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Abstract

National Identity and Post-Colonial Development: Dictatorial Zimbabwe and Democratic South Africa

A Thesis Presented to the Global Studies Department
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Brandeis University
Waltham, Massachusetts

By Andrea Cohen

This paper shows how nationalism is a significant influence on post-colonial development. The differences in Zimbabwe’s and South Africa’s national identities can be explained through an analysis of the political rhetoric, actions, and ideologies of their respective nationalist leadership. A state’s conception of an ethnic national identity is the more exclusive type of nationalism in terms of membership and subsequent liberties. Ethnic nationalism, like Zimbabwe’s, tends to spawn more authoritarian governments. These states tend to be more conflict prone, have stagnant or declining economies, and a poor human rights record. A civic national identity is the more open type of nationalism in terms of membership and subsequent liberties. Civic nationalism, like South Africa’s, tends to lead to more democratic governance, more political stability, regular elections, and greater economic success.
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I. Introduction

Anthropologists, sociologists and political scientists all have different questions about political or religious culture and society throughout Africa. They have studied pre-colonial, colonial, post-colonial and neo-colonial history in Africa. In recent decades, studies have expanded to conflict studies, civil war, and genocide; however, despite the research, many pressing questions remain.

Less than 40 percent of post-colonial African states are considered democratic states. How did that come to happen? Why are some African states relatively stable and successful, while other African states are ruled by ruthless dictatorships, riddled with disease, poverty, and high rates of unemployment, and struggle with volatile civil wars or genocide? It cannot be pure chance that divides stable African states from unstable ones. What were the similarities and differences in their colonial histories? In their transition from imperialism to independence? How was independence achieved? What roles did the leadership of the liberation movements play in the construction of an independent state and its policies? How did their varying approaches affect the political cultures, attitudes, and national identities of their citizens?

The democratic Republic of South Africa and dictatorial Zimbabwe are perfect examples for a comparison that will illustrate how the type of nationalism that a post-colony creates for itself largely affects the type of state it will become. The African National Congress (ANC), led by Nelson Mandela, emphasized a civic nationalism (like the United States) wherein democratic rights should be extended to all citizens. It utilizes
a very open definition of citizenship. For the most part South Africa is considered a successful democracy. Despite its recent rising crime levels, it is stable, relatively peaceful, and has regular free and fair elections.

Zimbabwe, on the other hand, has emphasized ethnic nationalism throughout its nationalist movement and today. Ethnic nationalism is a very selective type of nationalism. It makes distinctions between people on the basis of ethnicity, race, political affiliation or class. These distinctions exclude others from certain rights and liberties. Because of this, Zimbabwe has evolved into a dictatorship riddled with high unemployment, poverty, homelessness, illiteracy, political violence, human rights abuses and fraudulent elections, just to name a few of its problems.

Nationalism is identifiable through state policies like citizenship and through rhetoric, which can be inclusive, exclusive, violent, or reconciliatory. This thesis will identify each state’s nationalism as originating from state policies and rhetoric to show how each state’s political, economic rights and social stability is affected by the type of nationalism that it emphasizes. This thesis aims to show that a dictatorial state basing its identity on ethnic nationalism is more likely to be more unstable politically, less productive economically, and less homogenous than a democratic state that encourages civic nationalism.

In the thesis, South Africa will serve as a counterpoint for the comparison to Zimbabwe. Analyzing the factors and influences that contributed to the formation of a unified post-colonial and post-apartheid South African civic national identity will further add to the discourse on what separates successful post-colonial states from those that are considered weak or failing post-colonial states. The analysis will also contribute to the
discourse and support the thesis in showing that a national identity based on civic membership, rather than ethnic identity, allows greater opportunity for peace, stability and cooperation.
II. Literature Review

Social scientists utilize different methods in seeking their answers to the varying questions about political or religious culture and society throughout the continent of Africa. Analytical frameworks help separate different approaches of analysis. One approach, institutionalism, has been utilized as an analytical paradigm and can be further classified as “new” or “old” institutionalism, or as “theoretical” or “historical” institutionalism. Sven Steinmo has championed the theory of historical institutionalism, which views the impact of history as the basis for affecting institutions, while, Liah Greenfeld, a well respected sociologist and political scientist, utilizes theoretical institutionalism, which views culture as the impetus for shaping institutions, although she also utilizes historical institutionalism. Another method, not entirely unrelated to the larger framework of institutionalism, is game theory, which gained popularity during the Cold War. Game theory fits within the larger context of rational choice theory. Many political scientists and other social scientists utilize rational choice theory in addition to institutionalism to explain socio-cultural phenomena. The combined use of institutionalism with rational choice theory leads to a methodological individualist approach. This approach understands that people are shaped by the events and decisions that we now refer to as history and interpret their surroundings to make the most beneficial decision for themselves as a means to an end.
Institutionalism was the main theoretical framework utilized by political scientists until the end of the Second World War. Because much of political science is observational rather than experimental, analytical frameworks like institutionalism were criticized as being too narrow in approach and limited in scope to explain the string of the nationalist revolutions that toppled colonial dominance like dominoes two decades after WWII. New theories of behavioralism gained popularity through writers like David Easton, Robert Dahl, and Philip Converse, who looked at individual leaders and their distinct personalities.

However, behavioralism has its own limitations. While it is true that individuals can be inspirational and make significant impacts, a single person cannot be the sole impetus of change. An individual is created and marked by the time, place and history of his or her world. Adolf Hitler alone, for example, did not cause WWII. Rather, he was a product of his surroundings and shaped by history. He, like other Germans, felt embarrassed, ashamed, and cheated by the Treaty of Versailles. Hitler grew up during a severe economic depression in a post-war environment. These influences helped shape his character and fueled his desire to turn Germany into a great nation.

Similarly, Zimbabwean President Robert Mugabe has been shaped by his experience with imperialism, his revolutionary education in Harare, the liberation movements sweeping Africa as a young man, and his feelings of being cheated and coerced at the Lancaster House conference.

Nelson Mandela, the former president of South Africa, was also shaped by events in history. In his incredibly detailed autobiography, *A Long Walk To Freedom*, he illustrates how each event in his life affected his future. As a boy, his father, Gadla Henry
Mphakanyiswa, was a chief by both blood and custom. As part of his chiefly duties, he was a counselor to the Thembu kings. Rohihlahla Mandela (Mandela’s Xhosa name; Nelson was the English name given to him by his teacher on the first day of school), although a member of the royal family, was not among those who would be trained for rule. The death of his father when he was a young boy changed all that. Afterwards, Chief Jongintaba Dalindyebo, the acting regent of the Thembu people, offered to become Nelson’s guardian. Mandela was raised in the provisional capital of Thembuland, treated like the royal Chief’s other sons, and raised to become a counselor to the Chief of Sabata. As such, Nelson received a great education, and became learned in the ways of the tribal system of governance, as well as the privileges, rights and freedoms of a royal upbringing. Of course, Nelson did not become a counselor to a Chief. Events in South Africa and decisions he made led him to become a revolutionary and eventually the President of an independent and democratic South Africa.

These three examples show how people in one time and place are shaped by the events of history and that they are capable of interpreting their surroundings and making decisions through a cost-benefit analysis. Historical institutionalism taken together with methodological individualism have proved their lasting importance as viable theoretical frameworks of analysis.

In the beginning of *Peacemaking In Civil War: International Mediation in Zimbabwe*, Stephen Stedman utilizes historical institutionalism as his framework for analyzing significant turning points in the Rhodesian civil war. Stedman points to two important events outside Rhodesia that contributed to changing the civil war in favor of the revolutionaries. The failure of the Portuguese to hold on to their power in
Mozambique became a significant advantage for the Rhodesian liberation movements. The opening up of Mozambique supplied a safe haven for thousands of angry and oppressed young male refugees creating an opportunity for the leaders of the Rhodesian liberation groups who were in dire need of guerilla fighters to continue their campaign of liberation against the white regime. The influx of guerilla fighters strained the Rhodesian government and surrounding states, leaving peace negotiations as the most viable option for a peaceful settlement. The resulting international mediation, called the Lancaster House agreement, paved the way for Rhodesia’s first open election. Stedman’s analysis of the civil war and the Lancaster House agreement prove the effectiveness of a historical institutionalist approach for analysis.

Despite the effectiveness of historical institutionalism, rational choice theory can also be a useful paradigm in helping to explain some of the choices in strategy and policy employed by the leaderships of the liberation movements, and subsequently, the leadership of both independent post-colonial Zimbabwean and South African states. The rational choice paradigm is not about analyzing whether or not a choice is sane or crazy, moral or immoral. Rather it refers specifically to the choices people make based on their pre-existing aims and the theory is based on the assumption that people utilize cost-benefit analyses to yield the most external gains in specific economic, social and political environments. Rational choice theory is a beneficial theoretical paradigm to employ because it assumes that people are rational beings. This basic assumption, that people make decisions based on maximization utility, allows us to get past the things we do not understand because we assume that they are haphazard or crazy. Rational choice theory can guide and aid an attempt to better understand the internationally fraudulent elections.
in Zimbabwe, human rights abuses during the ZANU-PF (Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front) raid in Matabeleland in 1982, and other decisions of a leader like Robert Mugabe, who is a highly complex individual.

The analytical approaches of institutionalism and rational choice theory are not mutually exclusive; these theories can be used in conjunction with one another. The utilization of both theories creates a methodological individualistic type of analysis. A theorist can acknowledge the greater force that the events and decisions made throughout history has had in shaping their subject’s present while concurrently acknowledging that their subject also makes definitive choices in his/her own self interest. Utilizing the analytical approach of historical institutionalism along with the theoretical paradigm of rational choice theory will reveal why Zimbabwean political culture has evolved on the dictatorial end of the political spectrum. Historical institutionalism as a paradigm will also shed light on the reasons why the democratic post-colonial South African state has experienced greater economic success and more lasting political stability, following in the theoretical tradition of democratic peace theory. In short, democratic peace theory maintains that democratic countries rarely go to war with one another.

From both sociological and political science perspectives, concepts of nationalism and national identity are critically important pieces of the puzzle that lends further understanding of the bigger picture of Zimbabwe. Nationalism is important because throughout history and around the world, state policies on important issues like security, individual freedoms, immigration and citizenship, and the decision to go to war have all been made in the name of defending the nation. Defining a state’s conception of national identity will help to explain why Zimbabwe is the way it is today and how its dictatorial
political culture differs from the democratic political culture embraced during the
transition of colonial South African to an independent democratic South Africa.

Liah Greenfeld notes that a state’s conception of national identity determines the
criteria of membership, which can either be ethnic or civic. Greenfeld explains in “The
Political Significance of Culture,” that the “nation can be defined as a composite entity,
an association of free and equal individuals, or in unitary terms, as a collective
individual… the definition of the nation as a collective individual results in collectivistic
nationalisms,” which she claims, “tend to spawn authoritarian political arrangements.”
Thus, Greenfeld writes, “nationalism exists in three basic varieties: individualistic and
civic, collectivistic and civic, and collectivistic and ethnic” (Greenfeld, 1997, 192).

The reason why ethnic nationalism is such a tricky concept to define, Greenfeld
explains, is because, “the term ‘ethnicity’ refers to various ascriptive characteristics...
some of these ascriptive characteristics, such as language and religious or secular
traditions and customs, are obviously cultural, but others, such as physical type or
territorial roots, are not. Yet, the term ‘ethnicity’ applies equally to all of them”
(Greenfeld, 1997, 190). Therefore, ethnic nationalism is one wherein ethnicity, political
preferences and other traits either (biological or chosen) are used as a measure of true
membership in the nation and affect subsequent rights, freedoms, and benefits provided
and protected by the state. Traits that fall outside a state’s national identity can be
considered subversive to that state’s security. Conversely, civic nationalism is one
wherein citizenship and citizenship alone, the condition of existing as a person and a
citizen of the state, allows one true and equal membership in the nation. Biological traits
or personal preferences (sex, gender, ethnicity, race, religion, political preferences or anything else) do not affect a citizen’s membership in the state’s national identity.

It can be difficult but not impossible to determine Zimbabwe’s definition of national identity. ZANU-PF’s state policies on mono-citizenship and the rhetoric of ZANU-PF’s leading members all point to a very exclusive and restrictive national identity. A.P. Cheater, author of “Transcending the State? Gender and Borderline Constructions of Citizenship in Zimbabwe”, cites Gaidzanwa who notes that Zimbabwean citizenship rules have become more exclusive since independence (Cheater, 1998, 192). Cheater finds that Zimbabwe’s “view of citizenship coincides with Radcliffe-Brown’s (1950: 43) idea that ‘a continuing social structure requires the aggregation of individuals into distinct separated groups, each with its own solidarity, each person belonging to one group’” (Cheater, 1998, 192). Thus Zimbabwe’s national identity is the most extreme form of what Greenfeld defines as the “collectivistic and ethnic” form of nationalism, which is likely to be the most oppressive type of nationalism. Contrast this to the leadership of the ANC in South Africa, where individuals (especially Nelson Mandela) were looking to create a South African identity of the most cooperative kind—Greenfeld’s collectivistic and civic nationalism. (However, since the end of Mandela’s presidency South African national identity appears to be moving toward Greenfeld’s individualistic and civic type of nationalism).

