

Foreign Policy Posture in Post-Apartheid South Africa

Foreign Policy Posture in Post-Apartheid South Africa:

Consistencies and Ambiguities

Edited by

Bhekithemba R. Mngomezulu

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Foreign Policy Posture in Post-Apartheid South Africa:
Consistencies and Ambiguities

Edited by Bhekithemba R. Mngomezulu

First published in 2020

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2020 by Bhekithemba R. Mngomezulu and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-4091-X

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-4091-0

To my late beloved mother **Mrs. Nondlala Filda Mngomezulu** who passed away on Tuesday, 21 June 2016 and was laid to rest on Saturday, 02 July 2016 and to my two late brothers, **Moses** and **Josiah Mngomezulu** who passed on in 1999 and 2002, respectively. May their departed souls rest in eternal peace. I will forever miss them!

I also dedicate this book to my Esovane Community at Ingwavuma as well as all South African liberation fighters who sacrificed their lives for the oppressed masses of this country. We owe our freedom to them.

Foreign policy is a combination of aims and interests pursued and defended by a given state and its ruling class in its relations with other states, and the methods and means used by it for the achievement and defusing of these purposes and interests. (Ojo et al. 1985, 43).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	ix
Foreword	x
Acknowledgements	xii
Introduction	1
The Complex Nature of Foreign Policy Making Bhekithemba R. Mngomezulu	
Part I: An Overview of South Africa's Foreign Policy	
Chapter 1	22
A Realist Explication of the Metamorphosis of South Africa's Foreign Policy Posture Since 1990 Bhekithemba R. Mngomezulu	
Part II: South Africa's Foreign Policy in Africa	
Chapter 2	50
Complexities in South Africa's Foreign Policy Towards Nigeria Aderemi O. Ade-Ibijola & Nnanyere C. Ogo	
Chapter 3	73
South Africa's Foreign Policy Towards the Central African Republic Hlengiwe R. Phetha	
Chapter 4	94
South Africa's Foreign Policy Towards the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) Sakhile Hadebe & Siyabonga Dlamini	
Chapter 5	112
Soft Power and South Africa's Foreign Policy Towards Zimbabwe Bhekithemba R. Mngomezulu	

Chapter 6	133
South Africa and Mozambique from a Foreign Policy Perspective Rachidi R. Molapo & Khalesakhe S. Mbhense	
Chapter 7	155
Regional Supremacy or Coalition? South Africa's Political-Economic Integration in Southern Africa Nathi Mlambo & Olusola Ogunnubi	
Part III: South Africa's Foreign Policy Abroad	
Chapter 8	180
The Foreign Policy of Post-Apartheid Azania Mlungisi Phakathi	
Chapter 9	198
South Africa's Foreign Policy Towards Palestine and Israel Themba I. Radebe	
Chapter 10	214
South Africa's Engagement with the United States of America: An Afrocentric Perspective Kgothatso Shai & Stanely Ehiane	
Chapter 11	232
South Africa & BRICS: Foreign Policy Alignment of Africa's Peace & Security or Missed Opportunity? Martin R. Rupiya	
Conclusion.....	248
Consistencies and Ambiguities in SA's Foreign Policy Posture Bhekithemba R. Mngomezulu	
Appendix A: Abbreviations.....	255
Appendix B: Contributors	259
Index.....	267

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1 Sectoral share (in percentage) of Nigeria’s nominal GDP before and after rebasing.....	63
Table 7-1 Brands under four Massmart divisional operations	157

FOREWORD

I am deeply humbled and honoured to have been asked to pen the foreword to this very important book on South Africa's foreign policy in Africa and abroad, titled: *Foreign Policy Posture in Post-Apartheid South Africa: Consistencies and Ambiguities*. Given the occasional adversarial views within the African continent and internationally about the motives behind South Africa's dealings with other countries; and given the sustained debate on whether South Africa's foreign policy agenda is consistent or ambiguous, this book is a welcome contribution. I am certain that the South African government in general and the Department of International Relations and Cooperation (DIRCO) in particular will extol this effort.

South Africa prides itself as a country with many peculiarities. This is evidenced in the political abnormality epitomized by dual colonialism or 'Colonialism of a Special Type', smooth transition to a democratic order, diversity of cultures, a progressive Constitution, and many such conspicuous realities which remain a dream to many countries around the world.

Since 1994, South Africa has played a critical role in diplomatic relations, conflict resolution and in terms of engaging in many benevolent activities meant to better the lives of others. In the process, the country has made friends while also inviting hostile reaction from those who accuse it of claiming hegemonic status within Africa.

Against this backdrop, providing a broader context of South Africa's foreign policy position and using specific country case studies to expound the discussion marks a huge contribution to scholarship within the international relations field. This book does not only provide the historical context within which South Africa's foreign policy agenda should be understood and interpreted (important as that might be). Conversely, it also addresses very critical questions which have constantly been raised in many quarters in an attempt to understand why the country acts in a particular manner and why South Africa has become a significant player in African and in global politics despite being the late-comer in the democratic dispensation.

