercenary elements into neighboring countries to destabilize and overthrow their Governments” (R. G. Mugabe, 1986). Invoking the international community is a common practice in international politics. It is engaged for collective reference: it brings within its fold the multitude of actors within the international system (Kritsiotis, 2002). Hence Robert Mugabe was pressing for international collaboration. To achieve the ambitious political objectives in the sanctions, Zimbabwe needed the buy-in of virtually everyone who mattered in power politics. If one is to rely on the Rhodesian example, then it would have been certain that sanctions against South Africa were not going to be effective without the international community. In his speech, Robert Mugabe referred to sponsored South African bandits infiltrating the neighboring countries, highlighting the violation of sovereignty. It was important to remind the community of nations of the international laws South Africa was violating which were respected among the community of nations. This was supposed to inspire a collective action against Pretoria. In an interview with Jonathan Kapstein in 1981, Robert Mugabe speaking on behalf of his government affirmed their commitment to international efforts, “Now we are opposed to apartheid and we combine with the progressive forces in Africa and the international community of the United Nations in offering our support for any action that is taken to overthrow apartheid” (R. G. Mugabe, 1981).

A seasoned civil servant and diplomat, Finance minister Bernard Chidzero reminded the United States that there was a lot in common between Americans and Zimbabweans, noting “...and of the things that the Americans believe in. We believe that is not so. We would hope that the United States can stand squarely on

the side of freedom, democracy, and human dignity” (Hughes & Novicki, 1982). The call to commonality and sameness in values like human rights, freedom, democracy, and human dignity was an appeal to the international community. An international community is bound by norms and values of freedom and human rights. Robert Mugabe carefully dismissed the fears of communism and socialism which he was aware were rampant in the US. In the process, the minister did not isolate Zimbabwe’s socialist and communist friendly nations. The focus on human dignity, freedom, and democracy appealed to a wider coalition within the international community. The international community is used as the venue for discursive interaction, where “[t]he adoption of norms seems to be the price which the individual actor-person or state- must pay to participate in an interactive community” (Allott, 2001).

In 1989, addressing a Judicial Colloquium on The Domestic Application of International Rights Norms, Robert Mugabe argued that “the importance of human rights, both at the domestic level and internationally, can never be over-emphasized.” He drew on Zimbabwe’s history to underscore the country’s commitment internationally to the question of norms and human rights. For Zimbabwe, the human rights campaign abroad was perceived in racialized terms especially on the question of South Africa. The activist foreign policy of the newly independent Zimbabwe had roots in the Pan-Africanist commitment to racial equality established during the years of exile and war (Klotz, 1993). Zimbabwe understood the deep relations South Africa had with the international institutions since the League of Nations and participation in great wars. He understood that

without the threat of sanctions or military action which included the West (the UK, US, European community), South Africa would not move [change behaviors] (Melhuish, 1986). The call for the Commonwealth and Western countries to be involved in the campaign against the apartheid policy would strike South Africa in material terms (economic and security) and importantly isolate it from a group of nations Pretoria had relations with as a member of the League of Nations.

Zimbabwe's foreign policy discourse on sanctions was embalmed in norms and values to underscore the importance of international legitimacy for states. A reverence to the international community and the unwritten values and norms which constitute it can influence policy decisions. Importantly, the state [South Africa] in question must care about legitimacy and stand to lose economically and politically should it not abide by the stated values and norms. In various meetings with British officials and Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher where Robert Mugabe threatened a hardline approach, the British officials always highlighted the reforms, progress, and dialogue that was being made in South Africa. "We should take account of the changes already occurring in South Africa and encourage the progressive elements there to press for more" (Melhuish, 1986). Though Pretoria was racist, the Commonwealth leaders understood the regime's belief in liberal values and institutions. It was on this basis that they were pushing for dialogue pinned on a collective norm and values-based effort.

### **Economic Pragmatists and Ideologues**

*“Life is more serious than to be controlled by ideologies. Life is very down-to-earth, let us just look at the realities of life. And I believe that good businessmen enter into riskier areas than areas where we talk about ideologies without doing much about it.”*

The approach towards South Africa best illuminates the contest between nationalist hardliners and economic pragmatists. It is the classic case of balancing principles and practice in foreign policy. The hardliners were concerned that any reasoning with South Africa would have compromised Pan-Africanism commitment while pragmatists were concerned about the possible economic ramifications of a violent and vengeful South Africa. These differences in perception were evident in varying discursive elements in the government statements. The ideologues, in this case, had an unwavering commitment to Pan Africanism, their discourse often salient in the Prime Minister’s statement resembled a reverence to norms, idealistic arguments, and nationalism. Whether implicitly or explicitly, idealistic rhetoric emphasizes principles of definition and argues that auditors should comply with those principles (Burke, 1969). The economic pragmatists were very sensitive to the economic relationship with South Africa. The discourse they opted for was pragmatic and focused more on economic explanations rather than norms. This pragmatic discourse focused on the cause, effect, and consequences. As Kenneth Burke argued, Pragmatic rhetoric "evaluates a doctrine by its 'consequences,' by what it is 'good for,' by 'the difference it will

make to you and me,' or by its 'function,' or by asking whether it 'works satisfactorily'" (Burke, 1969).

