

20. Ту'мofeev Y'. N. Tezy'sы po vneshnej poly'ty'ke y' pozy'cy'ony'rovany'yu Rossy'y' v my're (2017–2024 gg.). *Vneshnyaya poly'ty'ka y' bezopasnost'*. 2017. Rezhym dostupu do resursu: <https://www.csr.ru/issledovaniya/tezisy-po-vneshnej-politike-i-pozitsionirovaniyu-rossii-v-mire/>.
21. Филимонов Г. Культурно-информационные механизмы внешней политики США. Истоки и новая реальность : [монография]. Москва: РУДН, 2012. 408 с.
22. Fy'ly'monov G. Kul'turno-y'nformacy'onnye mekhanizmy vneshnej poly'ty'ky' SShA. Y'stoky' y' novaya real'nost: [monografy'ya]. – Moskva: RUDN, 2012. 408 s.

**Fesyk Olesya. Foreign Policy Tools of «Revolutionary Geo-Strategy» of Russian Federation.** This article deals with the analysis of domestic political background and foreign policy tools used by the Russian Federation to restore geopolitical domination within the international system. The emerging unipolar international system and the loss of the status of one of the centers of power in the international arena after the collapse of the USSR did not meet the aims of the Russian political elite. Therefore, a new team headed by V. Putin initially set itself the goal to return the system to multipolarity to restore lost geopolitical domination.

To internal political factors that led to such a strategy, we attributed the fragmented and vague social identity of the Russian population, excessive paternalism, permanent social depression, national intolerance, national heterogeneity of the territory, and the need of the population of social justice through the aggressive and public satisfaction of imperial reflections. These factors were due to the development of the economy and were formed under the influence of information propaganda conducted by the political elite within the country. It is substantiated that in its foreign political activity, the Russian Federation is guided by aggressive realism, implementing in foreign policy a strategy of flexible attack with a combination of «soft» and «hard» forces depending on the region and interests pursued by the Russian Federation towards which the international system returned to multipolarity.

**Key words:** geopolitics, foreign policy, geo-strategy, «soft power», «hard power».

Стаття надійшла до редколегії  
23.04.2018 р.

УДК 327(669.1:689.1)

**Martha Slowly Shimuleni**

### **Southern Africa States' Foreign Policy: the Case of Namibia and Zimbabwe**

Foreign policy articulates and gears the process of pursuit of national interests. The research aims at looking into the diverse foreign policies of various states in the Southern region of Africa. It brings out the nature of Namibia and Zimbabwe interaction with other countries in Europe, America, Asia (China in particular) and even other African countries through what is being induced in their respective foreign policy agenda. African countries, belonging to the «global south» are characterized with under development due to long experience of war which renders them dependent on the «core» or «global north» for co-operation and interaction. A country's foreign policy is peculiar to it, as it represents the interests of a country which is usually distinctive in nature.

It is safe to say that foreign policy can be likened to an organizational set of objectives. Basically, an organizational set of objectives entails the processes of goal attainment. Based on this, foreign policy is an agenda that enlists national interests, and ways to attaining them. It is noteworthy that Zimbabwe and Namibia hold strong ties with their colonial masters. Both countries have strong foreign relations with the country that colonized them far more than with other countries. Zimbabwe has got strong ties with Britain and Namibia has got strong ties with Germany. Over the years, the efficiency of Zimbabwe and Namibia foreign policy has been undermined by conflict.

The study reveals the development in Namibia and Zimbabwe is attributed to their relations with other countries of the world. Mainly, in the areas of finding market for locally made products and in the aspects of attracting foreign investors. A major issue that jets itself into the foreign policy agenda of both of these countries is the issue of security both domestically and internationally. However, the reason is no foreign policy can be successful in area of chaos, unrest and hunger. A potent foreign policy is that which is flexible, versatile and serves the interest of all, the formulation of policies based on these criteria will ensure efficiency and ultimately development.

**Key words:** foreign policy, sovereignty, national interests, Southern African states, Zimbabwe's foreign relations, Namibia's foreign relations.