Greenfeld explains that states based on ethnic nationalisms are more likely to be aggressive because of their exclusivity. States based on exclusive ethnic nationalism are by definition not based on plurality and therefore do not have to accept outside opinions that are not explicated by the state. Greenfeld writes, “Ethnically defined nations are
more likely to engage in aggressive warfare than individualistic nations...individualistic nationalisms are by definition pluralisms, which implies that at any point in time there exists a plurality of opinions in regard to what constitutes the good of the nation” (Greenfeld, 1997, 193). Individualistic nationalisms are not particularistic. Ethnic nationalisms are thus making it very clear who is a member of the nation and who is not. This explains why ethnic nationalism is more brutal in their warfare is because they do not consider “others” as potential members of the nation. In a state with citizenship based on ethnic membership, a number of culturally ascribed characteristics can be accepted, rejected or restricted. Therefore, because one could not join an ethnic nation as one could in a civic nation; the clear distinction drawn between “us” versus “them” in an ethnic nationalism makes “others” much more expendable.

***

In Rhodesia, it made economic sense to encourage multi-national citizenship prior to the 1980 independence in the UDI (Unilateral Declaration of Independence) era of Rhodesia, which was largely internationally recognized as an illegitimate state and further supported by a UN endorsed trade embargo. As Cheater explains, “Passports from states which refused to recognize illegal Rhodesia were an important resource used very successfully in the expansion of Rhodesia’s state-dominated UDI boom economy.” Cheater elucidates, “In these circumstances, dual citizenship and multiple passports were useful to both state and individuals. Such identities did not conflict with one another, not least because the other citizenships were seen as instrumental to the achievement and protection of an autonomous Rhodesian nationality” (Cheater, 19998, 195). Zimbabwean citizenship rules have become more exclusive since independence, especially after 1990
brought about restrictive mono-citizenship policies making it illegal for a person over the age of 18 to be a citizen of any other country if one was a citizen on Zimbabwe. What used to be a \textit{jus soli} model, the earlier settler-determined territorial model, based on individual mobility and contractual achievement has been replaced by a \textit{jus sanguinis} view of citizenship which is based on ascribed descent\textsuperscript{1}.

Such restrictive mono-citizenship policies reinforce Zimbabwe’s conception of ethnic nationalism which is in part defined by birth and limited mobility, thus creating a selective national identity.

***

Another approach, theoretical institutionalism is a framework of analysis used frequently by sociologists and anthropologists. The scholars who prefer this approach believe that culture and society dictate and influence the institutions of that society. Liah Greenfeld uses theoretical (as well as historical) institutionalism to explain the concepts of nationalism and national identity. These concepts are critical in the analysis of the comparative case study of the impact and consequences of national identity in post colonial Zimbabwe and South Africa. Although Adu Boahen, author of \textit{African Perspectives on Colonialism}, agrees that nationalism was “one of the accidental” by-products of colonialism (Boahen, 1987, 98) he writes “the colonial system generated a sense of identity and consciousness among the different ethnic groups of each colonial state” (Boahen, 1987, 98). Boahen explains that the nationalism generated by colonialism was negative “arising out of the sense of anger, frustration, and humiliation produced by the oppressive, discriminatory, and exploitive measures and activities of the colonial administrators” (Boahen, 1987, 98). These feelings produced by colonial policies and

\textsuperscript{1} Cheater, 1998, 193-194
actions did not alone create nationalist movements in the colonies. Rather, nationalism was a means of resolving the feelings of anger and indignation resulting from colonial practices.

Applying Greenfeld’s approach and theories to Zimbabwe’s post-colonial development adds much to existing literature. The several distinctions between types of nationalism is another way to compare and classify the factors that make a difference between successful post-colonial states and weak or failing post-colonial states. If culture shapes institutions, and the events and decisions made throughout history shape the then-present culture, then historical institutionalism is a valuable paradigm in studying the development of post-colonial states (which have by definition been shaped by their experience with imperialism). But institutions and history are not enough to explain socio-political phenomena because people’s decisions as a means to an end affect the future.

Therefore, combining institutionalism with rational choice is an even better approach. The combination of the two creates a methodological individualist approach which can add much to the discourse of post-colonial development and culture. People learn from history just as the great revolutionaries of the 20th century learned about revolution, freedom, sovereignty and nationalism from their European predecessors. Although social scientists may disagree on which analytical framework is the best for analysis, most if not all would agree that events of history and people’s decisions have lasting impacts on societies around the world.

Historical events and self-interested decisions have an undeniable influence on society and culture. This is especially true in regards to imperialism where outside
cultures impose themselves on faraway local cultures solely for the metropole’s own economic gain. Boahen shows how colonialism, nationalism, the abolition movement, and liberation movements sweeping the colonies are all events and ideas that directly affected one another.

Boahen notes that the Europe that Africa was about to encounter was not the same Europe that they had been dealing with since the fifteenth century. It was now a Europe that had witnessed the industrial revolution and was desperately in need of new markets as well as raw materials. The metropole needed more and more raw materials to fuel their growth from the industrial revolution which led to a change in colonial policies that would create captive markets from which to extract such resources. With the abolition of slavery, the switch to trade in natural products had Europe drop its “old attitude of free trade and informal political control in favor of one of trade monopoly and direct political and financial control or colonial imperialism” (Boahen, 1987, 26). These captive markets effectively ended free trade for the colonies. The final event that made it possible for Europe to change its policies and practices to fit its needs was the discovery of a prophylaxis for malaria just before the turn of the 20th century. Mitigating the threat of malaria made it possible for Europeans to go deeper inland and settle in Africa for longer than before.

The Berlin Conference, which lasted from November 15, 1884 to January 31, 1885, formulated rules of conduct in the race for the European colonization of Africa. Switzerland and the United States were the only two Western countries that did not attend the Conference, and of course no African entity was invited to attend either. The carving of Africa later led to the establishment of 48 independent states. The fact that the

---

2 Boahen, 1987, 26
boundaries were arbitrarily drawn up from the imperial offices in Europe leads Boahen to state, “Had the boundaries of these states been laid down in accordance with any well-defined, rational criteria and in full cognizance of the ethno-cultural, geographical, and ecological realities of Africa, the outcome would have been wholesome” (Boahen, 1987, 96). Instead, Boahen agrees that a byproduct of colonialism has been the, “uneven sizes and unequal natural resources and economic potentialities of these states” (Boahen, 1987, 97).

Colonialism was a self-defeating enterprise because of other coinciding events and movements. David Abernethy’s book, *The Dynamics of Global Dominance: European Overseas Empires, 1450-1980*, highlights that colonial practices were rooted in hypocrisy and contradictions. Abernethy argues that colonial regimes were authoritarian by nature: “bureaucracies carried out decisions made by foreigners who were unaccountable to local people” (Abernethy, 2000, 367). Like Boahen, he also illustrates how imperialism could no longer be justified by the metropole. In addition, colonialism itself was conditioning its colonists in unforeseen ways. Opportunities like western educations were expanding thought and homogenizing languages. Foreign events like the abolition of slavery and the gradual acceptance of individual human dignity caused colonials to recognize the hypocrisy of autocratic colonial practices. Their introduction to Western liberalism caused a rise in colonial nationalism, and the natives soon began to reject the colonial systems that controlled them.

Ironically, ideas of nationalism that led to colonial aspirations of independence were brought directly to the colonies from imperialists themselves. Abernethy highlights the positive correlation between nationalism and colonialism, “Concepts of nation and
nationalism become more appealing in colonies as they become more popular in Europe” (Abernethy, 2000, 330). Educated nationals in their travels to Europe also picked up nationalism. Many examples of this include great revolutionaries like Mohandas Gandhi, Ho Chi Minh, Sun Yat-sen, Jawaharlal Nehru, Nelson Mandela and Kwame Nkrumah. These leaders inspired the masses, organized liberation movements, and attempted to create unity through nationalism to form states independent from imperialist rule. Abernethy notes that these “colonial elites wanted their territories to replicate not only the sovereignty but also the populism of European states” (Abernethy, 2000, 329).

The many accords and revolutions of European history display the progression of Western liberalism. England had achieved the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 gaining its monarch more sovereignty. And later its Glorious Revolution in 1688, Parliament successfully limited royal prerogatives. The French championed “Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity” through revolution in 1789, resulting in the famous Rights of Man. These expansions of human liberties, nationalism, and popular sovereignty have become examples for their colonial students to learn by. Indeed, without Europe’s innumerable political revolutions and philosophical ideas championing liberty and human rights, the greatest post-colonial revolutionaries of the 20th century might not have been as inspired to find nationalism in their own lands. The evolution of democracy in Europe throughout the centuries only increased the contradiction of Europe’s colonial practices. Abernethy finds, “the more democratic the metropole, the greater the contradiction between domestic and colonial practice” (Abernethy, 2000, 328).

Great thinkers like Steinmo, Abernethy, Barber, and writers like Fanon, and other historians, sociologists and political scientists agree that nationalism was a direct
consequence, if not a byproduct of, imperialism. Post-colonial writers Kincaid and Achebe write most effectively on how their native culture has forever changed through contact with the West and imperialism. Post-colonial institutions might have arguably looked very different today if they had not developed alongside Western liberalism’s hypocrisy and the shadow of self-interested imperial rule.

Abernethy’s utility of historical institutionalism in illustrating how important colonial institutions were to the development of the independent post-colony is incredibly compelling and effective. Abernethy writes, “in countries where colonial administrators, judges, and police were harsh and unpopular, retention of the institutions that employed them can undermine legitimacy even when the offending foreigners have been replaced by local personnel” (Abernethy, 2000, 366). Furthermore, Abernethy explains that the democratic (or less than democratic) development of a post-colony in large part has to do with whether or not “colony-wide representative institutions were in place and functioning effectively before independence” (Abernethy, 2000, 367). He goes on to explain, “while the presence of colonial legislatures cannot ensure democracy in later years, its absence appears to be a sufficient condition for maintenance of authoritarian rule” (Abernethy, 2000, 367). This is especially clear in the case of former Rhodesia where Great Britain granted Rhodesia self-governing status under white control in 1923. Great Britain’s early departure from direct colonial control of Rhodesia allowed the persistence of decades of authoritarian white rule over black Rhodesians. This authoritarian transition from colony to independent state later became the fuel for Mugabe’s fiery political rhetoric and the logical progression to his authoritarian rule.

---

3 Boahen, 1987, 96
Both the spread nationalism and imperialism are vital to understanding post-colonial development. Both caused about nearly 50 arbitrarily conceived colonies to become independent states. These new states had to develop their own conceptions of a new national identity to reconcile their colonial past. This forcibly brought together multiple ethnicities, cultures, traditions, languages and races. As Greenfeld has explained, different types of nationalism spawn different political and social cultures ranging from authoritarian to democratic, just as different types of colonialism (settler colonialism, dependency colonialism, plantation colonialism, and trading post colonialism) have different lasting effects on post-colonial development.
III. Methodology

Several concepts emerge from a comparative case study of Zimbabwe and South Africa when viewing the differences and similarities in the development of post-colonial states and the lasting effects that different national identities have in those states. The dependent variables in this empirical case study based on applied and nomothetic research are ethnic and civic types of nationalism. Open or restrictive citizenship policies reflect the type of nationalism a state has conceived. A content analysis highlights the positive correlation between restrictive citizenship policies and ethnic nationalism, as well as open citizenship policies and civic nationalism. The effects of each type of nationalism can be measured in terms of the political, economic, and social rights and liberties that citizens are either granted or denied.

Concepts of nationalism and national identity from both sociological and political science perspectives are a critically important piece of the puzzle, and lend further understanding of the bigger picture of Zimbabwe. State policies, the constitution, legislation and rhetoric used by the state’s leadership can be used as indicators that measure and define a state’s conception of national identity. These indicators will help explain how Zimbabwe’s dictatorial political culture differs from the democratic political culture embraced during the transition of colonial South Africa to an independent democratic South Africa.
The content analysis showing Zimbabwe’s ethnic national identity will be supported by state policies and either written or spoken words promoting ethnic nationalism or mono citizenship by persons representing the state. Unlike Zimbabwe, South Africa’s nationalism is clearly defined in its transparent charters, documents, and legislation that attempted to expand all people’s rights and freedoms from the liberation movement to its independence. The content analysis highlighting South Africa’s national civic national identity will be supported by state policies and either written or spoken words supporting civic nationalism or open citizenship by persons representing the state.

The first independent variable is economic success. Under the theory of functionalism and integration in political science, states stand to benefit more from working cooperatively since in this ever-shrinking globalized world nations are becoming more financially and politically linked. From a functionalist perspective, economic success is contingent upon a measure of legitimate acceptance of the free world market as well as acceptance by the leading participating members of the international economy. Do the leading international economic institutions who represent a consensus of integrated states like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) generally support the post-colonial state in question or do they look at them as a rouge and uncooperative state on the world stage? Does the post-colonial state in question acknowledge and support the legitimacy of the existing international world market or does it condemn it?

It may seem unfair to judge a post-colonial leader or government based on their attitudes regarding the Western dominated international free market. This is especially true for many third world economists, whose research shows that the world market is
dominated by Western interests and operates at the expense of underdeveloped and developing countries. However, this does not make it wrong to judge Mugabe and his ZANU-PF government—how their fractionalist and disintegrated economic policies have affected the average Zimbabwean over the last 32 years. If anything, it is important to ask why a leader might recognize the benefits of capitalism but then disregard them, leading to the economic detriment and extreme impoverishment of Zimbabwean citizens.

Mugabe has done just this because victimization is an important component for a strong ethnic national identity. Ethnic nationalism can be a powerful motivator for a leader who wants to retain power at the expense of a successful, sustainable economy. The methodology of content analysis will show the positive correlation between the effects of ethnic nationalism, the rhetoric of victimization, and the results of mono-citizenship.