The conflict within the Zimbabwe cabinet and foreign policymaking circles was somewhat predictable. In his first cabinet, Prime Minister Robert Mugabe had to balance warring factions, experiences, and personalities. The cabinet had Ivy league graduates, lawyers, guerillas, and members from the Central Committee who were of different ideological disposition. Just as the need for national reconciliation compelled Mr. Mugabe to include two white ministers in his Cabinet and four more from Mr. Nkomo's rival party, so the debt he owed his own Central Committee for their part in the direction of the war against the Rhodesian white government had to be paid. Of the 23 Cabinet members, 14 are drawn from ZANU Central Committee (MacManus, 1980). To illustrate this, in the cabinet there was minister Bernard Chidzero, an economist who had worked at various United Nations agencies. He identified more with the intellectual impetus of nationalism rather than with any single party. There was minister Enos Nkala, whose claim was political. *The Guardian* described him as a man of tempestuous temperament who is inclined to view the world in emotional terms, Mr. Nkala is perhaps hardly suited for the rarified atmosphere of high finance (MacManus, 1980). The Nkala and Chidzero juxtaposition as finance and economic ministers aptly makes the point that Mr. Mugabe has been able to pay off past political debts and plan for the future in structuring his cabinet (MacManus, 1980). In a confidential letter to the British government, Sir Roger Bone who served as the private secretary to the Foreign

Secretary noted that there was “a power struggle taking place between Mr. Ushewokunze, Minister for Home Affairs (a radical) and Mr. Mnangagwa, Minister for State Security (more moderate)” (R. Bone, personal communication, 2 December 1982). Even friendly governments at the time were aware of the ideological divisions in the cabinet and dealt with politics and security arrangements in cautious ways. Ministers like Chidzero, Emmerson Mnangagwa, Simon Muzenda, and Moven Mahachi were the main interlocutors when it came to arguing the ideological and economic implications of sanctions against South Africa. Prime Minister Robert Mugabe was made to listen to the implications of economic and military consequences of sanctions against South Africa. The ideologues like Enos Nkala, Nathan Shamhuyarira, and Hebert Ushewokunze wanted a forceful and uncompromising approach against South Africa. While the Pan-Africanists were calling for stronger sanctions, the economic nationalists cautioned restraint. Such a split resulted in a high rhetorical profile on additional sanctions without corresponding action (Klotz, 1993). Zimbabwean moderates were aware of the degree of dependency on South Africa, the country’s relative size militarily to South Africa, and that at the end foreign policy decisions had to serve economic realities and a compromise was needed.

In an interview with *Africa Report*, Finance Minister Bernard Chidzero argued that the United States should not be blinded with rhetoric. “Equally, we hope that the United States will not be influenced by ideological postures that are cast in rather academic terms-that socialism means communism...” (Hughes &

Novicki, 1982). The minister's call for the US to go beyond the veneer of rhetoric on South Africa was a rational wit reminder. Equally, we hope that the United States will not be influenced by ideological postures that are cast in rather academic terms-that socialism means communism.

High-ranking officials in the policymaking corridors who were moderates were aware of the repercussions of being antagonistic with South Africa. It was a mutual decision to leave trade relations open between the two countries. Minister Emmerson Mnangagwa was deployed to negotiate with South Africans in which he declined to establish an inter-ministerial communication between the two countries. The government's language where it mattered was very calculative and one could argue 'cordial' as Minister Chidzero noted: "We are aware that we have a big brother to the south, but we are not captive to that south. We have trading relations, economic relations, with South Africa" (Chidzero, 1982). South Africa was an unavoidable geographic contiguity and economic reality that influenced Zimbabwe's foreign policy rhetoric. I concede as shown in other sections of this chapter that Zimbabwe had a serious sanctions campaign against apartheid South Africa. There was no official diplomatic communication between the two countries, however, maintaining trade relations and calculated and moderate rhetoric from key Zimbabwe ministers is indicative of a gap between rhetoric and reality. Minister Chidzero argued further that life was more serious than to be controlled by ideologies.