**Statement of the Problem.** Every country on the planet Earth has a given set of tasks and objectives to be achieved. However, these tasks are quite difficult to attain singlehandedly which makes it sacrosanct for countries to interact and cooperate. It is worthy of note that no country is an «island» of its own; the implication being that, there will always be a reason to interact. Knowing ones task is a step towards achieving it and drafting how it would be attained is a following step to achieving those tasks. Thus, a step towards the attainment of these tasks leads the government towards formulating a scheme of cooperation with other countries which are well embedded in its foreign policy while knowing its sovereignty is at risk but still keeping it checked.

Foreign policy posits self-interest strategies adopted by states in the promotion of their interests and the attainment of their goals at the international level. Every country seeks to be known and dominant in the international system. In lieu of this, the sacrosanct nature of foreign policy is being put to limelight. Southern Africa states like, Zimbabwe and Namibia, had their peculiar foreign policy. However, these countries' foreign policy has been undermined by the long years of war. The foreign policies of Zimbabwe and Namibia are aimed at getting military logistics to bring an end to situations of a conflict. However, this is done without putting into consideration their states sovereignty. As a reaction, this research aims at investigating how well the foreign policies of Zimbabwe and Angola have been shaped by the quest to put an end to civil war.

**Analysis of the Latest Research and Publications.** The nature and specific aspects of foreign policy were considered by G. Perepelytsia, M. Fesenko, Ye. Makarenko, M. Ryzhkov, I. Pohorska, P. Tsygankov, G. Modelski, G. Ruggie, J. N. Rosenau, J. Gottman, G. Baker etc. Specifically, M. Brecher, B. Steinberg and J. Stein gave a thorough analysis of foreign policy behavior of states taking into account the ideas of G. Morgenthau, D. Easton, J. Rosenau, K. Thompson and others [1]. The mentioned Ukrainian scholars were primarily focused on different aspects of the US and the EU foreign policies. However, the issue of Southern Africa states' foreign policy (specifically, Namibia and Zimbabwe) remained out of scientific research of Ukrainian scholars.

So, **the purpose of the article** is to analyze the wide array of benefits to be accrued in the drafting of a well thought out policies in Southern African countries' relations with other countries of the world if war is out of the picture. The main objectives are to research the nature of Southern African states interaction with other regions/countries, their priority spheres.

**Theoretical Fundamentals of the Research and Methods of the Research.** Foreign policy is derived from the Latin word «for is» which means «out». The word «international policy» is synonymous to foreign policy as it is used interchangeably by scholars. For a clear understanding on the term «foreign policy», each word should be defined by bits. «Policy» could be likened to decision or a guide of selecting courses actions to achieve certain goals in certain manner. «Foreign» has to do with «beyond» the confines of state, to areas with little or no authority stirring the territory and people. Taken collectively, foreign policy is a guide aimed at selection a course of actions outside the confines of a state boundary for achieving goals. Foreign policy insinuates goals, values and various machineries utilized by the government in making relations with different countries. However, in the process of foreign policy formulation some issues like, environment (international and domestic), available choices and resources should be held sacrosanct before making foreign policy. Foreign policy spurs out from the interaction of local and international systems. Foreign policy is the basic section where the country chases its foreign political interests based on such structural elements as national sovereignty, national security, and economic prosperity and development [2].

Foreign policy provides the dimension upon which the process of international politics works. Foreign policy entails national interests which are well reflected in states relation to other states. These states determine their given course of actions that is favourable to them while putting into consideration ensuring it is beneficial to them as no country wants to enter an unfavorable cooperation.

Foreign policy has a wide array of definitions and it means different things to different people and ideologies. In the words of Professor G. Modelski, foreign policy is «the system of activities evolved by communities for changing the behavior of other states and for adjusting their own activities to the international environment» [3].

A clear look at the ideologies of the realists reveals their view on foreign policy as the process of being capable of bending conducts in such a way it is favourable to one's interest. The goal of a foreign policy

according to the realist representatives is for the purpose of procurement of security through military aid [4]. According to the ideology of the liberal representatives, the international system shapes the foreign policy of a country and it changes according to the trends of the international system. Consequently, the identified goals of foreign policy are the procurement of long-term economic aid or to some intense extent, social welfare [5]. However, in the case of Zimbabwe and Namibia, they happen to have over a long period of time aimed at attaining the suggested foreign policy goals of the realists. In these countries, their relationship or cooperation with countries of other regions over the years have been more of the needs for militaristic help due to the prevalence of war.