In a nutshell, I find this book critical in many respects. Firstly, it is informative and educative to any reader who is not knowledgeable about the country's beleaguered history. Secondly, it provides an invaluable analysis of foreign policy—both from a theoretical perspective and from a practical point of view. Thirdly, it demystifies some of the serious assertions that have been made about South Africa. Fourthly, it repositions South Africa as a key player in global politics. Fifthly and lastly, it has been written in such a manner that it appeals to different audiences.

In conclusion, let me once again take this opportunity to appreciate the space I was afforded to pen the foreword to this very important book and to congratulate Prof. Mngomezulu and the authors of the different chapters for doing such a commendable job. This book is worth reading, not just by political science, history and international relations students and scholars, but will appeal to a wider readership. It is a significant contribution to our understanding of the nuances and the dynamics of foreign policy making and should therefore find its place in many shelves—both in Africa and elsewhere in the world.

Mr. Sandile E. Schalk
Chief Director: SADC, DIRCO
Pretoria, 12 September 2018

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Putting a book together, no matter how big or small, can be a daunting task. Therefore, authors need all the support they can get in order to execute this mammoth task. The present project is no exception. It has greatly benefitted from many people who played different roles before and during the writing and assembling process. I cannot mention by name all the people who made it possible for this project to be a success but will mention just a few.

First of all, I would like to profusely thank my late mother, Mrs. Nondlala Filda Mngomezulu from whose passing I derived inspiration to do something good in her honour. This book is a result of that tragedy. Despite having not been able to go to school, my mother had immense love for education and sacrificed all to make me the person that I have become. **MAY HER DEPARTED SOUL REST IN ETERNAL PEACE!**

Secondly, I would like to thank the contributors of different chapters featured in this book. They worked assiduously to meet the deadlines I had set for them. I salute them all and deeply appreciate their patience with my constant e-mail reminders and phone calls.

Thirdly, my sincere gratitude goes to the University of the Western Cape (UWC) where I am currently based. While researching for this book, I used various University resources to collect the necessary data and to prepare the book. I am indebted to UWC for these services.

Fourthly, I am grateful to Mr. Sandile Schalk from DIRCO for agreeing to pen the foreword to this book. Fifthly, the platform provided by the Danish Ambassador in Pretoria is deeply appreciated. The feedback I received on the paper I was invited to present there on 14 June 2017 shaped my thoughts. In particular, I thank Prof. Thomas Mandrup who facilitated my trip.

Assembling the different chapters and formatting this book needed technical skills and sound computer knowledge. I am grateful to Mr. Nqobizwe Memela from the University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN) who assisted me with his technical skills. Moreover, I am indebted to Ms Fazlyn Petersen from UWC who assisted me in creating the book's index. Her assistance in this regard is highly appreciated. I also thank Mr. Conrad Meyer at UWC and Andiswa Vikilahle from Nelson Mandela Museum Council for lending

a hand on various technical aspects of the book. Importantly, I am grateful to Miss Barbara Dupont for her editorial work to improve the quality of this book. I salute these and all those who assisted me in many ways during this academic journey!

In order to assemble this book, I needed a quiet space to do so. In this regard, University West in Trollhattan in Sweden afforded me such an opportunity while I was a Visiting Professor there for five weeks teaching International Relations Theory. I had the much needed time to focus on the manuscript with no disturbances. While there, I also took time off and visited Oslo in Norway to refresh my mind. This was a welcome opportunity which I will forever cherish.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family, friends, and the community of Esovane at Ingwavuma where I was born and bred. I always see myself as their Ambassador in whatever I do. They continue to shape my thoughts and deeds. In particular, I humbly thank my late mother, Nondlala, and my two late brothers, Moses and Josiah Mngomezulu for laying the foundation on which I have built my academic career. I also thank my only surviving sister, Ms. Mavis Fanisile Mngomezulu who sacrificed a lot working at the petrol station at Mkhuze to provide for me. Above all, I thank my Creator who made it all possible.

Prof. Bhekithemba R. Mngomezulu

Trollhättan, Sweden

13 September 2018

INTRODUCTION

THE COMPLEX NATURE OF FOREIGN POLICY MAKING

BHEKITHEMBA R. MNGOMEZULU

Understanding foreign policy is a prerequisite for the success of any student of international relations. The reason for this is because those for whom international relations is a specialty have the potential to help nations forge relations and ensure global peace. Therefore, foreign policy as a part of the international relations discipline cannot be dealt with in a casual manner due to its long-term implications for states. It is mainly for this reason that Grieco, Ikenberry and Mastanduno (2015,105) espouse the view that “understanding foreign policy is critical because the foreign policy choices that states make have profound implications for relations among states.” These authors continue to argue that it is of pivotal importance in any international relations text to devote sustained attention to the various determinant factors of foreign policy making.