Zimbabwe's sanctions rhetoric against South Africa publicly was arguing for total isolation but in practice (owing to the economic realities) the government had to settle at the beginning for isolated cooperation in the trade relations. Countries can be completely opposed on the political and ideological front, however, where economic and national security interests are at risk they cooperate.

In discussing the role of the business community in Zimbabwe, Audie Klotz notes that there was tension between the corporate and socialist direction taken by the government. She notes analysis of the decision-making process reveals that, rather than considering business warnings inaccurate, the government discredited such opposition as disloyal, defeatist, and in sympathy with racist ideologies, thus demonstrating the role in (de)legitimizing and shaping policy (Klotz, 1993). While indeed Zimbabwe was preaching socialism in general terms, the economic structures and ways of doing business remained capitalist. As best captured by minister Chidzero's words, "Life is more serious than to be controlled by ideologies. Life is very down-to-earth, let us just look at the realities of life. And I believe that good businessmen enter riskier areas than areas where we talk about ideologies without doing much about it" (Hughes & Novicki, 1982).

Zimbabwe's relations with South Africa have been functional but often characterized by storms and suspicions with a basic underlying hostility because of apartheid (Hasu H Patel, 1985). Zimbabwe articulated an organic link between the foreign policy and the history of the liberation struggle against white minority rule. In an address at Zimbabwe National Army staff college, Foreign Affairs Minister

Witness Mangwende argued that “In conceptualizing, and in making out the various dimension of foreign policy, we have been, and we continue to be, strongly influenced by how we achieved our nationhood and regained sovereignty” (Mangwende, 1981). The strong foundations in nationalism and sensitivity about sovereignty and territorial security were key in making a strong sanctions campaign against South Africa. In uncompromising terms, the Prime Minister argued that “We vehemently condemn these (destabilizations) acts of aggression, which seek to foment political and economic instability in our region and increase the dependence of the front-line States on South Africa. We call upon South Africa to this policy of aggression” (R. G. Mugabe, 1986).

The government in Zimbabwe was unequivocal about the sanctions campaign, sanctions were considered an important puzzle to undermine apartheid. “Sanctions relating to military, economic, cultural, and sporting activities isolate the regime; they are one method of raising the cost of apartheid both economically and psychologically (R. G. Mugabe, 1987). Invoking sovereignty and territorial integrity was necessary for pushing the discourse into the international law realm. Robert Mugabe and his ministers had a consistent message in the opposition against South Africa, while the how of practicalities might have differed, the core message remained the same. A collective call to the international community, sovereignty, norms, and a call for respecting human rights was repeated through different Zimbabwe’s statements in the United Nations as argued above.

There was an appeal to a collective history of struggle against injustice: “The decision to fight for independence is not a phenomenon peculiar to southern Africa. Nor is the decision to fight for a nonracial society. Americans, more than most, must be aware of this, and Europeans, who fought only 45 years ago to free their countries from Nazi occupation. Independence and the democratic right of the majority to decide their destiny is or should be, a sacred principle to all of us” (R. G. Mugabe, 1987). While he was pressing on the commonality of the struggle experiences, Robert Mugabe also wittingly singled out the United States and European countries to make serious efforts against apartheid. This rhetoric underscored that fighting for the emancipation of the majority of people in South Africa would have been a mission to accomplish a noble cause.

The leaders knew South Africa had the economy of Zimbabwe by the throat. Despite the commitment to Pan Africanism and non-racialism at home and abroad, Prime Minister Mugabe heeded the calls of economic pragmatists and was hesitant to implement sanctions on South Africa. Also, the ideological and rhetorical approach in foreign policy was constrained. An argument can be made that while Zimbabwe’s sanctions rhetoric was constrained by economic realities, the government lacked a serious ideological project of its own. The Prime Minister’s scientific socialism arguments never really took off. Also, the incomplete control of the state and the economy created a toxic gap between policy and discourse. The incompleteness was because the Black government took over a bruised, but not defeated, settler state which contained powerful anachronistic

elements that were hostile to the political projects of the new regime (Herbst, 1990). This extended to business, trade, and the general economy. At independence, the ZANU PF leadership constituted a thin veneer atop a largely untransformed state apparatus. The Cabinet found itself in a fragile position because institutions wholly or partly controlled by groups of dubious loyalty were interposed between the leadership and its popular base (Bratton, 1981).