Foreign policies are being formulated giving due consideration to some geopolitical factors including: geomorphology, massive of continental plateaus, mountain ranges, islands and the life; rivers, sea basin divisions; economy and transport infrastructure; climate conditions; allocation of population; and civilization dimension [6].

Zimbabwe and Namibia achieved independence under difficult circumstances and not on a platter of gold just like the black Africans in South Africa fought towards the eschewing of the policy of apartheid. These countries fell short of strategies in exercising their sovereignty at the advent of independence. Southern African countries saw interaction with other countries as a means of solving their wide array of problems.

The article is based on the application of the next methods: 1) historical method enabled the research of the historical background which provoked the elaboration of states' foreign policies; 2) comparative analysis helped compare the foreign policies of Namibia and Zimbabwe; 3) interaction survey gave possibility to investigate verbal or physical exchange between nations ranging from agreements to threats to military force; 4) SWOT analysis enabled to single out strong and weak elements of states' foreign policies as well as their opportunities and threats.

**Results of the Research.** Namibia gained her independence on the 21<sup>st</sup> of March 1990 after decades of being under the German colony back in 1884. Prior to Namibia's independence, the Namibian war of independence was fought. Namibia's war of independence was a conflict that happened between South West Africa (now Namibia), Angola and Zambia which occurred in a period of 24 years from the 26<sup>th</sup> of August up until the 21<sup>st</sup> of March 1990 (which happened to be Namibia's year of independence). It was not a war entered into just by Namibia rather it was an intra war, as the South African defense force and the South-West (region) of African people's organization also entered into the war.

Namibia enjoyed the freedom independence brings at historically and quite similar ways most African countries acquired, that is «through struggle». Primarily the emphasis has been placed on security and it was state-centric in nature. The aspirations of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Namibia has some underlying visions such as enhancing a peaceful and diplomatic way of trading through the adoption of diplomatic schemes and engaging in multilateral trade that will be on till the year 2030 [7].

In the exact notes of Ministry's Mission Statement «the promotion of security domestically, within our neighborhood and in the global arena» Namibia is seen prioritizing domestic security within the country and in its relations to neighboring states. In addition, the Article 96 of the Constitution of the Republic of Namibia has some security related proponents, namely:

- to promote international cooperation, peace and security;
- to create and maintain just and mutually beneficial relations among nations;
- to foster respect for international law, treaty and obligations, as a breach in this could lead to international sanction and if intense, could lead to war;
- to encourage the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means [8].

A clear look at the above proponents in the foreign policy reveals there is serious attention placed on putting an end to war or trying to prevent war. However, what Namibia needs to know is that a conflict (which could resemble a war) is inevitable in the international system. Rather than spending judicious time on formulating conflict related policies, those efforts should be put out in other productive policies, specifically, policies of attracting foreign investors, infrastructural based policies and economic developmental policies.

This is quite evident in the developments Namibia has enjoyed in its relations to Asia, North America/Latin America, and America's in general, Europe and etc.

The European Union is a strong partner to Namibia. In the light of this a huge value is placed on this relationship by Namibia. Basically, Namibia happens to be at the receiving end. At the advent of Namibia's

independence, the EU Member States have paid serious attention to the country in terms of economic policies, security purposes and political purposes. These are past years, but it is becoming evident that we might be witnessing a transformation from «assistance» based interaction to engaging in reciprocal trade settings.

Namibia holds strong relations with Germany – its former colonial leader – most especially in the aspects of trade and investment, tourism, growth and development etc.. Germany provided development assistance schemes on issues pertaining to poverty, employment, governance, gender, land reform, and HIV and AIDS which is well manifested in Southern Africa. However, all of these were considered in the light of making a positive result of the above stated issues. Grants and loans were put in place by the Namibian government at its disposal although in recent times more loans are given to Namibia rather than grants [9].

Namibia holds strong relations with the United States of America. The Namibian government has sought to gain access to the US markets for the sales of Namibian native products like agricultural products and textile. This is made possible due to the easy mode of access in form of preference treatment enjoyed by African countries. The reason for this is to encourage more manufacturing from the continent of Africa as the continent is characterized with making available only primary products. Also, this tends to tighten the knot of cooperation of African countries like Namibia to the United States [10].