Political stability is an important component of a viable, developed state. In the field of political science, regular elections are a vital requisite for political stability. For elections to be considered regular they should be held at least once within every five years. Free, fair, and transparent elections are of course even more desirable in the eyes of the Western world and many international institutions like the World Bank and the IMF. Freeness and fairness of elections can be measured on whether or not the political opposition is allowed to participate without obstruction from the government and with legislation against government obstruction in place. Election transparency can also be gauged from the results from international monitoring groups like World Watch.

Although regular elections are a vital component of political stability, they are not the only aspect. Political freedoms like free speech, free association, free press, and freedom of assembly are also critical to a healthy political environment. These freedoms
can be found in documents and charters describing the goals of a liberation movement, a
government’s constitution, or in legislation. Independent branches of government are also
key to a healthy democracy, where one branch cannot legally have influence over another
branch. Conversely, when a president ignores decisions from the judicial branch or
disregards the consent of the legislative body, this displays an aversion to a stable
political system. Lastly, the incidence of political violence conducted by the state is
another way to measure if a state has a fair and transparent political system, one that acts
in accordance with international human rights laws and codes of conduct.

Social stability is another independent variable used to measure the success of a
state. Social stability is a measure of contentment among a state’s citizens, as well as the
effectiveness of a state’s governance. If people trust the state and feel like they can effect
change in regular elections, if they feel their jobs are earning them a sustainable living,
and if other sectors of their lives are decent, then people may not be as inclined to break
the law to get what they feel the state is not otherwise providing them. However, if the
majority of people are not content with their government, or cannot earn a sustainable
income, then civil war and crime may be more likely. If a large part of the population
cannot earn a living wage, if there unemployment is high, or if there are high levels of
poverty and homelessness, then government policies can be proven to be inadequate.
Therefore, unemployment, poverty and homelessness are all important factors of social
stability.
IV. Historical Background

Zimbabwe

Semi-autonomous White Minority Rule & The Land Issue

Cecil Rhodes, founder of the British South Africa Company (BSAC), organized a small group of white settlers known as the Pioneer Column. In September of 1890, accompanied by the BSAC’s private police force, they entered the north-eastern part of Matabeleland and claimed the capital of Harare in the name of the British Flag. The European settlers, with their superior military strength, entrenched themselves established a settlement in the territory. By 1893 there was a confrontation between Rhodes’s forces and the Ndebele African linguistic group. In 1896 the Shona and the Ndebele united to expel the Europeans, but they were eventually defeated by the settlers in 1897. Rhodes’ British South Africa Company administered Rhodesia until 1923. Soon after, the British government granted the white settlers their desire a “responsible self-government.” This was, of course, without consent or consultation of the black African majority.

Seven years after whites in Rhodesia gained self-governing status, they institutionalized discrimination against black Rhodesians. Their primary method of discrimination was to segregate land ownership. The 1930 the Land Apportionment Act “legally segregated the holding of land by giving Europeans the right to purchase in the
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most desirable agricultural regions…This system of land rights was further codified in 1969 with the passage of the Land Tenure Act” which “equally’ divided the land in Rhodesia into 45 million acres for blacks and 45 million acres for whites…this equal distribution provided the average white farmer 6,100 acres compared to 7 acres for the average African farmer” (Stedman, 1991, 41). The 1977 book Zimbabwe: The Facts About Rhodesia put together by the International Defence and Aid Fund for Southern Africa (I.D.A.F.) reports that “around 90% of the 45 million acres allocated to the black majority is made up of the Tribal Trust Lands [TTL], and the remaining 10% of the African Purchase Areas [APA]. Africans are only allowed to buy and own land individually in the African Purchase Areas” (I.D.A.F., 1977, 10). The TTL were communally occupied and farmed on a subsistence basis. The report explains that land in the TTL was “generally poor and eroded, and food production stagnant and even declining” (I.D.A.F., 1977, 10). By apportioning the most arable land for whites, the white minority government succeeded in their efforts to politically, economically and socially disenfranchise the indigenous black Rhodesians.

Their acquisition of arable land gave rise to a white bourgeoisie. Dr. Wellington Nyangoni, a Zimbabwean national and well respected professor of African studies explains in his book, Underdevelopment, Imperialism, and Neocolonialism in Zimbabwe, “the African neocolonial class (bourgeoisie) becomes the vehicle through which neocolonialism is perpetuated” (Nyangoni, 1992, 25). Policies like the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act, the Land Apportionment Act and the Land Tenure Act, the Masters and Servants Act and the Industrial Conciliation Act, as well as the Unlawful Organizations Act institutionalized and perpetuated the political, economic, and social
oppression of indigenous black Africans. Such acts denied workers to form or join trade
unions and made it a crime for a worker to strike. The I.D.A.F. report outlines in great
detail the economic, political and social inequities that became institutionalized under the
white minority rule. In terms of unemployment, “in 1976, a total of 926,000 Africans
were employed in the cash economy...compared with 120,000 whites, Asians, and
Coloureds” (I.D.A.F., 1977, 14). In terms of wages, the report explains that white wages
in Southern Rhodesia in 1977 were eleven times greater than black and that the black-
white wage gap was still growing at the time the book was published. The authors write,
“In 1976, Africans employed in the white owned economy in Zimbabwe earned average
annual incomes of R $517” while white, Asian, and Colored employees earned on
average R $5,583. Furthermore, “the gap between the average African and non-African
wages has increased from R $2,809 in 1970 to R $5,066 in 1976” (I.D.A.F., 1977, 16).
The I.D.A.F researchers explain that many Africans “are not employed in the cash
economy at all, but depend on subsistence agriculture in the impoverished Tribal Trust
Lands” (I.D.A.F., 1977, 16). The self-governing status of white minority rule allowed for
the continued repression of black Rhodesians in all sectors of society including land,
housing, employment, voting, and education. It also allowed for the continued inequitable
economic growth of the white ruling bourgeoisie.

The 1969 Constitution of Southern Rhodesia officially classified Asians and
Coloureds along with whites as Europeans⁵, clearly drawing rights of citizenship across
racial and ethnic lines. The minority white regime further encouraged a narrow and
distinctly separate identity among the black African population through a policy of
“provincialization” or “regionalization” implemented in 1972. On top of the existing

⁵ I.D.A.F., 10
division of land into European and African areas, the white regime divided the nation into three groups- whites, Mashona and Matabele. The I.D.A.F. explains, “by delegating greater local government powers to chiefs and tribal authorities, and emphasizing the differences between the two main African groupings, the regime’s aim is to encourage a narrow tribal identity among the black people” (I.D.A.F., 1977, 10). By creating competition for power and emphasizing differences between the two groups, the white government hoped it would play the two groups off each other, preventing the two groups from uniting over a more common identity, such as being African and similarly oppressed. The policies of the minority white government continually disenfranchised the majority population and created and defined a national identity that excluded indigenous black Africans, while simultaneously creating a narrow African identity along tribal lines.

In 1953, with strong opposition from the African nationalists, Southern Rhodesia joined with former Northern Rhodesia (now independent Zambia) and Nyasaland (now independent Malawi) to form the Central African Federation. The Federation broke up when Malawi was granted independence in 1964 followed soon after by Zambia. Desiring the independence of their neighbors, the all-white Rhodesian Front government, which was founded in 1961, led by Ian Smith unilaterally declared independence from Great Britain on November 11, 1965. The unilateral declaration of independence (UDI) was considered an illegal act as Southern Rhodesia was still considered to be a British colony. This made Smith’s Southern Rhodesia a rouge and unrecognized state in the eyes of the international community.

Nearly a week before the UDI, the Governor of Rhodesia declared a nationwide State of Emergency (November 5, 1965). While in the past this power had been regularly
lifted after three months, the U.S. Department of State’s website shows this State of Emergency lasting until July 1990.\(^6\)

According to the I.D.A.F. book the white Rhodesian government passed a whole series of “Emergency Powers Regulations” under the authority of the Emergency Powers Act of 1960. Many include: the Emergency Powers (Maintenance of Law and Order) Regulations, which allowed the government to arrest and detain people without charge, permitted the forcible removal of populations, the establishment of “protected” villages, as well as mandating curfews in designated areas, and the use of forced labor. Second, the Emergency Powers (Control of Manpower) Regulations, which controlled the activities of employees in certain industries. Third, the Emergency Powers (prohibition of Foreign Aid to Designated Political Parties) Regulations, which were used to prevent funds being provided to the African National Council from abroad. Lastly, the Emergency Powers (Sanction Counter-Espionage) Regulations, which prevented anyone from disclosing information about sanctions breaking (I.D.A.F., 1977, 34-35). Throughout the decades of rule the white minority government also restricted freedom of assembly, banned nationalist political organizations, restricted the freedom of speech, controlled the press and media, required black males over a certain age to register and carry identification cards and fingerprints, detained prisoners without trial and conducted over a hundred illegal executions.\(^7\)

These and other legislated denials of rights and freedoms that were implemented under white minority rule have continually been utilized by Robert Mugabe for

\(^6\) [http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/5479.htm](http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/5479.htm)
\(^7\) I.D.A.F., 1977, 35-44
justification of continuing his dictatorial rule throughout his thirty plus years as President of Zimbabwe.

*Mugabe’s Early Life, Education, Career, Revolutionary Involvement & Imprisonment*

Robert Gabriel Mugabe was born on February 21, 1924 at Kutama Mission in the Zvimba district, west of Salisbury. He was raised in a “Christian village” established by Jesuit Fathers for baptized Africans. Both of his parents had been mission trained. Mugabe’s father was a carpenter and his mother taught the catechism and the Bible. When Robert was ten years old his father deserted the family leaving Robert’s mother to raise him and his five other siblings.

Robert proved to be an exceptionally intelligent student who engrossed himself in his education. Father Jerome O’Hea was an Irish Jesuit who took charge of Kutama Mission when Robert was seven years old. Father O’Hea was a “strong believer in education as the key to emancipation.” It is said that he was a “secretive and solitary” child who was remembered by Father O’Hea for his “serious demeanor” (Meredith, 2007, 21). He took attention to Robert and “gave him a feel for Irish legend and revolution, describing the struggle the Irish had sustained to attain independence from Britain” (Meredith, 2007, 20-21).

In 1945 Mugabe left Kutama to teach for a couple years. In 1949 he won a scholarship to attend Fort Hare University College in South Africa, the same elite black university that Nelson Mandela had studied at a decade before. At Fort Hare Mugabe was introduced to the ideas of Marxism, South African communists and Gandhi’s campaign of passive resistance against British colonial rule—all of which influenced Mugabe significantly. Mugabe said about Gandhi’s influence, “This gave me personally a new
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kind of vision, a new philosophy, that if Africans were united in the same way as the Indians were, even if they resorted to a non-violent struggle, they would eventually emerge victorious” (Meredith, 2007, 23). Mugabe was an intelligent young man in an extremely revolutionary era, when colonies were beginning to vocalize their desire for not only inclusion in government but also for self-determination.

When Mugabe completed his degree at Fort Hare and returned to teach in Southern Rhodesia in 1952 it was apparent that his views had changed radically. He said, “I was completely hostile to the system, but of course I came back to teach within it” (Meredith, 2007, 23). Mugabe is referring to the system of the governance of white rule in Rhodesia. In 1955 Mugabe moved to teach in Northern Rhodesia in Lusaka (now Zambia) where he earned his third degree through distance learning at London University.

Three years later Mugabe moved again to teach in Ghana at the Takoradi Teacher Training College in 1958—just a year after Ghana gained independence from Great Britain. Ghana’s esteemed leader, Kwame Nkrumah was a revolutionary, socialist, nationalist, liberator, and among the first men considered to be a true pan-Africanist. Mugabe recalled about his time in Ghana, “I wanted to see what it would be like in an independent African state. Once there I began to develop definite ideas. You could say it was there I accepted the general principles of Marxism” (Meredith, 2007, 24). It was in Ghana that the revolutionary ideas and influences of Mugabe’s life truly culminated into a concrete worldview.

While Mugabe had been soaking up the revolutionary atmosphere surrounding Ghana’s new independence, the political situation back in Rhodesia began to change.
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There had been a certain status quo in Rhodesia since 1923 when Great Britain granted Rhodesia self-governing status under white control. However, in the late 1950s the tides began to change as elite black Africans began to rally around a new nationalism that did not involve a government in which only whites could participate in. In 1957 a contemporary of Mugabe’s, Joseph Nkomo, became the leader of the popularly supported African National Congress (ANC). This entity was subsequently banned by the white Rhodesian government two years later. By January 1960 the nationalists launched the National Democratic Party (NDP). Mugabe’s friend and one of the founders of the NDP, Leopold Takawira, pronounced, “We are no longer asking Europeans to rule us well. We now want to rule ourselves” (Meredith, 2007, 26). In 1962 Mugabe echoed Takawira’s desire for self-governance and self determination, “Europeans must realize that unless the legitimate demands of African nationalism are recognized, then racial conflict is inevitable” (Meredith, 2007, 28). Mugabe established early in his political involvement that conflict would be imminent if nationalist’s demands were not met.