Good state relations have many advantages to those states in all spheres of life. Such relations improve state security and have the potential to improve the economies of the states that have good working relations. In the same vein, bad relations among states could inevitably result in the destruction of those states because military engagement or the use of hard power remains a constant possibility. This means that both domestic and foreign policy should be carefully thought through, assiduously crafted and cogently sustained for state, regional, continental and global survival. After all, a country’s foreign policy is by default “an extension of its domestic policy” (Mhanda 2002/03, 157). As discussed in Chapter 5 of this book, South Africa adopted “quiet diplomacy” (also referred to by other international relations scholars as “silent diplomacy”) while dealing with Zimbabwe (Mlambo 2016; Fowale n.d.).

Historically, foreign policy making is a process that has been going on for many decades across the globe. However, there are two very discernible observations to be made about this phenomenon. Firstly, professional historians have generally left the responsibility of writing about foreign policy mainly to political scientists and any other scholars who specialise in international relations (Saunders 1990). This decision is predicated on the fact that, at times, foreign policy involves speculation as opposed to being strictly guided by archival knowledge which some historians dogmatically and religiously rely upon. Secondly, no foreign policy is stagnant in any country; countries' foreign policies change over time in order to be in line with the persistently changing political environment and the world order. At times a country's foreign policy depends on the incumbent government or the political leadership. Therefore, whenever the government changes hands and whenever the new political leadership ascends to power, the prospects for change in the country's foreign policy orientation is maximised.

It is within this context, therefore, that those countries that were once hostile to each other later draft friendly foreign policies which show signs of political convergence. In the same vein, countries that were once deemed friendly towards each other subsequently reconfigure their foreign policies the moment they identify divergent points which pull them apart as sovereign states. The same happens when new leaders assume power in a given country. One example is America's foreign policy towards Cuba under President Barak Obama and under President Donald Trump. President Obama initiated a process aimed at narrowing the decades-old gulf between America and Cuba evidenced in the two countries' foreign policies and international relations. The world applauded President Obama for his bold initiative. However, on assuming power, President Trump unapologetically reversed this foreign policy stance for his own personal ambitions of portraying himself as the self-proclaimed 'protector' of American interests. Once more, international relations between Cuba and America returned to a hostile state.

One undisputable point is that foreign policy making is a very complex process by any standard imaginable. As such, it should not be taken lightly by any leader. This complexity is occasioned by a confluence of factors which are outlined below.

It should hurriedly be stated here that policies in general, and foreign policies in particular, are triggered by, or anchored upon different strands. Here, we can mention five types of policies. Firstly, there are policies that are **proactive** in nature. These are the policies which anticipate what is

likely to happen in the near and distant future and try to avert any untenable and volatile political situations or untoward results. Such policies are undoubtedly the most preferred policies in the sense that they logically save resources (financial and material) that would have been used to deal with or address a situation once it has already arisen. Secondly, there are **reactionary** policies. These policies react to a situation that has already occurred and thus try to address or reverse such a situation or minimise its impact. In the event that hostile relations already exist between two countries, a reactionary foreign policy could assist in alleviating the crisis and hopefully eventually contribute to the total elimination of such a crisis. However, there is no guarantee that an untenable situation will totally dissipate. That is why it is recommended that a proactive foreign policy should be preferred to a reactionary one.

Thirdly, there are **corrective** policies. These types of policies are related to reactionary policies. They are meant to correct a situation which appears to cause animosity or friction between and among countries by straining relations – be they political, economic, social or otherwise. Fourthly there are **punitive** or **vindictive** policies. The main goal for drafting such policies is to punish a state or states deemed to be deviant or out of order in one way or the other. The aim is to bring such states or countries into line through a cogently formulated foreign policy that would send a clear message to the assumed offender. America's foreign policy stance on countries such as Cuba, Iraq, North Korea, Syria, Zimbabwe, and many others could be used as clear examples of this foreign policy type.

Lastly, there are **compliance** policies. These types of policies are formulated as a compliance factor. They are not crafted because the country really needs them per se or sees their relevance or need in its national interest. Conversely, they are created in order to comply with or conform to conventional practice.

In the final analysis, foreign policy making is a concerted effort. It needs people with various expertise to join hands and draft policies that are pragmatic, and which resonate with the prevailing situation at any given time. Importantly, as alluded above, all foreign policies are guided by national interests. Before formulating a foreign policy, each country looks at how such a policy will benefit the country and then drafts, adopts and implements such a foreign policy. Therefore, it should not come as a surprise that “we often say that a government is pursuing a particular foreign policy because it advances some interest” (Grieco *et al.* 2015. See also Jentleson 2010; George and Keobane 1980). This is so because no government would invest time and resources in drafting, adopting and

implementing a foreign policy that would be detrimental to its national interests and its people. After all, the electorate vote a government into power with the understanding and confidence that it will serve and represent their interests. Once in office, such a government cannot afford to fail its electorate. In the event that it does, it is voted out of power or is forcefully removed from power and replaced by another government.

Lastly, foreign policy should be grounded on non-interference in other countries' internal affairs (Mwanasali 2008). This increases trust and mutual respect as opposed to hostility. It is known that even when countries forge international relations, they still retain their political sovereignty and autonomy. It is for this reason, therefore, that international relations in general, and foreign policy making in particular, have to be predicated on trust and respect for each country's political sovereignty and autonomy. Any country which does not respect other partners loses both trust and respect; it is also generally frowned upon by other fellow countries and thus loses its political stature.