Population is a crucial factor to be considered when a country wants to find market for its products. Asia is the most populous continent with about 4 billion people living across the various countries. The implication of this is that Asia has the world's highest buying power and in respect of this many countries like Namibia want to trade with countries in Asia. Namibia places relations with countries in Asia with utmost importance and value. Namibia, through the benefits derived from being a member of the Commonwealth makes it possible to attempt working on a mutually beneficial relations with countries like China, India, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand and etc. The focal point is to strengthen the relations with «Asia power» China in areas of industrialization, technology transfer, tourism, service sector, resource development and trade and investment. Furthermore, in its relations with China, Namibia strictly adheres to the «One-China» policy [11].

The aftermath of Zimbabwe's independence in 1980 saw Harare swiftly becoming Southern Africa's place of diplomacy and an inarguably important player in the Frontline States' efforts to drive apartheid regime and colonialism outside the walls of Southern Africa. Zimbabwe inculcated a non-alignment policy in its conduct of international relations and its foreign policy with consideration of right to life, self-determination, national sovereignty defense, anti-imperialism, sovereign states equality and non-interference in the internal affairs of other state. Zimbabwe's high profile foreign policy had an effective domestic management record alongside in the 1980s which enabled President Mugabe a victor in international accolades such as the 1988 World Freedom against Hunger Award. In the 1980s, many termed it the «African Jewel», Zimbabwe's economy was diversified in nature and efficient. Its young population is well educated and at a time Zimbabwe's currency was even stronger than the United States dollar. Due to benefits derived from international trade, donor and multilateral communities were eager and comfortable to underwrite its economic development programmes. Aid flourished from many regions in the Western world, including the Bretton Woods Institutions in the 1990s [12].

The European Union and Zimbabwe hold strong foreign relations since the independence of Zimbabwe in 1980. Over the years the European Union has proven to be Zimbabwe's biggest benefactor. The ongoing cooperation scheme among these two is worth about 90 million Euros. The European Union was an observer at the Zimbabwe's parliamentary election in June 2000 with three intentions: firstly, to contribute to the observation exercise; secondly, to prevent intimidation and lastly, to have a clear judgment due to observing the process [13].

The EU representatives arrived in Harare on 15 May and stayed in Zimbabwe for a period of five days and was consented by the Zimbabwean government in consulting the Minister of Justice, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs, the Minister of Home Affairs, the Minister of State Security, the Registrar General, the Delimitation Commission and the Electoral Supervisory Commission. The EU formally declared to observe the upcoming elections on the 30<sup>th</sup> of May and the head of mission, P. Schori, landed in Zimbabwe's state capital the following day. The basic aim of the mission was to create a safe atmosphere devoid of harassment and to have a fair judgment of the winner.

The aftermath of Zimbabwe's independence saw a huge beneficial impact of British. The perspective of impacts has been on bilateral aid, i.e. Britain has been Zimbabwe's largest bilateral aid donor, being trading partners and these two countries have ended up being two large trading partners, and have provided military assistance through training of military personnel. It is noteworthy that the military assistance provided by the Britain to Zimbabwe has been the most successful and smoothly administered policy as other policies have attracted conflicts [14].

The U.K. has provided financial assistance on several occasions to Southern Africa in forms of grants. For instance, L. Chalker who was the then Minister of State at the foreign affairs supported Zimbabwe to change the transports routes of frontline States. Another situation was when Ch. Patten visited the state capital of Zimbabwe (Harare) in February 1987 and offered GBP 10 million. Similarly, M. Thatcher visit to Harare in March 1989 depicted good relations between these two countries as R. Mugabe gave her a warm welcome. British reputation in the region had propelled up by the success of the training Scheme for Mozambique military which happened to be run by British soldiers at the Eastern district of Zimbabwe.

UK being Zimbabwe's largest donor with the scheme of Overseas Development Administration has made attempts to influence Zimbabwe's development in ways that suites its interests. However, these countries' relationship has gone through a possibly predictable path. Although, both of these countries have had shaky times; an instance was when Zimbabwe criticized Britain's sanction on South Africa with the use of harsh words, these countries' relations still remain intact as Britain is still one of Zimbabwe's largest trading partners.