Mugabe returned to Rhodesia from Ghana in May 1960 for a long visit and had intended to go back to Ghana to complete his four year teaching contract. However, the government arrested three prominent NDP officials on July 19, 1960. Among the arrested was Leopold Takawira. That night Mugabe joined the 7,000 protesters. By the next day the number of protestors had grown to 40,000, and Mugabe was asked to be among the speakers (Meredith, 2007, 26-27). The Rhodesian government ordered police to break up the protest and introduced the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act, which if fully enforced would have obliterated all black liberties and individual rights.
Affected by the swell of revolutionary activity around him, Mugabe resigned his teaching job in Ghana to become a full-time activist. In October 1960, Mugabe was elected publicity secretary of the NDP. During Joseph Nkomo’s leadership of the NDP (1961-1962), he accepted a deal by the British that was highly unpopular among the other nationalist leaders and supporters. Nkomo was quickly losing the confidence, trust, and support of his colleagues (including Mugabe) and nationalist supporters. Violent protests broke out, culminating with the government banning the NDP. The nationalists responded by creating yet another party called the Zimbabwe African People’s Union (Zapu), and the Rhodesian government answered by banning that entity nine months later.10

The white Rhodesian government began tightening its reign. In September 1962, Mugabe and other nationalists were “arrested and restricted to their home districts for three months” (Meredith, 2007, 29). By December 1962, there was growing movement in the white communities against the wave of black nationalist activity. A new right-wing party called the Rhodesian Front, supported by white farmers, won control of the government in the next elections.

In January 1963, Nkomo was getting even more desperate for black nationalism to succeed and held a meeting in Dar el Salam to try to persuade his colleagues to form a government in exile. Mugabe attended this meeting with skepticism. However, Nkomo’s proposal was highly unpopular, leaving Mugabe stranded in Dar el Salam and facing trial for subversion and violating his terms of bail back in Rhodesia.11
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By this time Mugabe’s colleagues and other nationalists had lost patience with Nkomo’s lack of success. Later in 1963 they launched the Zimbabwe African National Union (Zanu) and elected Mugabe Secretary-General in absentia (Meredith, 2007, 32). In December 1963 Mugabe returned to Rhodesia and was arrested for subversion. By March 1964 he was sentenced to 21 years in prison.

Mugabe was imprisoned from 1964 to 1974. While Mugabe was in prison he got word that his baby had become deathly ill. When he requested permission to attend his baby’s funeral and comfort his wife the government refused. The white government’s denial to mourn the loss of his child with his wife was something Mugabe could never forgive. With the utmost intensity, he threw himself into his studies and organized study sessions with other inmates\(^\text{12}\).

During Mugabe’s incarceration Ian Smith became the zealous leader of the Rhodesian Front party (1964) and banned both the ZANU and ZAPU nationalist parties. Smith later succeeded in seizing independence from Britain in 1965. Smith ruled a tight rein and tried his hardest to wipe out black nationalism in an independent Rhodesia. Increasingly frustrated with Smith’s rule, black Rhodesians finally erupted into violence and Rhodesia fell into a civil war in 1972.

Mugabe was released from 11 years imprisonment in December 1974 during a cease-fire in the civil struggle in Rhodesia. Upon his release, Mugabe traveled to Lusaka, Zambia to attend a summit meeting of African leaders to plan for the Rhodesian peace talks that were to take place later that month. Many encouraged negotiations for a settlement between the Rhodesian whites and the nationalist guerilla forces. Tanzania’s President Julius Nyerere, Zambia’s President Kenneth Kaunda, Mozambique’s President

\(^{12}\) Meredith, 2007, 35
Samora Machel, and Botswana’s President Seretse Khama all backed this effort and disapproved the split between Mugabe’s Zimbabwe African National Union (Zanu) and Joshua Nkomo’s Zimbabwe African People’s Union (Zapu).

In 1975, Mugabe wanted to gain control of Zanla, ZANU’s guerrilla army in Mozambique, but his friend Maurice Nyagumbo was arrested and imprisoned for recruiting Africans to join the guerrilla army. Faced with the threat of arrest and imprisonment again, Mugabe had no choice but to escape. He crossed into Mozambique on April 5, 1975 with his friend Edgar Tekere. Despite these hardships, Mugabe persevered, and in August 1977 he finally gained control of the ZANU and its army.

_Toll Of Civil War In Rhodesia_

Stedman points to two factors that contributed to changing the military situation in favor of the revolutionaries, “first, the collapse of the Portuguese authorities in Mozambique in 1974-1975 opened a 600-mile-long sanctuary for Zimbabwean guerrillas. Second, the draconian antiterrorist activities of the white security forces drove tens of thousands of rural Zimbabweans into refugee status across the border in Mozambique” (Stedman, 37). This created a situation whereby there were tens of thousands of frustrated young adult males—more than willing to become guerilla fighters and support the liberation movement. The Rhodesian war against the guerrillas had been successful from 1965-1972, but the opening of Mozambique gave the black Rhodesian’s the advantage from Dec 1972-1976.

The demographics of Rhodesia were to the advantage of the nationalists movements throughout the civil war. According to the 1969 Rhodesian census, there was
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a European population of 228,296 and an African population of an estimated 5.4 million\textsuperscript{15}. Desperate to offset this, Rhodesia was drafting white European males aged 18-60 by 1980. However, in Rhodesia, European employees comprised just under 4 percent of the agricultural sector—which in 1975 accounted for nearly 11.5 percent of the GDP\textsuperscript{16}. The draft created a shortage of skilled European workers, thus seriously impacting the economy. The intensification of the war also created an exodus among the white population, further destabilizing the Rhodesian economy as well as white society in general. The white population “fell by 11,000 in 1977 (3.5%) and by 14,000 in 1978. In the first four months of 1979 another 4,500 whites left the country—more than twice the total for the same period in 1978” (Astrow, 1983, 150). The total expenditure on of the military alone from 1979-1980, “was budgeted to reach 295m pounds or 37% of all public spending” (Astrow, 1983, 150). Although Smith was popular among conservative white South Africans, he lacked popularity in South Africa’s governing leadership and struggled to maintain South African support for the Rhodesian government throughout the conflict. In 1976 a Rhodesian intelligence briefing admitted that “Rhodesia is totally dependent upon South Africa for military and economic survival” (Stedman, 1991, 39-40).

Not only was the Rhodesian economy suffering, loss of life throughout the civil war was astronomical on both sides. Astrow writes: “According to the RF, 7,000 guerrillas died between December 1972 and March 1978. In the following nine months, however, at least another 6,000 were killed—800 of them in September alone.” Astrow notes that “these figures excluded the thousands of Africans killed in the refugee and
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training camps in Zambia, Mozambique and Angola…by the time the cease-fire came into operation the war had killed 27,000 people and uprooted about one million Africans” (Astrow, 1983, 151). In its 13th year of civil war as 1978 drew to a close,

“nearly 85 percent of Rhodesia was under martial law…the last year had been its deadliest to date: 2,450 guerrilla, 282 Rhodesian troops, 2,406 black civilians, and 173 white noncombatants killed. The country lost over 13,000 whites to emigration. The Rhodesian military estimated that between 10,000 and 12,000 guerrillas were inside the country” (Stedman, 1991, 162).

Despite the huge loss of life, Astrow notes that the nationalist movements continued to train and receive thousands of guerrilla fighters. Astrow writes that in April 1977 “it was officially estimated that there were 2,350 guerrillas operating inside the country.” However, ZANU continued to expand its military wing. “Two groups of guerrillas finished their training in Tanzania, putting a force of at least 15,000 at Mugabe’s disposal. Meanwhile, ZIPRA numbered 10,000 in 1978, with a further 17,000 under training in Angola and Zambia” (Astrow, 1983, 151). Lastly, the nationalist movements had another advantage over the RF—the mujubas. The mujubas were young Africans in rural areas who “helped mediate between the guerrillas and the peasants.” The mujubas played an important role in the civil war, “they collected contributions from the people for the guerrillas, in the form of money, food, medicine and so on, while also helping to coordinate and organize” political meetings in the TTLs. They also provided “important security information to the guerrillas,” and “when necessary, the mujubas would fight alongside the guerrilla forces” (Astrow, 1983, 151). All told, by the end of the war, the mujubas numbered over 50,000 (Astrow, 1983, 151).
The war of liberation soon spread to the “Frontline” states of Zambia, Mozambique, Botswana, Tanzania and Angola. This heightened military activity threatened the security in those countries as well.

The African leaders had wanted unity among ZANU and ZAPU, but Mugabe was absolutely resistant to the idea. Perhaps Mugabe had more than lost his confidence in Nkomo’s competence and his ability to create an independent nation. From Nkomo’s unpopular deal with the British in 1962, to his repudiated idea to create a government in exile in Dar el Salaam, Nkomo seemed to demonstrate to Mugabe a sense of over-eagerness and a desperation that would not be compatible with Mugabe’s strong will and discipline. Furthermore, Mugabe’s 11 years in prison had given him time to learn, think, and become more resolute in his own vision of an independent Zimbabwe. Mugabe reported about the meeting in Lusaka,

“Nyerere attacked both Zanu and Zapu…He scolded us and then Kaunda spoke and attacked us still more viciously, calling us treacherous, criminal, selfish, and not taking the interests of our people to heart. If we did not comply, he would no longer entertain our military presence in Zambia” (Stedman, 1991, 54).

President Machel made similar threats. Faced with the threat of withdrawn support of neighboring countries, Mugabe finally made the tactical decision to join with Nkomo’s ZAPU.

More than a decade and a half of civil war had devastated Rhodesia—economically, socially, and politically. The Rhodesian civil war had compromised the stability of the Frontline states as well. Guerrilla fighting and civil war exacerbated the need for a political settlement. Rhodesia’s severe loss of life and the military’s burden on an already war-torn economy caused Smith to agree to negotiate. Mugabe’s external pressure from the Frontline states to pull support
compelled him to the negotiating table. Political pressure for settlement talks on both sides was also applied from South Africa, the United States, and the UK as well.

An interview Stedman had with an author who had previously interviewed a British diplomat sheds some light on the British’s understanding of Mugabe’s view on the civil war and on a negotiated settlement, “the British believed that Mugabe would fight any settlement. But the British recognized that Mugabe’s reluctance did not stem from ideology or principle. As one diplomat stated, ‘Mugabe was convinced that he could win outright and he feared risking the gains he had already won. Mugabe was convinced that he would win an election, but was unsure he would have a chance to win an election. He believed in armed struggle, because of Smith’” As for Nkomo, the author said the diplomat told him that he “‘didn’t need a lot of pressure—he was the weak link in the Patriotic Front. Lancaster was his last chance’” (Stedman, 1991, 169).

Lancaster House Conference

Four fractions from Salisbury attended the Lancaster House negotiations: Muzorewa and his UANC faction, Peter Walls and the government faction, Ian Smith and the RF faction, and lastly, Sithole and the internal opposition to Muzorewa. Lord Carrington, who organized and headed the conference, had a very well constructed notion of how he believed the conference should be run. He planned the principles that would guide the negotiations, the themes that would recur throughout the negotiations and which issues the conference needed to produce agreement on in order to be considered successful. The three issues the British thought most required accord between factions was a new constitution, a plan for the transition period prior to the elections, and the

\[17\] Stedman, 1991, 172
agreements for a cease-fire that would ultimately allow for free and fair elections in Rhodesia\textsuperscript{18}.

Lord Carrington’s strategy for the conference emphasized four factors. Carrington used what he called the “second-class solution” (Steadman, 1991, 174). He hinted that the British would recognize Muzorewa and remove the sanctions on Rhodesia if he found that ZANU-PF was responsible for failing to reach a settlement. Thus, Carrington effectively created the condition for the first factor that would guide his negotiations— the first party to walk away from the negotiating table would lose everything, thereby making it in every party’s interest to negotiate until an accord was met. Secondly, Carrington knew it was necessary to have all parties believe they could win in a fair election. If any one party did not believe that then there would be good reason for them to walk away from a settlement. Thirdly, Carrington believed that Smith and Mugabe, as persons who were most opposed to a settlement, had to be isolated. Lastly, since Britain lacked leverage and trust among ZANU-PF, he needed the help of the Frontline presidents to apply pressure on Mugabe and Nkomo (but especially Mugabe). This task was simple, as the Frontline states risked further deterioration of the security of their respective nations if they failed to compel the nationalist leadership to attend the conference and resolve the civil war.

When the time came for Mugabe to negotiate with the British colonial leadership at the Lancaster House conference in London in 1979 he did not want to attend, but was urged by the presidents of Mozambique and Zambia to go. Mugabe was suspicious of any settlement because he believed that ZANU could win on the battlefield. His opinion was that negotiations could only strip ZANU of what it had gained throughout the civil war.

\textsuperscript{18} Stedman, 1991, 177
Since he was so certain of ZANU’s odds on the ground, he figured his odds were much lower at the negotiation table up against three other factions. However, Presidents Machel and Kaunda refused to support Mugabe’s military campaign so long as the opportunity for peace or a settlement could be reached at the negotiating table. With this loss of military support, Mugabe’s best chance at advancing ZANU’s political goals remained at Lancaster. Despite the long odds, Mugabe begrudgingly made his way to the negotiations.

Lord Carrington emphasized the use of ultimatums to address any issue before allowing the conference to move on to other issues. Carrington also put a strong emphasis on seriousness. He thought it was critical that the attending parties believed in the British commitment to ending the conflict in Rhodesia. Carrington had four other components as part of his plan that he believed would hold the conference together. The first: bring a “strong conception of a feasible outcome.” The second: a “strong imposition of deadlines into the meetings combined with making necessary concessions when conditions arose.” The third: a “step-by-step approach to the major issues in the in the hope of building and sustaining momentum toward an agreement.” Lastly: “the use of a single negotiating text” (Stedman, 1991, 175).