Understanding Foreign Policy and Foreign Policy Analysis

Foreign policy: What exactly do we mean by 'foreign policy'? This question can be answered at two levels – one which is more general, and another which is nuanced and deep. With regards to the former, a very simplistic answer to this question could be that foreign policy refers to how different countries relate to or interact with one another and how they forge relations in different aspects of life such as political and socio-economic relations. Depending on the nature of these relations, we can then talk about a 'friendly' foreign policy or a 'hostile' foreign policy. Linked to this definition is the view that foreign policy is "the strategy or approach chosen by the national government to achieve its goals in its relations with external entities" (Hudson 2008, 12). Flowing from these definitions, it is not an exaggeration to state that foreign policy guides countries on how they should relate to and interact with one another within a particular political context. It is informed by anticipated national gains from such relations.

More nuanced definitions of foreign policy implore us to apply our minds to how we perceive and understand foreign policy. One view is that in order to understand this concept we first need to acknowledge the fact that foreign policy is a sub-field of international relations, and that within international relations two main sub-fields exist, i.e. international politics and foreign policy (Tayfur 1994, 114-115). If this view is anything to go by, then we can safely argue that foreign policy is part and parcel of the international

relations discipline. It guides individual countries across the globe on how they should relate to other countries without necessarily compromising their national interests - which should always take first priority, and without tempering with other countries' political sovereignty and autonomy.

While the explanation presented above is helpful, there are even more specific definitions of foreign policy proffered by various authors. For example, McGowan (1973, 12) avers that "foreign policy could be defined as the actions of national or central governments taken towards other actors external to the legal sovereignty of the initiating governments." Implicit here is the view that a national state or government decides which state(s) it wants to forge relations with and how those relations should be shaped. The aim is always to satisfy national interests as prescribed under the realism theory; a theory that is said to be state-centric.

The fact that foreign policy brings together two or more national governments and/or states is confirmed by the definition provided by Wilkenfield *et al.* (1980, 22) where they advocate the view that "foreign policy is those official actions (and reactions) which sovereign states initiate (or receive and subsequently react to) for the purpose of altering or creating a condition (or problem) outside their territorial sovereign boundaries." What is also worth noting here is that at times a state's inaction is itself guided by its foreign policy. In that sense, foreign policy is not always about the state's action(s), on the contrary, at times inaction is in itself the epitome of the state's foreign policy imperative or foreign policy stance. It is within this context that a country's 'neutrality' or abstention during voting on a resolution at the UN is interpreted as action or is viewed as reminiscent of the country's foreign policy stance.

Foreign policy analysis [FPA]: In a way, this concept is self-explanatory; it refers to how foreign policy is analysed so that it makes sense to a larger audience in a more accessible way. A nuanced definition of FPA is that the concept is a sub-field of International Relations [IR] which is saddled with the responsibility to explain foreign policy or foreign policy behaviour (Hudson 2008). According to Hudson (2008, 12), among the many trademarks or characteristic features of FPA are the following:

- (i) a commitment to look below the nation-state level of analysis to actor-specific information;
- (ii) a commitment to build actor-specific theories as the interface between actor-general theories and the complexity of the real world (Ibid.);

- (iii) a commitment to pursue multi-causal explanations spanning multiple levels of analysis;
- (iv) a commitment to utilise theories and findings from across the spectrum of social science; and
- (v) a commitment to viewing the process of foreign policy decision-making as important as the output thereof.

Scholars of FPA advance the view that the history of the development of this concept has three phases, which are enumerated as follows:

- (i) an initial period of development from the mid-1950s to the mid-1960s when it arose out of deep dissatisfaction with the simplistic nature of realist accounts of foreign policy;
- (ii) an exploitation of FPA in the US during the late 1960s and early 1970s, as a tightly bound group of scholars gravitated towards a specific methodology; and
- (iii) The period since the early 1970s (Smith 1987, 345).

Following from the discussion above, we can conclude that the two concepts (foreign policy and Foreign Policy Analysis) are not as simple and straightforward as they seem at face value. They are more complex and need close scrutiny by whoever uses them in order to ensure that the meaning attached to them is not lost or watered down. For this reason, it is imperative that this complexity be considered whenever using the two concepts so that one is not accused of being too presumptuous, casual or even taking a cursory look at more complex concepts in the field of international relations. As a matter of fact, foreign policy can either make or break nations. For this reason, it is always wise to consider the complexities and challenges associated with foreign policy making. This point is expounded in the next section below.

Complexities and Challenges in Foreign Policy Making

There is a general consensus among scholars of international relations that foreign policy making is a complex process with many challenges (Putman 1988; Hudson 1995; Snyder *et al.* 2002; Mintz 2004). This complexity can be attributed to a confluence of factors which operate at different magnitudes. Moreover, while some of these factors are context specific and only apply to certain countries and situations, others are more general or generic and tend to transcend the geographical and racial divide. Here, I will enumerate and explicate just a few of these factors—albeit in a tantalising manner, in order to give substance to the assertions made above. The

primary goal in this section is simply to demonstrate **how** and **why** foreign policy making is deemed to be such a complex exercise or process for nations.