The prime Zimbabwe's foreign policy Asian interest lies in China. Two factors have contributed to Zimbabwe – China interaction: firstly, in the past China, having suffered similar African like problems, over the years developed a «kindred spirit»; secondly, in the 1970s and early in the 1980s China happened to be an alternative socialist model for countries not interested in the camp of the Soviet Union. R. Mugabe (former president of Zimbabwe) saw China's socialist states model as a developed one which was a motivating model to intending countries in the socialist movement course. The interaction between these two countries was guided by a document signed on 8 November 1989 which encompasses certain agenda for future co-operation and interaction to avoid conflicts. For this purpose these countries gave in to a nine point stipulated aims of cooperation, namely,

- to endeavor to develop their ties of friendly co-operation on the basis and principles of independence, complete equality, mutual respect and non-interference in each other's internal affairs;
- to exchange delegations and share views on issues of common concern;
- to exchange publications and documentation, to promote friendly relations and co-operation between the mass organizations of two countries;
- to consolidate and promote existing friendly relations between the two republics;
- to exchange reporters, give lectures and provide research personnel;
- to exchange views in international arenas;
- to invite members of the central committee of the other party for working holidays;
- to support National Liberation Movements in Southern Africa [15].

**Conclusions and Prospects of Further Research.** The goal of every foreign policy is directly or indirectly aimed at fostering growth and development. Every country in the world interacts with others one way or the other. Namibia and Zimbabwe have drafted policies peculiar to them which over the years have helped both of these countries in becoming key actors in the international environment and their quest for growth and development. A well thought out policy with efficient follow up will ultimately lead to a better economy down to the betterment of the lives of citizens. Namibia and Zimbabwe interaction with world powers has helped them overcome conflict to some level. However, if their foreign policy priorities are adhered to, both of these countries could be witnessing a change in the shift of «developing countries» to «developed countries». The further research could focus on the foreign policy priorities of other states of the region or could be devoted to the issues of communication instruments which help achieve foreign policy goals.

#### *References*

1. Brecher M., Steinberg B., Stein J., *A Framework for Research on Foreign Policy Behavior* [Electronic resource]. Available at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/002200276901300105>.

2. Adnan M. *Foreign Policy and Domestic Constraints: a Conceptual Account* [Electronic resource]. Available at: [http://pu.edu.pk/images/journal/csas/PDF/19\\_Mubeen\\_Adnan\\_v29\\_no2\\_2014.pdf](http://pu.edu.pk/images/journal/csas/PDF/19_Mubeen_Adnan_v29_no2_2014.pdf).
3. Ghali S. Ibrahim, *Foreign Policy Analysis: Nigeria and Great Powers*. [Electronic resource]. Available at: [http://www.academia.edu/34945065/FOREIGN\\_POLICY\\_ANALYSIS\\_NIGERIA\\_AND\\_GREAT\\_POWERES](http://www.academia.edu/34945065/FOREIGN_POLICY_ANALYSIS_NIGERIA_AND_GREAT_POWERES).
4. Realism in international relations [[Electronic resource]. Available at: [http://internationalrelations.org/realism\\_in\\_international\\_relations/](http://internationalrelations.org/realism_in_international_relations/).
5. Liberalism in International Relations. [Electronic resource]. Available at: [http://www.stefanorecchia.net/1/137/resources/publication\\_1040\\_1.pdf](http://www.stefanorecchia.net/1/137/resources/publication_1040_1.pdf).
6. R. D. Schwartz. *Coming to Terms: Zimbabwe in the International Arena (1980–1994)* [Electronic resource]. Available at: <http://theses.lse.ac.uk/2472/1/U615421.pdf>.
7. Namibia's Foreign Policy and Diplomacy Management [Electronic resource]. Available at: <http://www.namibiahc.org.uk/perch/resources/pdf/white-paper-on-namibias-foreign-policy-and-diplomacy-management.pdf>.
8. The Constitution of the Republic of Namibia [Electronic resource]. Available at: [http://www.gov.na/documents/10181/14134/Namibia\\_Constitution.pdf/37b70b76-c15c-45d4-9095-b25d8b8aa0fb](http://www.gov.na/documents/10181/14134/Namibia_Constitution.pdf/37b70b76-c15c-45d4-9095-b25d8b8aa0fb)
9. Katjavivi P. H Namibia's bilateral relations with Germany: A crucial relationship [Electronic resource]. Available at: [http://www.kas.de/upload/Publikationen/2014/namibias\\_foreign\\_relations/Namibias\\_Foreign\\_Relations\\_katjavivi.pdf](http://www.kas.de/upload/Publikationen/2014/namibias_foreign_relations/Namibias_Foreign_Relations_katjavivi.pdf).
10. Lindeke W. A. From confrontation to pragmatic cooperation: United States of America–Namibia relations [Electronic resource]. Available at: [http://www.kas.de/upload/Publikationen/2014/namibias\\_foreign\\_relations/Namibias\\_Foreign\\_Relations\\_lindeke.pdf](http://www.kas.de/upload/Publikationen/2014/namibias_foreign_relations/Namibias_Foreign_Relations_lindeke.pdf).
11. Odada J. E., Kakujaha-Matundu O.. China-Africa Economic Relations: the Case of Namibia [Electronic resource]. Available at: <https://www.africaportal.org/documents/>.
12. Hanns W. Maull. Globalization and German foreign [http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/ipg/2011-2/12\\_a\\_maull.pdf](http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/ipg/2011-2/12_a_maull.pdf)
13. Zimbabwe and the EU [https://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/zimbabwe\\_en/1867/Zimbabwe%20and%20the%20EU](https://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/zimbabwe_en/1867/Zimbabwe%20and%20the%20EU)
14. Chigora P. On Crossroads: Reflections on Zimbabwe's Relations with Britain at the New Millennium. [Electronic resource]. Available at: <http://www.msu.ac.zw/elearning/material/1314190147READING%20ON%20ZIMBABWE%20FOREIGN%20POLICY%202.pdf>.
15. Chun, China–Zimbabwe Zh. Relations: A Model of China–Africa Relations? [Electronic resource]. Available at: <https://www.saiia.org.za/occasional-papers/643-china-zimbabwe-relations-a-model-of-china-africa-relations/file>.