During the first meeting of the conference, Carrington set the tone for the negotiations and outlined seven themes that would recur throughout the meetings to come:

“(1) that Britain was acting on a mandate of the Commonwealth; (2) that the British were serious about asserting their decolonizing responsibilities; (3) that the constitution was the key to the settlement, and that only when that was solved would the conference proceed to discussions about arrangements; (4) that Britain had long experience as a decolonizing power, which enabled the British
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negotiators to deal with the sticky issues involved in the conference; (5) that agreement would demand compromises by all parties; (6) that independence did not mean that one side would win but that all sides would have an equal chance to win an election; and (7) that the British proposals would form the basis of the working document—other parties’ suggestions would be considered but only insofar as they dealt with the British document” (Stedman, 1991, 176).

The conference was long and threatened to unravel several times. There were many disagreements and Mugabe was frequently outspoken against Carrington’s dictatorial style of running the conference. Despite the turmoil, compromises were eventually made on all sides. While Mugabe and Smith both disagreed about negotiating the new constitution as the first objective, Carrington was unrelenting about the order of the negotiations.

The ZANU-PF disagreed with British proposals on this first objective, the creation of a new constitution, and held up talks for two weeks. Although the PF eventually conceded to the twenty reserved seats for whites in Parliament, they “raised objections over land, pensions, citizenship, protected rights and form of constitutional government” (Stedman, 1991, 180). When agreement could not be reached, Carrington asserted “Britain’s duty to arbitrate: ‘When the Conference cannot agree, when the parties cannot agree, we have an obligation to make clear what in our mind is fair and reasonable and we have done so’” (Steadman, 1991, 182/United Kingdom 1979, minutes of eleventh plenary). Mugabe and his PF faction found the land issue extremely difficult to accept and threatened to walk away from the negotiations. The Frontline states threatened to take away guerrilla bases if he walked. Nkomo, who was not willing to lose everything in the first round of talks and was intrigued by the prospect of winning an election if ZANU walked, told Mugabe that if he walked, ZANU walked alone20. Two
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days later the British offered to cover some of the expense of compensating farmers for land redistribution, but it did not immediately change the PF’s stance. In response to the situation (and through efforts of an initiative by Carrington), the United States gave Carrington “ambiguous support for a fund that would help Zimbabwe bear the economic burden of pensions and compensation for land” (Stedman, 1991, 182-183). The notice of the US’s support coupled with the lack of support from Nkomo and the threats to take away guerrilla bases in the Frontline states caused Mugabe and his delegation to announce that, pending their satisfaction with the transitional arrangements, “there will not be need to revert to discussion on the constitution” (Steadman, 1991, 183).

In the second phase of the transitional arrangements there were many disagreements. Among them were disputes over a proposed British governor who would maintain full legislative and executive powers, Carrington’s plan to keep the existing Rhodesian police force intact, and the duration of the 2 month time table of the transitional period prior to the elections. Zambian President Kenneth Kaunda soon was forced to intervene to help bring the parties back to the table. While Carrington made two important compromises in the ZANU-PF’s favor, they still disagreed on several other issues. Steadman outlines the issues, “the Patriotic Front had accepted a British governor who would rely on the existing Rhodesian administration, an election council and British election commissioner, and a party list system of voting. Areas of disagreement included the full registration of voters, the nature of the police force, the length of the transition, the formation of a cease-fire commission, and the composition of a peacekeeping force” (Steadman, 1991, 195). In response, Carrington extended the transition period from two months to twelve to thirteen weeks, added more than 100 members to the election
commissioner, and changed the peacekeeping force to a Commonwealth monitoring force, but he flatly vetoed a cease-fire commission\textsuperscript{21}.

The final phase of the negotiations (over the cease-fire) was equally challenging as the prior two phases proved to be. Just when it seemed like the end was near, the conference threatened to unravel at the seams. Stedman tells the story, “the PF gave partial acceptance on December 6 but made full approval conditional on the longer cease-fire period and additional assembly points...the conditional acceptance threatened to bring down the whole settlement,” Stedman quotes Smith and Simpson who wrote that the conference became “bogged down over precisely how, where, and when the war would end” (Stedman, 1991, 200). In response, Carrington, who refused to lose all the momentum that had been gained and who felt like a settlement was an arm’s reach away, named Lord Soames governor of Zimbabwe and dispatch him to Salisbury\textsuperscript{22}.

Carrington’s move left Mugabe’s PF delegation feeling disregarded and provoked “PF’s most belligerent responses to date, with Mugabe’s press secretary, Edison Zvobgo, informing the British press that Lord Carrington ‘can go to hell,’ and that ‘Thatcher can jump in the Thames’” (Stedman, 1991, 201). The British encouraged the United States to lift their sanctions on Rhodesia, and forwarded the message to Mozambique’s president, Samora Machel. Machel instructed his aid in London, Fernand Honwana to inform Mugabe that the war was over and that “if he [Mugabe] did not sign the agreement, he would be welcomed back to Mozambique and given a beach villa where he could write his memoirs” (Stedman, 1991, 201). With pressure from the US and President Machel and “after a final face-saving gesture by the British in granting the Front an additional
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assembly point, the Lancaster House accords were signed on December 21 (1979), the 102nd day of the conference” (Stedman, 1991, 201).

Overall, part of the agreement was for the British to send a governor and a small team of officials to Rhodesia in the hopes that a cease-fire would last long enough for elections to be held. It was agreed that the British would hold absolute power in the transitional period until an election resulted in the installation of a freely and fairly elected black government with twenty seats in Parliament reserved for Europeans, and for the army and police to remain in European hands until the new regime was established. The parliamentary arrangements were a source of discontentment for Mugabe but he eventually conceded and 20 of 100 seats in Parliament were reserved for the settlers23.

During the transitional period prior to the elections, in January 1980, Lord Soames, the interim governor of Rhodesia, renewed the state of emergency for another six months24. It was a complicated election among several parties who were all accused of using terror, violence and coercion to get people to vote. Even still Mugabe won with 63 percent of the vote in which ZANU-PF won 57 of the 80 African seats in Parliament, Nkomo’s ZAPU won 20 seats, and Muzorewa’s UANC gained only three seats, the Europeans held firmly on to their 20 reserved seats25. ZANU-PF’s support came predominately from the Shona-speaking regions, while ZAPU’s support came mostly from the Matabeleland26. Unlike South Africa’s transition from colony to independence through domestic negotiations, Zimbabwe was founded on internationally mediated negotiations. Mugabe viewed the resulting binding agreements from Lancaster House
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conference as unfair and illegitimate because of the international and autocratic nature of the negotiations and because he felt coerced into attending the conference (since he believed he could win on the battlefield). As we will see through Mugabe’s rhetoric, actions and policies, the fact that Zimbabwe’s independence is based in foreign intervention is significant to Mugabe’s worldview.

**Republic of South Africa**

**ANC Leadership**

Nelson Mandela, Oliver Reginald (O R) Tambo, Walter Sisulu, Thembisile (Chris) Hani, Ahmed Mohamed Kathadra (Kathy), Archibald Mvuyelwa Govan (clan name, Zizi) Mbeki and his son Mvuyelwa Thabo Mbeki, and Joe Slovo were among the foremost members of the African National Congress. The leading members of the ANC were highly educated individuals who dedicated their lives to ending apartheid rule. They worked to mobilize the masses of oppressed women, blacks, Coloreds, Indians and others to challenge apartheid rule. The ANC helped to build international support to delegitimize the apartheid regime. Even under the most oppressive conditions, in high security state prisons like Robben Island, leading members of the ANC took it upon themselves to advocate for true democracy and to try to initiate negotiations with the members of the apartheid regime. True democracy for the ANC meant extending existing citizenship rights to all of South Africa’s marginalized peoples and demanding an end to the systematic and institutionalized discrimination that characterized the apartheid era.

The goal of the ANC leading up to negotiations with the ruling party was to establish an independent democratic South Africa whose structures, institutions and policies would be rooted in non-racialism. The ANC leadership believed that a ubiquitous
policy of non-racialism was necessary to build a true unified democratic South African national identity. The ANC’s Freedom Charter (June 1955) and the Constitutional Guidelines for a Democratic South Africa (1989), which will be discussed at greater length in the “Findings” section, highlight the political, economic and social values of the ANC. However, the widespread circulation of the Freedom Charter culminated in the banning of the ANC and the arrest of 156 activists on the grounds of treason (ANC.org.za). Despite this, the democratic values held by the nationalist leadership contributed to overcoming the systematic and institutionalized inequalities of the apartheid era. This ultimately led to the establishment of a much freer and fair participatory democracy.

*Dismantling Apartheid: F.W. de Klerk and Negotiations With Mandela*

Leader of the National Party (under apartheid), F.W. de Klerk’s willingness to negotiate with the leadership of the African National Congress and other liberation movement leaders had little to do with a noble sense of justice. Rather, it had more to do with his personal politics as well as internal and external pressure on the apartheid regime. This external pressure came in the form of international trade sanctions and policies of divestment. The internal pressure came from the popularity of the nationalist movements.

An old adage claims, “men and nations act rationally when all other options have failed.” This is certainly true in the case of South Africa. The National Party, with de Klerk as President, realized that apartheid was failing and could no longer sustain itself. Meanwhile, the ANC realized that they would be unable to physically seize power. This
mutual understanding propelled the bumpy negotiation process between de Klerk’s apartheid regime and the leadership of the liberation movements.

Early in his involvement in the National Party de Klerk’s policies appear somewhat ambiguous, but he was generally perceived as a centrist. Mandela believed de Klerk was not an “ideologue, but a pragmatist, a man who saw change as necessary and inevitable” (Mandela, 1994, 552). De Klerk knew that apartheid was failing and would no longer be able to sustain itself in the face of internal opposition--both from the radical Conservative party and from the mass resistance of liberals and non-whites in South Africa. Apartheid’s legitimacy was also being undermined from international opposition in the form of UN sanctions and the divestment of South African goods and services. For those reasons de Klerk knew that talks with African leadership were inevitable. He also knew that they were also the only option left for him to be able to retain some minority power. Negotiation also offered the only hope for avoiding outright civil war and dissolution of the Republic of South Africa.

Aside from de Klerk’s own disposition and political views, there were other external factors which contributed to an atmosphere conducive to negotiations between the government and the leadership of the liberation movements. The first factor to influence change was when nearby Namibia gained independence. This showed South Africans that even highly intractable conflicts could be resolved at the negotiating table. Furthermore, The leadership of the ANC (Tambo in particular) did not want to be caught unprepared to negotiate, like the nationalist movement in Rhodesia had been. ZANU-PF’s stubbornness and lack of preparation to negotiate resulted in the internationally mediated Lancaster House Agreement as a take-it-or-leave-it agreement. If the ANC had
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to negotiate, they decided that they had to be prepared\textsuperscript{28}. The second factor was the fall of the Berlin Wall on November 9, 1989 (which signified the failure of communist rule). This event eliminated the “source of the anti-communist paranoia that had provided the rationale” for the apartheid regime’s refusal to talk with the ANC and other nationalist movement leaders.

De Klerk demonstrated his commitment to a new order when he allowed an ANC protest against police brutality in Cape Town. De Klerk further garnered trust when he announced the release of Walter Sisulu and seven other prisoners from Robben Island on October 10, 1989\textsuperscript{29}. From then on de Klerk began to slowly dismantle “many of the building blocks of apartheid.” He announced that he would soon repeal the Reservation of Separate Amenities Act (a law that had enforced segregation or “petty apartheid” in South Africa since 1953). In November that same year, de Klerk also announced that he would dissolve the National Security Management System, which was a secret structure that had been emplaced under Botha’s presidency to combat anti-apartheid forces\textsuperscript{30}.

Lastly, on February 2, 1990, de Klerk officially lifted bans on the ANC, PAC, the South African Communist Party (SACP), and 31 other previously illegal organizations. He also ordered the release of political prisoners who were incarcerated for non-violent crimes, suspended capital punishment, and lifted some of the restrictions imposed by the State of Emergency Act. De Klerk declared, “the time for negotiation has arrived” (Mandela, 1994, 556).

President de Klerk’s inauguration and slow dismantling of apartheid restriction, Namibia’s independence, the fall of the Iron Curtain, and the ANC’s preparedness to
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negotiate a settlement set the stage for negotiations. In May 1990, starting with the
Groote Schuur Minute, ‘talks about talks’ got underway. The Groote Schuur Minute
“committed both parties to ending the climate of violence, as well as to a peaceful
negotiations process. It established a working committee to make recommendations for
the release of political prisoners and the granting of immunity in respect to political
offences by those inside and outside the country” (Welsh and Spence, 2011, 122). This
successful meeting led to the next round of talks held in August of 1990 known as the
Pretoria Minute. Just prior to this the ANC announced the suspension of armed struggle
as a sign of good faith.