One of these factors is the very fact that foreign policy making calls for dedicated skills and a clear focus from those who are tasked to carry out this process. For any country to relate in an efficient and effective manner with another country “its foreign policy must be well defined, well thought out, and must possess a lucid direction” (Ade-Ibijola 2012, 121). This view is supported by Osahor (2003), among other authors. Another important causal factor for this complexity stems from the fact that domestic policy and foreign policy are almost always inextricably intertwined with each other but sometimes fight for supremacy and are therefore in constant competition with each other. This is so because the former has an effect on the latter (Fearon 1998; Mhanda 2002/03). It is almost impossible to talk about foreign policy without also making reference to domestic policy, and vice versa.

Within this broad context, Evans *et al.* (1993) talk about the relationship between international bargaining and domestic politics. Guided by this trajectory, Hubert Humphrey, who was one of the Presidential candidates in America in 1966, espoused the view that foreign policy is actually domestic policy which has its hat on (Humphrey 1966). In the same vein, Canadians stated over three decades later that their foreign policy could be viewed as social work on a global scale (Canada and the World 1999). Implicit in these statements is the view that the two policy types (domestic and foreign policy) are interwoven to the extent that one cannot be fully explained without making reference to the other. Any attempt to divorce domestic policy from foreign policy (and vice versa) would be synonymous to trying to remove the heart from the body and hope that the body would still survive on its own.

Drawing from the foregoing discussion, it is clear that one policy type cannot be adequately formulated without also thinking about how it will affect and be affected by the other type. Another point worth noting in this regard is that, as liberalism teaches us, the type of government in a country determines the nature of both domestic and foreign policies that are crafted at any given time and place (Heywood 2011; Slaughter 2011; Starr 2007). For example, when South Africa was dubbed a ‘pariah state’ under the disreputable apartheid regime, the country’s domestic and foreign policy posture was an epitome of the apartheid regime. In the same vein, when South Africa eventually became a democratic country following the first

inclusive elections in April 1994, the country's policies went through a reconfiguration process to align with the changed political environment. This should not be misconstrued to denote South Africa's incongruity. The same applies to all other countries across the globe – be they in Africa or anywhere in the world; be they developed or undeveloped. The nature of the state and the calibre of its leadership determine the nature of both the domestic and foreign policies of that country, as evidenced in the Obama/Trump cases referred to earlier.

Another complexity of foreign policy making comes into the fore by virtue of the fact that foreign policy mirrors domestic policy. It can safely be said that it is not easy to formulate a foreign policy that might contradict the country's domestic policy. That alone means that foreign policy making is bound to be a complex exercise regardless of the country or countries involved in the drafting process.

Hudson (2008, 20) provides another angle through which one can vividly see the complexity of foreign policy making. He makes the point that one of the focal points is that the very mind of the foreign policy maker is under no circumstances a *tabula rasa*. This means that such a mind already contains a number of complex and intricately related ideas on which any decision is predicated. Included on the list could be the following: beliefs, attitudes, values, experiences, emotions, memory, feelings, assumptions, etc. In a nutshell, the decision-maker does not operate in a vacuum. Remnants and vestiges of culture, geography, history, ideology and such related factors all shape the policy-maker's thinking, both directly and indirectly.

One of the main questions that needs to be asked is: What role does democracy play in foreign policy making? Put differently, the question could be phrased as follows: does foreign policy making need the voice of the majority in a country for it to work? These are not easy questions to answer. From a democratic perspective those who live in a country should have a say on how they should be governed and who should govern them. This is what French philosopher Michel Foucault refers to as **governmentality** (Burchell *et al.* 1991; Gane 2008; Nilsson and Sven-Olov 2013). In this context, one would expect the voice of the electorate to feature in foreign policy making. However, in the context of representative democracy those who are in office represent the rest of the masses and decide on their behalf.

Therefore, while these sentiments about democratic practice have credence and are at the core of democratic consolidation, the reality of the matter is

that when it comes to foreign policy making, such notions of democracy do not necessarily hold firm. There is an ongoing debate between the liberal democratic and realist approaches to foreign affairs in general and foreign policy making, in particular, regarding the role of public opinion in that process. One of the realist scholars (Morgenthau 1978) sees public opinion as a barrier to any thoughtful and creative diplomacy in all its facets. While it is true that part of democratic consolidation entails allowing the voice of the majority to reign supreme, democratic notions do not seem to apply when it comes to foreign policy making. In fact, realists show a high level of skepticism towards the possible contribution of the general public to effective foreign policy making. The process is left in the hands of a few technocrats who coin or draft such policies.