Economic pragmatists won the conflict against ideologues like Ministers Enos Nkala and Nathan Shamuyarira. The cooperation on trade relations helped to somewhat thaw the relations between the two countries. Accommodative rhetoric from ministers like Bernard Chidzero and Emmerson Mnangagwa on behalf of the government eased nervousness in South Africa. There was a relaxed attitude to continued rhetoric hostile to Pretoria, which is in stark contrast to...earlier more belligerent responses (*Mugabe Bucks Area's*, 1984)

The Zimbabwe government was compelled to alternate between Pan-African discourse (commitment to non-racialism) and pragmatism in which the government had to negotiate with bitter rivals to save the economy from collapsing. In a series of speeches at various Non-Aligned Movement conferences and Commonwealth Heads of state meetings, Mugabe spoke vehemently against apartheid South Africa and supported the imposition of economic sanctions. This ideological character of foreign policy was pushed by nationalist hardliners within the government and at the party level. However, while Zimbabwe publicly supported sanctions against Pretoria, the country did not push with the

implementation. Economic pragmatists and other leaders (Thatcher, 1989) warned against the implications of the sanctions and how it would complicate Zimbabwe's economy. As a result, Harare did not push for the implementation of the sanctions. The appeal to international community rhetoric is a double-edged sword. On one hand, the appeal to the international community's condemnation of SA apartheid gives Zimbabwe some cover. On the other hand, Zimbabwe can be hemmed in on how much they can move forward with sanctions (by the UK, and other Western countries). This is an example of how Zimbabwe utilized the rhetoric of Pan Africanism without fully sacrificing the pragmatism of the Realism frame, especially as it relates to a major economic partner (one that cannot be changed because of geographic reasons and because Zimbabwe inherited a state apparatus from Rhodesia that is some intertwined with South Africa). No amount of ideology can change the reality of modern state geographic location! All told, Zimbabwe did its best to play the hand it was dealt, and its Foreign Policy rhetoric was how it played it to become such a force in Southern Africa.

## **Chapter Four**

### **Conclusion**

After independence, the Zimbabwe government had to balance developing meaningful foreign policy structures and operationalization of new relationships. The country was isolated with nonexistent meaningful relations beyond apartheid South Africa. It is not surprising that after independence, Prime Minister Robert Mugabe committed to joining a community of other nations, respected for multilateral approaches, and opened the country to everyone. As I argued in Chapter Two, after independence Zimbabwe's decision to align with Frontline states was not only a blow to South Africa's constellation policy but a direct challenge to its regional hegemony. At the heart of South Africa's regional hegemony was white supremacy which motivated bullish behavior to any state that challenged that policy. Zimbabwe's decision to join forces with Frontline states was an unwavering commitment to emancipation and liberation in the region. The question of liberation of the people in Namibia and ending South Africa's toxic involvement in Mozambique and Angola was so central to Zimbabwe's foreign policy.

Zimbabwe's campaign against the apartheid system had two important outcomes, the campaign put pressure on the illegal government in Pretoria and elevated Zimbabwe's international status. South Africa had previously played a mediatory role in the Henry Kissinger Accord and forced Ian Smith to accept the proposals because they did not want an international searchlight beamed at the problems in South Africa. Zimbabwe's campaign exposed South Africa, more attention than before was put on South Africa. Zimbabwe's rhetoric was to put

pressure on other nations (the US, European nations) to apply pressure to South Africa, which allows Zimbabwe to essentially have it both ways. As argued in Chapter Three, Zimbabwe had private engagements with the British government officials pressuring them to act decisively against the apartheid regime in South Africa. This ultimately allowed Zimbabwe to navigate the middle ground between Realism and Pan Africanism.

The Zimbabwe Prime Minister used every opportunity in the British Commonwealth, United Nations, and Non-Aligned Movement conferences to condemn South Africa. Prime Minister Robert Mugabe argued that apartheid was the biggest threat to the security and wellbeing of every citizen in Southern Africa (R. G. Mugabe, 1987). The primary audience in Zimbabwe's foreign policy on South Africa was those Western nations aligned and continued to do business with South Africa within the International Community. Apart from weakening and exposing Pretoria, the campaign elevated Zimbabwe's status in international politics. A small landlocked and the newly independent country developed a big reputation because of the commitment to international norms, non-racialism, anti-imperialism, and human rights. Zimbabwe developed into such an important voice that the 12th Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting was held in Harare in 1991. Zimbabwe was recommended by Margaret Thatcher for the work in Mozambique and bringing peace to the region (Thatcher, 1989). Zimbabwe had also hosted and chaired the Eighth Summit of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries in September 1986. At the summit, the question of South Africa was discussed but the conference also deliberated on Nuclear weapons, Israeli-Palestine

conflict. Zimbabwe was a deliberate choice for both of these conferences because of the reputation and commitment which the country had espoused in its foreign policy.