The two Minutes, or ‘talks about talks,’ led ultimately to the first formal attempt
at constitutional negotiations between the government and the African leadership—
known as the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA) on December 20,
1991. In Cape Town, on February 21, 1991, a meeting between the ANC and the South
African government resulted in the D. F. Malan Accord. This accord "spelled out in detail
what the suspension [of armed struggle] entailed" (Welsh and Spence, 2011, 123).
Despite these gains, on 12 February 1992 the national party was struck a blow when
mounting opposition from the right-wing Conservative Party (CP) “won a by-election in
Potchefstroom [in the Transvaal region], turning around an NP majority of nearly 2,000
in 1989 to a CP majority of 2,140” (Welsh and Spence, 2011, 129). This by-election
result led de Klerk to announce the following day that a referendum would be held on
March 17, 1992 to test white commitment and support for the government-led negotiation
process. Despite the mounting political opposition, the referendum passed with an overwhelming 68.7 percent of the vote to continue negotiations.\footnote{Welsh and Spence, 2011, 130}

Unfortunately, the progress gained by the passing of the referendum was short. The second round of CODESA negotiations (beginning on May 15, 1992) ended in complete deadlock. One major point of contention was de Klerk’s opposition to what he referred to “simple majoritarianism,” a winner-takes-all Westminster parliamentary system. Instead he was in favor of proportional representation with a system of “power sharing” that would be based on group rights, enabling the preservation of a form of minority rule.

Three critical incidents occurred following the breakdown of the CODESA 2 negotiations to further erode progress that had been gained in the first round of constitutional negotiations. The first incident (June 17, 1992) occurred when “a heavily armed force of Inkatha members secretly raided the Vaal township of Boipatong and killed 46 people” (mostly women and children). The attack on Boipatong was the fourth mass-killing of ANC supporters that week.\footnote{Mandela, 1994, 603} Several months later on September 7, 1992 homeland troops killed 29 ANC supporters and wounded over 200 marching in Bisho, the capital city of Ciskei. These killings showed both parties the consequences of a deadlocked negotiations—the fear, anger and resentment that could build when the leadership could not find common ground. The result of these events pushed the country to the brink of civil war.

There was a glimmer of hope before yet another dark moment for South Africans. Shortly after the Bisho killings on September 26, 1992 Mandela and de Klerk signed the
Record of Understanding. This set the framework for continuing negotiations. It established a “single, elected constitutional assembly, which would adopt a new constitution and serve as a transition legislature for the new government” (Mandela, 1994, 606). Joe Slovo, a leading member of the ANC, contributed greatly during to getting the negotiations back on track. As a sign of good faith to the government, he proposed a ‘sunset clause’ that would provide for a “government of national unity that would include power-sharing with the National Party for a fixed period of time, an amnesty for security offices, and the honoring of contracts of civil servants,” which the National Executive Committee endorsed on November 18, 1992 (Mandela, 1994, 606). The sunset clause furthered an agreement between the ANC and the government in February 1992 on a five year “government of national unity, a multiparty cabinet, and the creation of a transitional executive council” (Mandela, 1994, 607).

On April 10, 1993 a leading member of the ANC, Chris Hani, was assassinated by a militant member of the Afrikaner Weerstandsbeweging (AWB). This was a clear attempt to subvert the negotiations process. It was feared by many that the assassination of Hani, the leader of the youth wing of the ANC, would trigger a racial civil war. Mandela appealed to all South Africans to “honor the memory of Chris Hani by remaining a disciplined force for peace” (Mandela, 1994, 608). Mandela and de Klerk met and agreed it would be reasonable for the ANC to hold a week-long series of mass rallies and demonstrations to give people a healthy outlet for their anguish, rather than allowing people to turn to violence. Hani's murder was a reminder that it would take committed co-operation to get past these negotiations and to come to a mutually
acceptable settlement. They needed to resist their temptations and not let their frustrations
tear them apart.

How Mandela and de Klerk were able to overcome their own frustrations,
anguish, and their crumbling trust in one another and redirect their emotions to
constructive use while calming a riotous nation is somewhat miraculous. However, it was
no miracle; it took human courage, strength, leadership and a commitment to peace to
quiet the storm that was brewing in South Africa. On June 3, 1993 the date was set for
South Africa’s first national, nonracial, one-person-one-vote election for April 27, 1994.
In the election that brought Mandela to the Presidency, the ANC won 62.6 percent of the
national vote, just shy of the two-thirds vote the party would have needed to write a
constitution without input from other parties. Characteristically, Mandela was glad the
party had not crossed the two-thirds threshold. In Mandela’s unique view, a collaborative
multiparty constitution would better represent a new, democratic South Africa and be a
“true government of national unity” (Mandela, 1994, 619).

The election was a watershed event for South Africa, demonstrating to the world
that negotiations could proceed under the most precarious situations and ultimately reach
a settlement. Peace could be achieved and enemies could become partners. Mandela
explained in his autobiography about being awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1993
jointly with de Klerk, “to make peace with an enemy one must work with that enemy, and
that enemy becomes one’s partner” (Mandela, 1994, 612). De Klerk made his concession
speech to a newly unified South Africa on May 2, 1994 and was sworn in a South
Africa’s second deputy president.
V. Findings

Zimbabwe

Mugabe’s Feelings on the Lancaster House Conference

Despite winning a popular election, Mugabe’s desire for war and his bitterness about the Lancaster agreement is salient in his own words. Mugabe fumed about Lancaster House, “The front-line states said we had to negotiate, we had to go to this conference. There we were, we thought we were on top of the situation back home, we were moving forward all the time, and why should we be denied the ultimate joy of having militarily overthrown the regime here? We felt that would give us a better position. We could then dictate the terms.” Mugabe recalled, “As I signed the document, I was not a happy man at all. I felt we had been cheated to some extent, that we had agreed to a deal which would to some extent rob us of victory we had hoped we would achieve in the field” (Meredith, 2007, 8).

Differences & Similarities Among Liberation Movements

The leadership among the nationalist groups agreed most on the issue of landownership. In Rhodesia the land was most prominent issue because denial of land to Africans was “fundamental to the maintenance of European privilege” (Astrow, 1983, 138). Landlessness, caused by inequalities in land rights established by white settlers, was the most prominent issue on any nationalist agenda. Therefore, “the starting point for
any fundamental transformation of Zimbabwean society would require the nationalization of all land and its redistribution to the peasantry” (Astrow, 1983, 138). The leadership also agreed that the country would have to go through a period of capitalist development.33

Since each group was in agreement that some form of socialism was necessary, there was disagreement about how long, and what to what degree capitalist development would look like. Because the nationalist leadership was also guided by the interests of the African masses, they struggled with what shape nationalization would take, and how to deal with land redistribution. The nationalist leadership had difficulty reconciling their socialist desires with democratization and with knowing that a period of capitalization would be in the best interest of their newly independent state.

In Astrow’s analysis of ZANU’s land policy, he finds “ZANU preferred to say virtually nothing about its future land policy, or preferred to formulate it in the most abstract generalities, leaving it open to the most divergent interpretations possible” (Astrow, 1983, 138). For example, Astrow writes, “Mugabe stated that all the land would be nationalized, and land owned by individuals living outside the country would be nationalized at an early stage. But he then pursued a theme particularly dominant today, by adding: ‘You cannot start off by nationalizing everything. You have to take into account the realities of the situation’” (Astrow, 1983, 139). This sort of back and forth rhetoric about the land issue worked out well for ZANU’s popularity as its rhetoric remained emotionally charged, nationalistic, and broadly applicable.

On the other hand, Astrow finds that ZAPU’s position on land reform was quite clear. Astrow finds that ZAPU’s position was similar to Muzorewa’s United African
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National Council (UANC) and the African Farmers Union of Rhodesia (AFUR). The three groups believed that it would be necessary to maintain the “free enterprise system in agriculture and to avoid the nationalization of productive land…these groups shared a common perspective—to reduce the inequality in land distribution with a capitalist framework” (Astrow, 1983, 138).

Nationalist leadership reinforced existing ethnic and regional divides, since they would not fully agree on a single political program and were competing for political control. Also, splits within the nationalist movement were over leaders trust in Nkomo’s competency to lead the movement. Faith in Nkomo’s effectiveness as a nationalist figurehead came to a head in January 1963 after he failed to convince his colleagues to form a government in exile in Dar el Salam. Nkomo’s failure resulted in the split amongst the nationalist leadership, the creation of ZANU-PF and the election of Mugabe as president of ZANU in absentia. Later, ideological and strategic differences began to surface between ZANU and ZAPU as Mugabe’s ZANU emphasized guerrilla tactics, while Nkomo’s ZAPU downplayed them. Further differences arose when ZANU aligned itself to China and Mozambique, while ZAPU based itself in Zambia and received arms, training, and advice from the Soviet Union.

Another crucial difference between ZANU and ZAPU was each group’s support came from two different ethnic and regional populations. Nkomo’s ZAPU found most of its support in the areas around Bulawayo in eastern region of Matabeleland. The Ndebele ethnic group lives in that region and comprises 15 percent of Zimbabwe’s population. Meanwhile, ZANU’s strongest support predominantly came from the northern Shona-
speaking regions. Astrow finds that Mugabe’s rhetoric has shown that the “politics and maneuvers of the leadership reinforced the existing ethnic and regional divisions” among the African people (Astrow, 1983, 158).

**Shape & Scope Of Zimbabwean National Identity**

a. Nationalization and the Land Issue

Although ZANU-PF was not always clear on what the party’s policy on the land issue was, it remained a large part of ZANU ideology. The land issue was an emotionally charged one, especially for Mugabe. Although the PF kept their policy on the land issue ambiguous and open to interpretation for political reasons, the land issue was an important one for Mugabe personally. He said on June 14, 2000 at a rally in Ghana, “It will never happen that blacks should fight each other. I will die with my claim to land. My right to land is a right which cannot be compromised. It is our right. It is our land. We must be prepared to die for it.” (Meredith, 2007, 183)

In 1986, ZANU amended the Constitution to replace the 20 reserved minority seats in Parliament with nominated seats. These seats were chosen by ZANU, reserved for ZANU loyalists to further secure ZANU’s power in the legislature. Even twenty years later, when Mugabe’s power was entrenched, he would talk about the land issue as if the Rhodesian civil war had not ended with the signing of the Lancaster House accords. On June 7, 2000 he proclaimed about land redistribution,

“If we allow others to own portions of it, it must be out of our own will, our own desire, our own charity. It will not be on the basis of our colonial history…Perhaps we made a mistake by not finishing the war in the trenches. We were modest and rushed to Lancaster. If the settlers had been defeated through the barrel of a gun, perhaps we would not be having the same problems. The revolution is yet to be concluded. The next elected parliament should ensure that it concludes this last phase of our revolution…the revolution had been fought on

---

37 Astrow, 1983, 158
the basis that land will come with political power…our revolution has not ended. We want it to end and the starting point is land” (Meredith, 2007, 184-185).

The land issue helped to create a national identity that was embedded with a certain dichotomy. That dichotomy separated indigenous black Zimbabweans from the more prosperous, productive land-owning whites. Since the land issue was part of a ZANU national policy, and since the land issue derived from discriminatory colonial policies, it naturally added racial, ethnic and class conscious elements to a Zimbabwean national identity.

b. ZANU Political Ideology, Political Program:

ZANU’s political ideology stemmed from a two-stage revolution, and “followed in the “tradition of the Russian Mensheviks and international Stalinism” (Astrow, 1983, 141). The first phase was a “National Democratic Revolution” which ZANU professed was a necessary “transitional stage” in “preparation for the socialist revolution.” ZANU claimed that “the deeper the national democratic revolution, the better the conditions for the socialist revolution”38. A ZANU political education publication explained the two-stage revolution as follows:

“the driving force behind the revolutionary movement in Zimbabwe has been the broad front of workers, peasants, soldiers and students, and the lumpen proletariat in both ZANU and ZAPU… at this national democratic phase, all elements of the oppressed and colonized people have to be mobilized to fight against the common enemy in Zimbabwe…At this state, even the petit bourgeois and traditional chiefs and headmen who are opposed to the enemy can and should join the struggle.…

the second state of the socialist revolution will be undertaken by a movement with a proletarian ideology after political independence has been won. But, the success of this process in the second stage, depends on the emergence of the working class movement, with a proletarian ideology during the first phase” (Footnote: Zanu, Astrow, 1983, 141- ‘Political education in ZANU: abridged Commissariat lectures’, Zimbabwe News, ZANU, Vol. 10, No. 1, January-February 1978, 54, Astrow’s emphasis).
ZANU was often criticized by the African masses that voted him into power. The majority of the population was still poor, burdened by the capitalist system and largely unemployed. Mugabe told a reporter,

“You do not destroy an infrastructure that is in being in order to realize your socialist aims. In fact you can do so by building on the structure that is there…our Socialism must be realistic. It must never assume that in the end there won’t be any private enterprise. I don’t think you’ll ever get to a situation where everything belongs to the State—it would be absolutely ridiculous, there must be some forms of property which continue to belong to individuals” (‘Europa’, The Times, Vol. 7, No. 8, July 1, 1980, Astrow, 1983, 144).

ZANU’s first stage of their political program was then a national democratic revolution, forwarding the interests of land owning whites and a black petit bourgeoisie. The second stage, a potential socialist revolution, was completely dependent on the completion of the first stage. Therefore, the African masses had little to gain under ZANU’s political program.

One dejected ZANU supporter observed, “it is impossible to construct socialism on the superstructure of capitalism” (Astrow, 1983, 173). Four months after Mugabe was elected, he was quoted in the International Herald Tribune saying that the statements and literature circulated by himself and ZANU during the liberation movement was mainly rhetorical. He explained that it was only part of a wartime ‘propaganda campaign’, ‘designed to increase the morale of the guerillas’ and ‘put pressure’ on the white regime (Astrow, 1883, 173).