Confirming the view expressed above, Holsti (1992, 440) elegantly sums up this trajectory by stating that, “finally, the effective conduct of diplomacy requires secrecy, flexibility, and other qualities that would be seriously jeopardised were the public to have a significant impact on foreign policy.” This view corroborates that of Morgenthau (1978) who posited that the rational requirements of any good foreign policy cannot, from the outset count upon the support of a public opinion whose preferences are emotional as opposed to being rational. This is the reality of what foreign policy entails and what should be expected in any country.

Taking a cue from the discussion above, one can safely say that foreign policy making is a complex exercise which needs to be carefully thought through. At times, it negates the very democratic principles which many countries uphold and guard. Exogenous and endogenous factors shape the formulation of foreign policy. These factors do not always see things from the same vantage point. That is why some policies make sense from an international perspective but do not necessarily resonate with the local context. Whenever this happens, domestic policy and foreign policy sit at the opposite ends. In order to defend national interests, national governments develop foreign policy strategies to guide them in their engagement with other countries. This remains an ongoing process which constantly changes as the need arises. It is for this reason that a country's foreign policy is never static.

Therefore, foreign policy making in South Africa cannot be understood outside of this general principle. In the same vein, it would be foolhardy to assume that foreign policy making in South Africa would be a simple exercise if it is complex everywhere else. The reality is that foreign policy making in South Africa was complex in the past; it is complex now; and

will remain complex even in the future. This understanding should set the parameters within which readers should read this book.

About the Book

Background

As a general principle, there is never a book which simply emerges from nowhere. All books across academic disciplines are informed by specific factors which motivate authors to write them in the first place. The present book is no exception in this regard. In a nutshell, this book on South Africa's post-apartheid foreign policy was motivated by three reasons. Firstly, I personally wanted to understand and reflect on how South Africa's foreign policy has evolved over time, and especially since the 1990s, with a view to establishing the chronology of events over time. Secondly, I wanted to test the notion that South Africa's foreign policy is inconsistent and that it is primarily predicated on nationalist interests with no intention to assist other countries South Africa has relations with. Thirdly, I wanted to debunk any insinuation about the possibility of perceived South African particularism by demonstrating that South Africa's foreign policy is informed by realism as is the case with all other countries across the globe. I therefore made a conscious decision to use examples from both Africa and beyond in order to demonstrate the ubiquity of practice in foreign policy making.

In putting this book together I had to apply my mind to these ideas extensively and assiduously. The aim behind the preparatory work outlined above was to ensure that the end-product would be what it was envisaged to be and serve the purpose I had in mind when first conceptualising this book. I first toyed with the idea of writing the book alone, as I have done in the past, so that I could freely expand on all the issues I wanted to discuss in the realm of foreign policy in particular and international relations in general. However, on second thought, I decided to afford some of the postgraduate students I have supervised and groomed over the years an opportunity to write something for the larger public and thereby gain confidence as emerging scholars. This decision was informed by my resolve to capacitate young researchers who should take the baton to promote scholarship when some of us exit the academic stage.

Against this backdrop, I then took a very conscious decision to invite seven of my former postgraduate students (Masters and PhD) to contribute chapters either as sole or co-authors. I also invited two former colleagues of mine who once worked under my supervision at the University of KwaZulu-

Natal (UKZN) where I served as the Academic Leader and whose postgraduate dissertations I examined. Moreover, I invited one academic who was supervised by one of my former PhD students who is now an Associate Professor at one of the universities in South Africa. One of my former students suggested another academic who was based at the University of Zululand (UNIZUL) whom he wanted to co-author with, to which I agreed. I then invited one independent and established scholar whom I had met at the Danish Embassy in Pretoria where I presented a paper titled “Norms and values in SADC–South African normative leadership?” I selected this scholar due to his keen interest in the theme of this book. I asked him to contribute a chapter that would be broad in its focus, and he agreed.

To make life easier for my contributors, I decided on the title of the envisaged book, its three parts, and the titles of the individual chapters I expected them to put together. This was done with the view to ensure that there would be a clear chronology and that the selected cases would tease out the issues which informed the writing of the book in the first instance and maintained the consistency that I wanted to see. Where minor deviations from the original chapter titles were suggested by two authors, I looked into those proposals against the broad theme of the book and accepted the minor changes that would not tamper with the contents of the original chapter titles. With all these logistical arrangements agreed to, my team was ready to move. I then immediately set reasonable deadlines so that the process could be controlled. I promised to send constant reminders to my authors in addition to individual feedback they received from other readers. This was done because I had to read and comment on all the individual and co-authored chapters, while also penning some of the chapters as well as preparing both the introduction and conclusion to the manuscript to ensure its flow.

The Book’s Focus

The focal point in this book is primarily to provide an analysis and explication of South Africa’s foreign policy posture since the advent of democracy. This process was ushered in by the negotiations which began in 1992 when the African National Congress (ANC) leadership and the Nationalist Party (NP) government sat around the table to plan the future of South Africa. The process reached its saturation point with the historic 27 April 1994 first democratic election in the country. More specifically, the book identifies both consistencies and ambiguities in successive administrations from President Nelson Mandela (1994-1999), to President Thabo Mbeki

(1999-2008), and lastly to President Jacob Zuma (2009-2018). President Kgalema Motlanthe (2008-2009) is not given any specific attention in the book. This is because he was simply a caretaker President elected to finish President Mbeki's term following his recall by the ANC. As such, he did not have time to craft any foreign policy that would distinguish his administration from those of the three presidents, nor did he have any specific emphasis on pre-existing foreign policy positions already in place when he came on board. These are the factors that made it unnecessary to provide an analysis of Motlanthe's short-lived administration.