Zimbabwe's approach to the relationship with apartheid South Africa was indicative of how the country was able to navigate and balance the commitment to ideology and pragmatism. In ideology, the emphasis is on ideas and principles which the administration identifies with and is committed to advancing those ideas. In pragmatism, the government goes beyond idealism and focuses on the practicality of politics and advance national interests. These interests can be economic or security. In both societies with strong institutions and those with thriving ones, it is important to note the difficult difference between personal interests (despised as national) and those that advance development, the prosperity of the nation, and result in an improved standard of living. Zimbabwe's foreign policy was characterized by a commitment to a Pan-Africanist ideology and a realist approach. The varying and oscillating discourse present in a series of Robert Mugabe's speeches and those of his ministers is indicative of a dual approach to South Africa. The geographical reality and economic positioning of Zimbabwe influenced the rhetoric that was adopted towards South Africa. Resultantly, as chains can bind a prisoner captive, the language in international relations can bind values, identities, and narratives to state decisions.

Zimbabwe meticulously navigated and balanced a commitment to non-racialism and reconciliation at home while arguing against white apartheid South Africa. Unlike Rhodesia, the new state was for everyone, blacks, whites, and all

non-white people. It was a reconciliation of a people previously separated by white supremacy. This accommodative approach by the new government made it difficult for South Africa to accuse the administration in Harare of being unreasonably anti-white. Robert Mugabe argued that “We are not opposed to the whites in South Africa; neither are the liberation movements, as they have often stated. It is the policies of apartheid that we oppose and will continue to oppose with all the moral, political and diplomatic power available to us, in support of the oppressed people of South Africa” (R. G. Mugabe, 1987).

Considerations for discursive elements help to further understand foreign policy formulation and can also work as a complementary foreign policy analysis method. Discourse produces meaning and becomes a source that shapes and reflects policy. A State’s foreign and security policy discourse not only articulates certain ideas of that State’s policy and strategy but also creates social interactions in IR through conveying meanings to other States (Yongtao, 2010b). Discursive elements show how policymakers perceive and interact to formulate policy. This interaction between the arguers and the audience illuminates details that can be easily missed by a structural approach. Ultimately scholars of rhetoric and argumentation emerge as interlocutors capable of contributing a conceptual apparatus to analysis of world affairs (Mitchell, 2009). Foreign policy statements tell something about the perceptions and ideas of those who make policy (Fisher, 1969). Embalmed in Pan Africanism various statements by the Zimbabwe government espoused a commitment to norms, nationalism, and non-racialism as important factors in foreign policy. While these principles had to be sustained by

rhetoric. A great deal of foreign policy consists of establishing a rhetorical position rather than effectuating action in the world (Forsythe, 1980).

Pan Africanism and Realism were not incommensurable paradigms in Zimbabwe's foreign policy. Despite arguments that they are, looking at the rhetoric suggests otherwise; that they can be blended to advance both a nation's political and moral interests. Rhetoric is the only way to navigate the difference. In addition, rhetoric is important in foreign policy analysis, it can show the character of a country's foreign policy character.

Paying attention to various rhetorical patterns can shed light on government actions. Realizing your incapacities and adopting a toned-down approach that does not bleed your ailing economy is a stroke of pragmatism. While I have highlighted the disagreements between the cabinet members on the approach towards South Africa these agreements were not silos. The history, context, and character of a foreign policy is a major determinant of the available language and narratives a state can deploy. There is a dearth of literature that deals with rhetoric in Zimbabwe foreign policy, much is yet to be explored on how leaders create narratives and utilize them.

The geography and proximity of Zimbabwe to South Africa was a factor in influencing the foreign policy rhetoric and actions. The country had a strong bond with South Africa which also the newly independent government had to consider. These economic, geographical, and historical realities played an important role in influencing foreign policy rhetoric. Zimbabwe as a new state had to confront the constraints that were set because of the Rhodesian state. There was a question

of balancing continuity and transformation in dealing with South Africa. Indeed, there were idealist and economic reasons for Zimbabwe to launch a campaign against South Africa. On the economic front, Zimbabwe wanted to end dependence on South Africa, that process was complicated and compromised by the destabilization program referred to in previous chapters. Zimbabwe wanted to use the cheaper Beira corridor for trade, but the corridor was militarily under attack by South Africa. On the idealist front, it was important to promote liberation and Pan-Africanism. While idealism was the starting point the outcomes were supposed to push for the end of apartheid policy.