Similar to the land issue, ZANU’s political program, which was guided by this two-stage theory of revolution, added up to a very complex national identity. The two different stages of the political program carried with it two very different types of policies. The first stage, the national democratic one, incorporated land and business-owning whites into a Zimbabwean national identity, since ZANU’s policies would
support their interests. This is why in 1980 he told white farmers about Western support for Zimbabwe, “We are the darling of the world, and since we are on honeymoon and honeymoons don’t always last too long, we ought to take advantage of it!” (Meredith, 2007, 46). However, regardless of whether or not the first stage succeeded, the socialist revolution planned afterwards would serve the interests of the African majority, thereby excluding the economic interests of whites.

The first stage ZANU’s political program explains Mugabe’s use of inclusive rhetoric during the first 18 months of his presidency. Mugabe assured the public,

"Zanu wishes to give the fullest assurance to the white community, the Asian and coloured [mixed-race] communities that a Zanu government can never in principle or in social or government practice, discriminate against them. Racism, whether practiced by whites or blacks, is anathema to the humanitarian philosophy of Zanu. It is as primitive a dogma as tribalism or regionalism. Zimbabwe cannot just be a country of blacks. It is and should remain our country, all of us together“ (Meredith, 2007, 9-10).

After winning the election on March 4, 1980, Mugabe said in a televised broadcast:

“There is no intention on our part to use our majority to victimize the minority. We will ensure there is a place for everyone in this country…Let us deepen our sense of belonging and engender a common interest that knows no race, colour or creed” (Meredith, 2007, 13). Three weeks later on April 17, 1980 Mugabe addressed Zimbabwe again saying,

“If yesterday I fought you as an enemy, today you have become my friend and ally with the same national interest, loyalty, rights and duties as myself. If yesterday you hated me, you cannot avoid the love that binds you to me and me to you… The wrongs of the past must now stand forgiven and forgotten. If ever we look to the past, let us do so for the lesson the past has taught us, namely that oppression and racism are inequalities that must never find scope in our political and social system. It could never be a correct justification that because the whites oppressed us yesterday when they had power, the blacks must oppress them today because they have power. An evil remains an evil whether practiced by white against black or black against white“ (Meredith, 2007, 15).
However, Mugabe could not always be the pragmatic, diplomatic president he tried so hard to be. The second stage of the revolution, the socialist stage, was frequently emphasized during the Rhodesian civil war by Mugabe and his ZANU compatriots. This stage legitimated his exclusive violent rhetoric towards the white bourgeoisie. Not long after his election Mugabe vehemently declared, “it is the blood and sweat of the workers that has made these people millionaires. They have sucked the blood of their workers like vampires so that they can board expensive airplanes and go on long holidays.” It was unacceptable to Mugabe that “the very bourgeoisie which only yesterday enjoyed political power and used it to oppress the Zimbabwean people…continues to have a monopoly on Zimbabwe’s economic power” (Meredith, 2007, 52-53).

Mugabe would use the ideology of socialist revolution, which he longed for during the Rhodesian civil war, to blame Zimbabwe’s economic woes on the white bourgeoisie. He said about a report from a commission that was set up to look at the reason for a shortage of maize meal, a staple diet of most Zimbabweans,

“I will never believe the story that the shortage was caused by so many people now buying mealie meal or that some of the mealie meal was going to Botswana or Mozambique. That is a lie. I know these millers. Their intention is to suck the wealth of the country and destroy the government…those whites we defeated are still in control. They own the mines, the factories, commerce. They are the bosses in our country” (Meredith, 2007, 84).

The analysis section will show how the first stage of ZANU’s two-stage theory of revolution contradicted the aims and goals of the socialist revolution. It is evident that ZANU’s political program, defined by two very different ideologies, allows for a complex Zimbabwean national identity. It was one that could either include, or through scapegoating and victimization could exclude the white population along racial, ethnic, or class-conscious lines. The racial, ethnic, and class-conscious identities are easily flexible
to fit the form of socialism and imperialism, meaning ZANU could use these identities as a scapegoat when using anti-capitalist, anti-Western, or anti-colonialism rhetoric.

*Mugabe & Zanu-PF Speeches and Policies Supporting Mono-Citizenship*

In the UDI era of Rhodesia (which was not internationally recognized as a legitimate state, supported by a UN endorsed trade embargo) it was beneficial to encourage multi-national citizenship. Cheater explained that a dual citizenship made economic sense, because it allowed economic gain for individuals as well as the state during a time when Rhodesia was perceived as a rogue nation by the international community. Allowing multi-national citizenship under the UDI government was not seen as a conflict of national identity because it allowed for the economic success of the country during a politically complicated time.

Zimbabwean citizenship policies have become more exclusive since independence in 1980. Zimbabwe permitted multiple citizenship until 1984 and extended the requirement for citizenship from three years to five continuous years of residence. He explains, “Zimbabwe’s 1984 Citizenship Act did not define citizenship, nor its rights and obligation. Instead, minimalist definitions exist in the text of the declaration of allegiance” (Cheater, 1998, 196). These definitions Cheater finds are not widely available to Zimbabwean citizens, “and there is no [formal] teaching on issues of citizenship within the state educational systems” (Cheater, 1998, 197).

Recall Cheater’s explanation of citizenship policies under white minority rule, which allowed individual mobility and multinational citizenship. Instead, ZANU’s citizenship policies are based on ascribed descent. It is telling how Zimbabwe’s citizenship policies clearly distinguish citizens by birth and descent from citizens by
registration. Citizens by birth and descent get passports valid for ten years, while the passports of registered citizens are validated only for five years (Cheater, 1998, 199).

Furthermore, since 1984, birth in Zimbabwe has not carried guarantees of either citizenship or residence rights. Both shocking and illegal is the fact that “even a citizen by birth and descent who formally rescinds or has rescinded her or his citizenship and then emigrates, on trying to return will find that s/he has no residual residence rights, contrary to article 13(2) of the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the more generous colonial provisions which made it impossible to remove the right of domicile from those born in the country” (Cheater, 1998, 199).

Thus, the practices of ZANU-PF invariably increase the likelihood of statelessness among its own citizens under its own laws.

The ‘Conditions of Issue’ enforce a policy of mono-citizenship. The ‘Conditions of Issue’ (56) for Zimbabwean passports issued after 1990 specify that ‘A citizen of Zimbabwe who is eighteen years of age or above may not be a citizen of any other country. A citizen of Zimbabwe who makes use of the passport of another Government commits an offence’ (Cheater, 1998, 197). When this renunciation was established by the government of Zimbabwe in 1985, 20,000 passports were handed (illegally) to the state, which were returned to their issuing authorities. However, “the United Kingdom, having publicly advertised that any action taken in Zimbabwean law has no validity under British law, returned them to their legitimate holders.” Zimbabwe’s Citizenship Act recognizes that mono-citizenship is enforceable by one state only when all other states also enforce it. Clearly ignored by the PF government is the fact that “‘partner’ states involved may refuse to enforce it, thus rendering it impossible to eliminate dual citizenship” (Cheater, 1998, 198). Even still, Zimbabwe’s Minister of Home Affairs has explicitly noted the state’s position: ‘it is not possible for a person to have complete
allegiance and loyalty to two sovereign States at the same time’ (Parliamentary Debates, House of Assembly, 14 August 1984, col 800).

Cheater surmises that citizenship issues thus “appear to be subject to administrative decision, and administrative behavior suggests that the Zimbabwean state does not distinguish civil, political and social rights of citizenship” in the manner that citizenship is typically defined in the literature of Marshall, Gaidzanwa, and Vogel. Cheater cites Gaidzanwa who writes citizenship are the virtues of ‘cooperation, altruism, responsibility and consideration of broader social interests’ which Vogel writes are exercised through ‘active involvement in the affairs of the community’ (Cheater, 1998, 197). Instead, Cheater remarks that Zimbabwe appears to “view citizenship as a form of ownership over individual citizens, reflected in an apparent reluctance to encourage their free mobility abroad” (Cheater, 1998, 197). While the early dual citizenship policy of the UDI era was expedient, these changes in passport policy and citizenship rights reveals the regime’s true dictatorial nature and support of an ethnic national identity.

Firstly, ZANU’s mono-citizenship policy was undermined by countries like Britain, who gave their citizens back their passports, making Zimbabwe’s policy ineffective. By trying to enforce it anyway, the PF government shows arrogance and a disregard for international norms concerning citizenship. Secondly, the government shows disregard for people’s rights and liberties by confining the mobility of its citizens. Lastly, these policies create important distinctions along racial and ethnic lines that point to an undeniable selective ethnic national identity.
Mugabe’s View of the Justice System & Government Corruption

Since Rhodesia was granted self-governing status in 1923, it practiced decades of exclusionary and institutionalized discriminatory policies. The institutions ZANU inherited in 1980 were ones that had oppressed and disenfranchised Africans. Therefore, the institutions did not hold much legitimacy in their eyes. Mugabe shows his lack of respect for an independent judiciary throughout his more than thirty years in office. He plays into Abernethy’s research, proving that the retention of harsh and unpopular institutions can undermine those institutions’ legitimacy even when those institutions have been taken over by post-colonial governments.

In the summer of 1982, a judge rejected evidence obtained by coercion and ill treatment. Mugabe expressed his fury at the court’s decision, “The law of evidence and the criminal procedure we have inherited is a stupid ass. It’s one of those principles born out of the stupidity of some of the procedures of colonial times” (Meredith, 2007, 55).

In 1999, in response to a five page letter from the High Court and Supreme Court judges rebuking Mugabe, he said, “If judges assume both a judicial and quasi-political role, what suffers is in effect their judicial function. In those circumstances the one and only honorable course open to them is that of quitting the bench and joining the political forum” (Meredith, 2007, 153-154). When an interviewer pointed out to Mugabe two weeks later that he did not possess the power to dismiss the judges, Mugabe responded, “We have not looked into that.” (Meredith, 2007, 155). Less than a year later, Mugabe continued to express his disdain for the judicial system:

“the courts can do whatever they want, but no judicial decision will stand in our way…my own position is that we should not even be defending our position in the courts. This country is our country and this land is our land…They think because they are white they have a divine right to our resources. Not here. The
white man is not indigenous to Africa. Africa is for Africans, Zimbabwe is for Zimbabweans” (Meredith, 2007, 203).

Previously, in 1989, Mugabe used his anti-capitalist rhetoric afforded to him by ZANU’s socialist stage of the two-stage theory of revolution to justify corruption among ZANU officials. When the PF government came under pressure from its involvement in the “Willowgate” scandal, one involving car racketeering in a commission report that found three cabinet ministers guilty of corruption charges, Mugabe supported his ministers and explained, “They had been seduced by the evils of the capitalist system.” He gave Nyagumbo a presidential pardon and told the press, “Who amongst us has not lied? Yesterday you were with your girlfriend and told your wife you were with the president. Should you get nine months for that?” (Meredith, 2007, 87).

Other than having a complete disregard for institutions in his country, Mugabe also speaks harshly against international financial institutions. In the mid 1990s when ZANU was met with criticism of government spending, Mugabe said he would “not dance to the whims and caprices of the IMF and the World Bank” (Meredith, 2007, 129). Mugabe continues to explain why he does not like the IMF in May 1999, “I do not like the IMF. It is a tool being used by the western imperialists to subject us to their will. The IMF is being political and we will be political in our attitude towards it. It is a monster we do not deserve. We are better off without it. We will be happy without it. We will not die as a country. Never ever.” (Meredith, 2007, 156). This is another issue that arises out of his prescription to a political ideology that has two opposing beliefs. Whereas the first stage of the national democratic revolution supports capitalism and receiving aid from international institutions like the World Bank and the IMF, the second stage of the socialist revolution does not. Mugabe can use this type of vehement anti-colonial rhetoric
because institutions like the IMF and the World Bank threaten a national identity supported by an ideology that believes in the imminence of a socialist revolution.

Rhodesian Civil War Nationalist Rhetoric & Election Time Rhetoric

The rhetoric Mugabe used throughout the Rhodesian civil war establishes his inclination to rally supporters through violence. Mugabe seems eager to utilize violence as a tactic, as a legitimate means to an end.

A couple months after Mugabe escaped to Mozambique during the Rhodesian war with his comrade Edgar Tekere, Mugabe resolutely declared in 1976:

“Our votes must go together with our guns. After all, any vote we shall have, shall have been the product of the gun. The gun which produces the vote should remain its security officer—its guarantor. The people’s votes and the people’s guns are always inseparable twins” (Meredith, 2007, 241).

Robert Mugabe’s 1979 New Year’s Message to the People of Zimbabwe is full of violent imagery:

“Let the People’s fury break into a revolutionary storm that will engulf and sweep the enemy completely from our land. Let every settler city, town or village, let every enemy farm or homestead, let every enemy post, nook, or hiding place be hit by the fury of the People’s storm. The People’s Storm must come with thunder, heavy rain and irresistible blasting gusts that will ransack the enemy strongholds. Let us call this year therefore the Year of the People’s Storm—Gore re Gukurohundi. Let us proceed from the Year of the People to the year of the People’s Strom and storm right through to victory and the creation of a nation based on People’s power. The People are a power, the People are a revolutionary storm” (Stedman, 1991, 163).

While some may deem physical and rhetorical violence as a legitimate tactic to rally behind during a civil war, others might wonder about the legitimacy of using these techniques during electoral campaigns and at the voting booths.

Two examples of Mugabe’s use of physical and rhetorical violence appear just before and after the 1985 election. The first began when just one day before the voting ended, Mugabe addressed an audience at an election meeting in Bulawayo, the region
where most of Nkomo’s ZAPU party historically found its support base, “where will we be tomorrow? Is it war or is it peace tomorrow? Let the people of Matabeleland answer this question” (Meredith, 2007, 71). In 1985 election Mugabe addressed his supporters speaking in chiShona, the language of the region where his support lies, “we will kill those snakes among us, we will smash them completely.” (Meredith, 2007, 57).