Theoretically, the book is anchored on realism as an international relations theory. Within this context, various chapters use specific countries to explain why South Africa's foreign policy posture took a particular direction at any given point but resorted to another approach in other instances. However, this should not be misconstrued to mean that other theories of international relations do not matter. Where necessary, these are mentioned and applied, albeit in passing. The three key questions addressed in the book are the following:

- (i) To what extent has the realist theoretical approach informed South Africa's foreign policy agenda since the 1990s;
- (ii) To what extent is post-apartheid South Africa's foreign policy posture characterised by consistencies and/or ambiguities; and
- (iii) To what extent is South Africa's experience with foreign policy making similar to or different from other countries?

In order to address these questions adequately, the book uses a case study approach. This decision was informed by the view that case studies allow researchers the opportunity to delve more into issues and provide detailed accounts that paint a better picture than general discussions. Case study research "allows the exploration and understanding of complex issues" (Zainal 2007, 1). Since the book is divided into different parts (as shall be seen below), there are also broad chapters in each part. These chapters are meant to give broader contexts to the discussions covered in each section or part. Such a decision was triggered by the desire to assist readers who might not be conversant with the issues discussed in each of these sections or parts.

Structure of the Book

This book has eleven chapters and is divided into three parts. After the introduction, PART I is an overview of South Africa's foreign policy. This part only has one chapter (**Chapter 1**) which provides a realist's explication

of **how** and **why** South Africa's foreign policy evolved. In this chapter, I trace South Africa's foreign policy from 1908 when the Union of South Africa was contemplated up to 1989 when FW de Klerk took over as the last leader of the Nationalist Party government in South Africa. This is meant to provide background historical information to assist readers who might not be knowledgeable about South African political history. I then begin the main discussion by focusing specifically on the period between 1990 and 1994 when a free and democratic South Africa was envisaged and when discussions between the apartheid government and the ANC ensued. Here, I discuss the many activities that took place during this period as a build-up to the first democratic election in 1994. The chapter then looks at how the post-apartheid government formulated its foreign policy and shows how such a policy differed markedly from the one formulated by the apartheid government since 1948. In a nutshell, Chapter 1 provides the broader historical context of the entire book.

Part II focuses on South Africa's foreign policy in Africa. It draws from the historical context presented in chapter 1. This part comprises six (6) chapters. These are chapters 2-7. In **Chapter 2**, Ade-Ibijola and Ogo discuss South Africa's relations with Nigeria. In so doing, they consider what has worked well and what the key challenges have been in these relations. The two authors discuss the complexities of South Africa's foreign policy towards Nigeria under different administrations. They demonstrate that relations between the two countries were either strong or weak depending on who was at the helm at each given political moment. Importantly, the authors also demonstrate how the power struggle between the two countries affects their foreign policy positions and thereby both directly and indirectly affect relations between other African countries, especially given that they are both dominant in Africa.

Chapter 3 focuses specifically on South Africa's foreign policy towards the Central African Republic (CAR). In this chapter, Phetha traces South Africa's relations with the CAR and discusses the country's involvement in the political conflict in the CAR as well as its aftermath. She reflects on the debates that were triggered by South Africa's involvement in the CAR which resulted in the deaths of many South African soldiers who were stationed there. These debates are traced both within South Africa and from across Africa and beyond. Importantly, Phetha links her discussion to the notion of national interest and foreign policy making. This speaks directly to the overall theme of this book using this particular case study.

Chapter 4 stays in the Great Lakes region but switches or refocuses the discussion to the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). In this chapter, Hadebe and Dlamini trace back South Africa's relations with the DRC over time and under different administrations—including those of Mobutu Sese Seko, Laurent Kabila, and his son Joseph Kabila whose term of office ended in December 2016 but remained in office as at the time of this book being put together. The two authors provide the chronology of events and enumerate a number of activities carried out by South Africa in the DRC at different political moments. Importantly, they also reflect on the impact of South Africa's involvement in the DRC in the socio-economic and political life of the people of that country as well as on South Africa's political image.

Chapter 5 comes closer to home and specifically looks at South Africa's foreign policy towards Zimbabwe. In this Chapter I provide a critical analysis of the context within which the now contentious 'soft power' and 'quiet diplomacy' approach was initially started by President Mandela, put into effect by President Mbeki and subsequently sustained by President Zuma in Zimbabwe. Key in the discussion in this chapter are the reasons **why** South Africa consistently forged relations with President Mugabe despite his well-known human rights challenges in his country and despite the outcry made by several global players that South Africa should adopt a tough approach in dealing with Zimbabwe. To assist the reader, I explicate issues in this chapter within the context of both the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and the African Union (AU). Importantly, I also draw from history in order to fully explain the context of South Africa's foreign policy position towards Zimbabwe. In this regard, I argue that it would be almost impossible to understand South Africa's 'quiet diplomacy' towards Zimbabwe without also understanding the history of the relations between the two countries—both during and after colonialism and apartheid.