South Africa's regional hegemony with more military and economic prowess meant that Zimbabwe had to be creative. Resultantly, rhetoric appealed to commonality, collective action, and norms were deployed to coerce and convince international players to act decisively on South Africa. Zimbabwe's decision to join the Frontline States was a sure commitment to like-minded states and an indication that anti-imperialist efforts were serious and at the heart of the country's foreign policy. The country's multilateral and working with everyone approach was guided by the need to achieve black majority rule in Southern Africa. Consequently, the apartheid policy was problematized in regional security terms which made it easier to appeal for collective actions. Burdened by the economic and geographical reality the country adopted flexible and accommodative rhetoric which was not blind to Southern Africa Geopolitics. This foreign policy analysis exercise puts communication and rhetoric at the heart of Geopolitics, paying attention to discourse and language is fundamental in

understanding the character of Zimbabwe's foreign policy. In analyzing foreign policy of countries with antagonizing relationships a rhetorical analysis best exposes the 'truths' in the discourse which is sometimes the only available source which to predict another country's actions. Zimbabwe's discourse was indicative of the country's interests, priorities, and the direction which the country sought to take in interacting with others in the community of nations.

## Bibliography

- Abrahamsen, R. (2017). Africa and international relations: Assembling Africa, studying the world. *African Affairs*, 116(462), 125–139.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/afraf/adw071>.
- Abrahamsen, R. (2020). Internationalists, sovereigntists, nativists: Contending visions of world order in Pan-Africanism. *Review of International Studies*, 46(1), 56–74.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210519000305>.
- Allott, P. (2001). *Eunomia: New order for a new world*. Oxford University Press.
- Badza, S. (2005). Foreign Policy Zimbabwe: The next 25 years. *Centre for Peace Initiatives in Africa*.
- Bone, R. (1982, December 2), Letter Private Secretary, Foreign and Commonwealth Office [Confidential].
- Bratton, M. (1981). Development in Zimbabwe: Strategy and tactics. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 19(3), 447–475.
- Brown, W. (2006). Africa and international relations: A comment on IR theory, anarchy and statehood. *Review of International Studies*, 32(1), 119–143.
- Burke, K. (1969). *A grammar of motives*. University of California Press.
- Carr, E. H. (2016). *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939: Reissued with a new preface from Michael Cox* (M. Cox, Ed.). Palgrave Macmillan UK.  
<https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-349-95076-8>
- Chan, S. (1992). *Kaunda and Southern Africa: Image and reality in foreign policy*. British Academic Press.

- Chan, S. (1994). The diplomatic styles of Zambia and Zimbabwe. In P. B. Rich (Ed.), *The Dynamics of Change in Southern Africa* (pp. 218–233). Palgrave Macmillan UK.  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-23617-6\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-23617-6_11).
- Chan, S. (2017, February 27). *Plural international relations in a divided world*. Wiley.  
Wiley.Com. <https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Plural+International+Relations+in+a+Divided+World-p-9781509508679>.
- Chan, S., & Patel, H. (2006). Zimbabwe's foreign policy: A conversation. *The Round Table*, 95(384), 175–190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00358530600585693>.
- Chidzero, B. (1982). *Bernard Chidzero, Zimbabwean Minister of Finance, Economic Planning, and Development*.  
<https://search.proquest.com/docview/1304051309/citation/7FE66A2D2CFB47DFPQ/1>
- Clark, J. F. (2001). Realism, Neo-Realism and Africa's International relations in the post-cold war era. In K. C. Dunn & T. M. Shaw (Eds.), *Africa's Challenge to International Relations Theory* (pp. 85–102). Palgrave Macmillan UK.  
[https://doi.org/10.1057/9780333977538\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1057/9780333977538_6).
- Dzimba, J. (1998). *South Africa's destabilization of Zimbabwe, 1980-89*. Palgrave Macmillan UK. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230372146>.
- Engel, U. (1994). *The Foreign policy of Zimbabwe*. Hamburg: Institute of African Affairs.
- Falola, T., & Agbo, C. (2019, July 29). *the prospects and challenges of Pan-Africanism*. Oxford Research.Encyclopedia of Politics.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.718>.