**Марта Шимулені. Зовнішня політика країн Південної Африки: досвід Намібії та Зімбабве.** Зовнішня політика формує й контролює процес досягнення національних інтересів. Мета статті – вивчення різноманітної зовнішньої політики держав Південного регіону Африки, зокрема природи взаємодії Намібії та Зімбабве з іншими країнами Європи, Америки, Азії (зокрема Китаю) і навіть іншими африканськими державами, зважаючи на пріоритети, визначені в зовнішньополітичних програмах держав. Розвиток Африканських країн, які належать до «глобального півдня», перебуває під впливом багаторічного досвіду війни, що робить їх залежними від «глобальної півночі» в питаннях співпраці й взаємодії, що ґрунтується на зовнішній політиці країни, яка представляє інтереси держави й звичайно має своєрідний характер.

Можна з упевненістю сказати, що зовнішню політику можна порівняти з організаційним набором цілей, які зумовлюють процеси досягнення мети. Виходячи з цього, зовнішня політика – це програма, яка закріплює національні інтереси та способи їх досягнення. Примітно, що Зімбабве й Намібія міцно контактують зі своїми колишніми колоніальними господарями. Обидві країни мають сильніші зовнішні зв'язки з державами, які колись їх колонізували, ніж з іншими країнами. Так, Зімбабве має міцні зв'язки зі Сполученим Королівством, а Намібія міцно співпрацює з Німеччиною. Упродовж багатьох років ефективність зовнішньої політики Зімбабве та Намібії була підірвана конфліктом.

Дослідження показує, що розвиток Намібії й Зімбабве пов'язаний із їх відносинами з іншими державами світу, головним чином у сфері пошуку ринку для продукції на місцевому ринку та в аспекті залучення іноземних інвесторів. Головною проблемою є питання безпеки як на внутрішньому, так і на міжнародному рівні. Однак причина полягає в тому, що зовнішня політика не може бути успішною в ситуації хаосу, хвилювання та голоду. Потужна зовнішня політика має бути гнучкою, універсальною й служити інтересам усіх; формулювання політики, заснованої на цих критеріях, забезпечить ефективність і, в кінцевому рахунку, розвиток держав.

**Ключові слова:** зовнішня політика, суверенітет, національні інтереси, держави Південної Африки, зовнішні зв'язки Зімбабве, зовнішні відносини Намібії.

The article acted to the editorial board  
in 26.05.2018