Chapter 6 focuses on South Africa's foreign policy towards Mozambique. In this chapter, Molapo and Mhense discuss how South Africa and Mozambique's relations have changed over time. They demonstrate that during the apartheid era, Pretoria and Maputo's relations were shaped by different political and economic contexts. At times they were good but at other times there was mistrust between the two countries. Given the good relations which existed between the ANC and President Samora Machel, the two authors advance the view that these relations improved under the leadership of the ANC and have continued to be cordial to-date, long after the demise of President Samora Machel who hosted the ANC in his country. The authors remind the reader that President Machel died in a mysterious

plane crash in 1986 at Mbusini in the present-day Mpumalanga Province of South Africa and provide the political context within which Machel died. Lastly, the two authors explain why it has been important for the South African government to strengthen ties with Mozambique through successive political administrations.

Chapter 7 covers broader regional issues in the context of the SADC region. In this chapter, Mlambo and Ogunnubi ask whether South Africa's foreign policy within SADC is the epitome of coalition or supremacy. This speaks directly to the debate on whether South Africa's foreign policy has been consistent or ambiguous. It also brings to bare the argument about South Africa's intentions for getting involved in regional development. In other words, the two authors provide a critical analysis of South Africa's activities within SADC. They assiduously engage this question in the context of political and economic regional integration. This discussion links South Africa to the tenets of realism and tries to understand the motivating factors behind South Africa's somewhat benevolent behaviour within SADC.

Part III looks at South Africa's foreign policy outside Africa. This part has four chapters (8-11).

Chapter 8 provides a general understanding on how South Africa's foreign policy towards the international community was crafted in the period between 1990 and 1994 and how this foreign policy direction has been implemented since 1994. In this Chapter, Phakathi draws from chapter 1 in terms of history but leans more towards South Africa's relations with countries abroad, both before and after 1994. He does this in order to draw clear comparisons. This chapter provides the basis for the next two chapters in which country case studies are used to demonstrate how this foreign policy position played itself out from a practical point of view. It should be noted that Phakathi uses 'Azania' when referring to South Africa, and an explanation is given for this decision.

Chapter 9 uses Israel and Palestine to discuss South Africa's foreign policy abroad. In this chapter, Radebe demonstrates South Africa's different approaches when dealing with Israel and Palestine and in forging economic and political relations with the two countries. Importantly, drawing from history, Radebe proffers views on why South Africa treats Israel and Palestine differently. Put succinctly, this chapter meticulously discusses South Africa's different foreign policy approaches towards Israel and Palestine as well as ambiguities and inconsistencies, especially in the areas

of economy and politics. To expound this complexity, Radebe demonstrates that politically, South Africa's foreign policy is sympathetic towards the state of Palestine but less so to Israel. However, on the economic front, South Africa tends to retain good relations with Israel. Radebe discusses this ambiguity and links it to national interests. Of paramount importance in this chapter is the author's compelling argument that the decades-old conflict between Israel and Palestine cannot be fully understood without bringing into the equation the religious factor on which it is grounded. Lastly, Radebe argues that any biased analysis of the crisis is not helpful but perpetuates the crisis even further.

Chapter 10 is about South Africa's foreign policy towards America. In this chapter, Ehiane and Shai discuss relations between the two countries and demonstrate both consistencies and ambiguities in those relations. To achieve this goal, the two authors cite specific examples in the form of themes and incidents through which South Africa's foreign policy stance presents itself. Some of the issues covered in this chapter focus specifically on South Africa while others relate to Africa in general but also consider South Africa's position and actions with regards to issues which concern America.

Chapter 11 is much broader, it discusses BRICS in the context of South Africa's foreign policy. In this chapter, Rupiya asks whether South Africa's BRICS membership could be seen as an epitome of foreign policy alignment with Africa's peace and security or if it is a missed opportunity for South Africa to use BRICS to do more in terms of the country's international relations. The significance of this chapter is that it teases out South Africa's foreign policy across different continents and tries to establish if what has been discussed in the preceding chapters bears any relevance when one broadens the scope beyond bilateral and regional relations to consider the international or inter-continental context epitomised by BRICS. The fact that BRICS countries cover different continents means that this chapter is able to provide more in terms of continental dynamics. This locates South Africa in the broader context and teases South Africa's foreign policy stance in that regard.

The **conclusion** of this book revisits the different themes discussed by various authors and also reflects on the book's title to give it meaning and context. In it, I discuss consistencies and ambiguities in South Africa's foreign policy posture. Drawing examples from the various chapters presented in the book, I demonstrate that South Africa's post-apartheid foreign policy shows both consistencies and ambiguities. I then argue that