- Farley, J. (2008). *Southern Africa*. Routledge Handbooks Online.  
<https://www.routledge.com/Southern-Africa/Farley/p/book/9780415310352>
- Ferim, V. B. (2017). Reassessing the relevance of the Pan-African Discourse in contemporary international relations. *Theoria*, 64(4), 85–101.  
<https://doi.org/10.3167/th.2017.6415306>.
- Finlayson, A. (2012). Rhetoric and the political theory of ideologies. *Political Studies*, 60(4), 751–767. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2012.00948.x>
- Fisher, R. (1969). *International conflict for beginners*. Harper & Row.
- Forsythe, D. P. (1980). American foreign policy and human rights: Rhetoric and reality. *Universal Human Rights*, 2(3), 35–53. <https://doi.org/10.2307/761845>.
- Gallagher, J. (2017). *Zimbabwe's international relations*. Cambridge University Press.  
<https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/zimbabwes-international-relations/55C89CF9A7F8EF4F7E7DCE5962072A0F>.
- Hanlon, J., & Staff, C. I. F. I. R. (1986). *Beggary Your neighbors: Apartheid power in Southern Africa*. Indiana University Press.
- Henderson, E. (2017). *African realism? International relations theory and Africa's wars in the postcolonial era*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.  
<https://rowman.com/isbn/9781442239517>.
- Herbst, J. (1990). *State politics in Zimbabwe*. Univ of California Press.
- Hughes, A. J., & Novicki, M. A. (1982). Bernard Chidzero, Zimbabwean Minister of Finance, Economic Planning, and development. *Africa Report*, 27(3), 4–11.
- Johnson, P. (1986). *Destructive engagement: Southern Africa at war* (1st ed.). Zimbabwe Publishing House for the Southern African Research and Documentation Centre.

- Keohane, R. (1986). *Neorealism and Its Critics*. Columbia University Press.  
<http://cup.columbia.edu/book/neorealism-and-its-critics/9780231063494>
- Klotz, A. (1993). Race and nationalism in Zimbabwean foreign policy. *The Round Table*, 82(327), 255–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00358539308454162>.
- Klotz, A. (1999). *Norms in international relations: The struggle against Apartheid*. Cornell University Press.
- Kritsiotis, D. (2002). Imagining the international community. *European Journal of International Law*, 13(4), 961–992. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/13.4.961>.
- Lines, T. (1988). Investment sanctions and Zimbabwe: Breaking the Rod. *Third World Quarterly*, 10(3), 1182–1216.
- Lumumba-Kasongo, T. (1994). *Political re-mapping of Africa: Transnational ideology and the re-definition of Africa in world politics*. University Press of America.
- MacManus, J. (1980, March 13). In ruling Zimbabwe Mugabe will have to balance Parliament, Cabinet, and ZANU. *The Guardian*, 7.
- Mangwende, W. (1981, November 4). *Diplomats should be honest and truthful* [Press Statement]. Zimbabwe Department of Information.
- Mashanda, T. (2017, August 23). *Of Zim foreign policy and national interests*. The Herald.  
<https://www.herald.co.zw/of-zim-foreign-policy-and-national-interests/>
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2006). 3. Structural Realism. In *International Relations Theories*. Oxford University Press.  
<https://www.oxfordpoliticstrove.com/view/10.1093/hepl/9780198707561.001.0001/hepl-9780198707561-chapter-3>.

- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2010). *Why leaders lie: The truth about lying in international politics*. Oxford University Press.
- Melhuish, R. (1986). *Secretary of State's meeting with Mr. Mugabe* (Confidential No. 1011252; p.4).
- Michel, E. R. (2016). *The White House and White Africa: Presidential policy On Rhodesia 1965-79*. 349.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs & International Trade—Foreign policy*. (1980, April 18). Ministry of Foreign Affairs & International Trade.  
<http://www.zimfa.gov.zw/index.php/about-us/foreign-policy>
- Mitchell, G. (2009). Rhetoric and International Relations: More Than “Cheap Talk”. In A. Lunsford, K. Wilson, & R. Eberly, *The SAGE handbook of rhetorical studies* (pp. 247–264). SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412982795.n14>.
- Morgenthau, H. (2005). *Politics among nations* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Mugabe Bucks Area's Diplomatic Trend* (1984, November 7). The Washington Post.  
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1984/11/07/mugabe-bucks-areas-diplomatic-trend/c9027b04-e45a-4a33-a438-fb9a5b68ea99/>.
- Mugabe, R. (1989). Inaugural Address by His Excellency the President Cde Robert Gabriel Mugabe. *Legal Division International Affairs Division Human Rights Unit Commonwealth Secretariat, 2*.
- Mugabe, R. G. (1981, March). *Robert Mugabe on aspects of Zimbabwean foreign and domestic policies*. South African Institute of International Affairs.  
[https://media.africaportal.org/documents/Robert\\_Mugabe.pdf](https://media.africaportal.org/documents/Robert_Mugabe.pdf)

- Mugabe, R. G. (1986). *Address by Mr. Robert Gabriel Mugabe, Prime Minister of The Republic of Zimbabwe (A/41/Pv.21; Forty-First Session General Assembly Provisional Verbatim Record of The Twenty-First Meeting)*. United Nations.
- Mugabe, R. G. (1987, 88). *Struggle for Southern Africa*.  
<https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/southern-africa/1987-12-01/struggle-southern-africa>.
- Nathan, L., & Shaw, P. T. M. (2012). *Community of insecurity: SADC's struggle for peace and security in Southern Africa*. Taylor & Francis Group.  
<http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/wfu/detail.action?docID=834070>
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2013). *Pan-Africanism and the international system*. Routledge Handbooks Online. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203803929-3>.
- Nkiwane, S. M. (1993). Development of Zimbabwe's foreign relations 1980–90. *The Round Table*, 82(326), 199–216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00358539308454155>
- Non- Aligned Movement. (1986). *8th Summit Conference of heads of state or government of the non-aligned movement* [Conference Resolution].
- Park, Y. (2008). Historical Discourse Analysis. In *the SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*. SAGE Publications, Inc.  
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412963909.n198>
- Patel, H. H. (1987). *No master, no mortgage, no sale: The foreign policy of Zimbabwe*. CREDU.
- Patel, Hasu H. (1985). No master, no mortgage, no sale: The foreign policy of Zimbabwe. *Regional Development at the International Level: Volume 2, African and Canadian Perspectives / Ed. by Timothy M. Shaw, Yash Tandon.*, 219–263.

Payne, R. (2007, August 16). *Neorealists as critical theorists: the purpose of foreign policy debate* | *Perspectives on Politics* | Cambridge Core.

<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/perspectives-on-politics/article/neorealists-as-critical-theorists-the-purpose-of-foreign-policy-debate/25537AC57238C5CE54F845686BE5640D>.

Sachikonye, L. (2012, April 24). *Zimbabwe's lost decade*.

<https://muse.jhu.edu/book/18147>.

Thatcher, M. (1989, March 29). *Speech at dinner given by Zimbabwean President (Robert Mugabe)* | Margaret Thatcher Foundation.

<https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/107612>.

Tieku, T. K. (2013). *Theoretical approaches to Africa's international relations*. Routledge

Handbooks Online. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203803929-2>

Trevor Phillips. (1986, December 2). *Economic War* | *South Africa* | *Zimbabwe* |

*Emmerson Mnangagwa* | *This Week* | 1986 |.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QHUzjbvk-Jc&t=125s>

Walt, S. (1997, March 6). *Revolution and War*. [https://www.amazon.com/Revolution-](https://www.amazon.com/Revolution-Cornell-Studies-Security-Affairs/dp/0801482976)

[Cornell-Studies-Security-Affairs/dp/0801482976](https://www.amazon.com/Revolution-Cornell-Studies-Security-Affairs/dp/0801482976).

Yongtao, L. (2010a). Discourse, meanings and IR studies: Taking the rhetoric of 'Axis of

Evil' as a case. *CONfines de Relaciones Internacionales y Ciencia Política*, 6(11),

85–106.

Yongtao, L. (2010b). Discourse, Meanings and IR Studies: Taking the Rhetoric of 'Axis of

Evil' As a Case. *CONfines de Relaciones Internacionales y Ciencia Política*, ISSN

1870-3569, N<sup>o</sup>. 11, 2010, 6.

## Curriculum Vitae

Tatenda Mashanda  
tatendamashanda@alumni.wfu.edu

### EDUCATION

#### **Wake Forest University - Winston-Salem, NC | Master of Arts**

*Communication and Rhetoric, 05/2021*

**Thesis:** *Foreign Policy Discourse, The Interaction between Realism and Pan Africanism in Zimbabwe Foreign Policy Narratives.*

Coursework in Organizational Communication, Research Methods, Rhetorical Criticism, and Political Communication

#### **Wake Forest University - Winston-Salem, NC | Bachelor of Arts**

*Politics and International Affairs, 05/2017*

Minored in African Studies

**Thesis:** *Realism and Idealism in US foreign policy towards Iran*

#### **Waterford Kamhlaba UWCSA - Eswatini | High School Diploma**

*International Baccalaureate, 11/2013*

**Extended Essay:** *Successes and Failures of Zimbabwe Government of National Unity.*

### RESEARCH INTERESTS

Southern Africa Geopolitics

Zimbabwe Foreign policy

Language/Rhetoric in International Politics

### WORK HISTORY

#### **GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANT | 08/2019 to 05/2021**

WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY - Winston Salem, NC

Communication Teaching Assistant (a)Public Speaking, (b)Rhetorical Criticism

Facilitated academic lab for writing and public speaking

#### **THE HERALD ZIMBABWE** (Newspaper Publications)

Of Zim foreign policy and interests (23 Aug 2017)

Good politics a prerequisite for development (17 Aug 2018)

Rethinking the term Sub-Saharan Africa (10 May 2017)

Africa rising: Don't mistake hype for reality (29 June 2018)