Second, the result of the election for the white seats in parliament was gained by Ian Smith’s party, the Conservative Alliance of Zimbabwe, which gained 15 of 20 seats. Recall that the Lancaster House agreement ensured 20 percent of white and minority seats in parliament up until and through the 1985 election. About Smith’s minor victory (which they had not even gained all of the 20 reserved seats), Mugabe retorted,

“The voting has shown that they have not repented in any way. They still cling to the past and support the very man…who created a series of horrors against the people of Zimbabwe. We wish to make it very clear that it is going to be very hard for the racists of this country…Those whites who have no accepted the reality of political order in which the Africans set the pace will have to leave the country” (Meredith, 2007, 56).

Mugabe’s denial and/or complete disregard for the Lancaster House agreement which reserved those 20 minority seats is evident. Mugabe made a sweeping generalization encompassing all whites who voted for Smith and concluded they only voted for him because they are racists or cannot accept “the reality of a political order in which Africans set the pace.” Furthermore, by referring to Africans the way he did, Mugabe distinctly removed whites’ claims to Zimbabwean nationality by calling them non-Africans; as if a person who is ethnically English but from Zimbabwe cannot be nationally (technically continentally) African.
Mugabe said about his opposition during the 1990 election and Tekere’s Zimbabwe Unity Movement (ZUM), “That Tekere nonsense should stop. If the whites in Zimbabwe want to rear their ugly terrorist and racist head by collaborating with ZUM, we will chop that head off” (Meredith, 2007, 91). During a presidential election campaigning season, a ZANU television ad showing a bad car accident that said, “This is one way to die. Another is to vote ZUM. Don’t commit suicide, vote ZANU-PF.” (Meredith, 2007, 91).

At a state banquet in 2000, after over two decades of dictatorial rule, Mugabe declared, “I do not want to be overthrown and I will try to overthrow those who want to overthrow me” (Meredith, 2007, 17). Then in 2002 Mugabe won Zimbabwe’s presidential election through blatant fraud. The election was not recognized as a legitimate election by Britain, US, and the EU on March 17, 2002. Mugabe said his election victory had dealt a “stunning blow to imperialism.” He continued to gloat, “That ugly head we thought we had smashed through our anti-colonial struggle, no we left it alive and it is rearing again, perhaps calling for another much more devastating blow to the head, not longer to the body of that monster.” Mugabe proclaimed, “In Africa, black skin is the most important skin, not the white skin. In Africa, the African is supreme” (Meredith, 2007, 229-230). At a victory party in his home after the stolen presidential election of 2002 Mugabe exclaimed about those that did not vote ZANU, “those who want to rebel and to cause lawlessness will be beaten to the ground like they have never been beaten” (Meredith, 2007, 230). Through this type of rhetoric, Mugabe continually defines those who politically oppose ZANU out of the Zimbabwean national identity.
Mugabe’s vision of nationalism is not strictly racialized. This shows through ZANU’s stance towards his opposition of black Zimbabweans. In 1982, small groups of former ZIPRA soldiers (soldiers who had been in the army for Nkomo’s ZAPU party) who had become increasingly frustrated with their loss of representation in government as well as participation in the national army, resorted to lawlessness in the Matabeleland. In a speech to parliament Mugabe reacted to the ex-combatant’s lawlessness and sent a warning, “Some of the measures we shall take are measures which will be extra-legal…an eye for an eye and an ear for an ear may not be adequate in our circumstances. We might very well demand two ears for one ear and two eyes for one eye” (Meredith, 2007, 65).

As the lawlessness and unrest continued in the Matabeleland, where Nkomo’s ZAPU party had found much support, ZANU’s 5th Brigade (a special army comprised of Shona-speaking ex-Zanla forces loyal to Mugabe and trained by North Koreans) killed at least 2,000 civilians, destroyed hundreds of homes, and beat civilians numbering in the tens of thousands. Furthermore, the Brigade imposed curfews, stopped transportation, closed shops, and “blocked drought relief supplies for villagers facing starvation” (Meredith, 2007, 67). In 1983 Mugabe addressed the people in Matabeleland, saying, “don’t cry if your relatives get killed in the process…where men and women provide food for the dissidents, when we get there we eradicate them. We do not differentiate who we fight because we can’t tell who is a dissident and who is not” (Meredith, 2007, 68).
Mugabe and ZANU’s security and defense forces aim most of their attention (or no attention when the region needs help) towards the people of the Matabeleland. Historically, most of the support for any opposition party has come from this region. Some of these parties included Nkomo’s ZAPU party and Morgan Tsvangirai’s Movement for Democratic Change (MDC). In the Spring 2000 Mugabe broadcasted to white farmers who supported the MDC, “Our present state of mind is that you are now enemies because you really have behaved as enemies of Zimbabwe. We are full of anger. Our entire community is angry and that is why we now have the war veterans seizing land” (Meredith, 2007, 175).

It is evident from Mugabe’s reaction to the lawlessness of those who clearly opposed ZANU that when he is faced with any opposition, all moderation falls to the wayside. It is clear his first reaction is to fight back two-fold, which Mugabe said himself in 2003, “If that is Hitler, then let me be Hitler tenfold. That is what we stand for” (Meredith, 2007, 18).

He can rally support behind ZANU by calling others “dissidents.” Part of his nationalism is built around victimization, which can be based in ethnicity, race, class, and political affiliation. He uses these identities as scapegoats for anti-colonialism, or anti-capitalism. A key source of his rhetoric’s adaptability and endurance is that it does not matter who the culprit is as long as what Mugabe claims the culprits are targeting is something central to the established nationalist dogma. As long there is a perceived threat to Mugabe’s power or the PF’s nationalism Mugabe can act to protect the nation.
Republic of South Africa

Influences and Formation of Post-Colonial South African National Identity

The South African Truth and Reconciliation Commissions (TRCs), Archbishop Desmond Tutu’s theology of *ubuntu*, the leadership of the African National Congress (ANC), and former South African President de Klerk’s (’89-’94, of the ruling National Party) willingness to commit to the negotiation process are all factors and influences that contributed to the unification of a post-apartheid democratic South Africa. Together they helped forge a more homogenous South African national identity based on civic membership.

Towards the end of the liberation movement, the nationalist leadership of the ANC differed from their Rhodesian nationalist counterpart in their strategy. Unlike Rhodesia’s ZANU, ZAPU and other nationalist movements, the ANC leadership recognized that they could not physically seize power from the apartheid regime. Although the apartheid regime was stronger, the ANC in conjunction with the international community had put a substantial amount of pressure on the apartheid regime. Through internal nationalist resistance, the external anti-apartheid divestment policies, and economic sanctions, de Klerk recognized that apartheid had failed and could no longer sustain itself. The ANC did not want to wait to negotiate under a take-it-or-leave-it basis like the Rhodesian nationalist leadership had at Lancaster. Therefore, the conditions in South Africa made it worthwhile for both parties to enter into negotiations for a settlement.

The aim of the ANC leading up to the negotiations with the ruling party was to establish an independent democratic South Africa whose structures, institutions and
policies would be rooted in non-racialism. The ANC leadership believed that a ubiquitous policy of non-racialism was necessary to build a true unified democratic South African national identity. The ANC’s Freedom Charter (June 1955) and the Constitutional Guidelines for a Democratic South Africa (1989) highlight the values that contributed to overcoming the systematic and institutionalized inequalities of the apartheid era and led to the establishment of a more free and fair participatory democracy.

The Freedom Charter was adopted at the Congress of the People in Kliptown on June 25, 1955. It was a “statement of core principles of the South African Congress Alliance, which consisted of the African National Congress and its allies the South African Indian Congress, the South African Congress of Democrats and the Coloured People's Congress” (ANC.org.za). The Charter was a declaration of the illegitimacy of the apartheid government, whose policies and institutions were rooted in institutionalized discrimination and systematic inequality. The Charter was a demand for a true democratic government whose authority lied with the will of all its citizens irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, religion or sex. The Charter, which spoke on behalf of all South Africans, demanded social, economic, political, religious and fundamental human rights. The Charter both preserved and protected cultural and linguistic rights. It did so by preserving all peoples “equal right to use their own languages” and engage in their own customs, while demanding that “the preaching and practice of national, race or colour discrimination and contempt” be illegal. The Charter concluded by stating that peace and friendship among South Africans can only be “secured by upholding the equal rights, opportunities and status of all.”
The Constitutional Guidelines for a Democratic South Africa (1989) outlined the ANC’s core principles for an independent South Africa. The leadership of the African National Congress adopted a policy of non-racialism in an effort to depoliticize the concept of race and ethnicity in South Africa. They saw this as the best way to dismantle the existing apartheid regime’s policy of reinforcing a hierarchy of separate group identities. In addition to eradicating oppressive and discriminatory laws, the ANC sought to replace them with democratic ones. This included the implementation of a universal suffrage system “based on the principle of one person, one vote.” The Guidelines declared, “South Africa shall be an independent, unitary, democratic and nonracial state” and that “sovereignty shall belong to the people as a whole.” The Guidelines also affirmed under the auspices of the state that, “all organs of government including justice, security and armed forces shall be representative of the people as a whole, democratic in their structure and functioning, and dedicated to defending the principles of the constitution.”

The Guidelines promoted the protection of fundamental human rights for all citizens irrespective of sex, race, ethnicity, or religion. These citizenship rights included “equal cultural, linguistic, and religious rights for all.” The Guidelines spelled out a Constitution that would have a Bill of Rights based on the Freedom Charter. Also included in the Guidelines was an affirmative-action section requiring state and social institutions to actively take steps to immediately eradicate “the economic and social inequalities produced by racial discrimination.” The ANC believed that the “acquisition of genuinely shared patriotic consciousness,” would follow as long as people, both in their habits and practices, adhered to the non-racial and non-sexist thinking promoted by
the ANC’s new Constitution. The ultimate goal of the ANC was to establish a non-racial participatory democracy in which every South African irrespective of race, ethnicity, religion, or sex, or linguistic preference could genuinely share a unitary patriotic national identity based on civic membership.

Archbishop Desmond Tutu’s Theology of Ubuntu

Desmond Tutu was an anti-apartheid and human rights activist, serving early in his career as Bishop of Lesotho from 1976-1978. Tutu was the first black General Secretary of the South African Council of Churches in 1978. Tutu also served as Bishop of Johannesburg and as the first black South African Anglican Archbishop of Cape Town until his retirement in 1996, when he was made honorary emeritus Archbishop of Cape Town. Archbishop Tutu has been the recipient of the 1984 Nobel Peace Prize for seeking a non-violent end to apartheid, the Albert Schweitzer Prize for Humanitarianism in 1986, and also the Gandhi Peace Prize in 2005 (Mandela, Nelson R. and the Nelson Mandela Foundation. 2010, 441).

Tutu is also well known for his belief and adherence to the African concept of “ubuntu”. The concept of ubuntu in Africa is a special one. Ubuntu has been translated to mean, “I am human through your humanity,” and also, “I am who I am because of who we all are.” This is a concept of humanity and interdependence that is not easily described, but one whose presence or absence is noticeable. Tutu explains that ubuntu, “has to do with what it means to be truly human, it refers to gentleness, to compassion, to hospitality, to openness to others, to vulnerability, to be available for others and to know that you are bound up with them in the bundle of life, for a person is only a person through other persons. And so we search for this ultimate attribute and reject ethnicity and other such qualities as irrelevancies. A person is a person because he recognizes others as persons” (Tutu, 1994, 125).
Ubuntu, then, is a concept of humanity whose sole attribute binding people together is our humanness. People are human through their acknowledgement first and foremost that others are human, rendering their other biological or chosen attributes irrelevant to one’s humanity. Tutu further explained, “We think of ourselves far too frequently as just individuals, separated from one another, whereas you are connected and what you do affects the whole World. When you do well, it spreads out; it is for the whole of humanity” (2008).

Archbishop Tutu chaired the Truth and Reconciliation Commission following the democratic election that brought Nelson Mandela to the Presidency in 1994. Tutu and his colleagues utilized this concept of ubuntu as a foundational principle and as a mandate to others to look towards a new unified South African national identity. He asks, “Why can’t we be human together in South Africa?” (Tutu, 1994, 125).

truth and reconciliation commission

The TRC was established under the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act, No 34 of 1995. TRC recounts human rights violations in the Republic of South Africa from 1960-1994, compiling the experiences of about 21,000 witnesses. The purpose of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission can be found in the preamble of the founding Act which called on “the need for understanding but not for vengeance, a need for reparation but not retaliation, a need for ubuntu but not for victimization” (Tutu, 1995, 8). Tutu proclaimed, “It is only by accounting for the past that we can become accountable for the future” (Tutu, 1995,7).

Some distinguishing features of the South African Truth and Reconciliation model include openness and transparency rather than operating behind closed doors. The
Commission operated “in the full glare of publicity” as a way for the whole country to both personally and collectively experience the healing process (Tutu 1998, 1). The Commission also decided that individual amnesty and not blanket amnesty was the right option for the situation in South Africa. Through this decision, the Commission encouraged the value of individual responsibility and to promote a culture of respect for fundamental human rights and ubuntu, the humanity of others. The criteria for amnesty was “full disclosure of the truth” (Tutu, 1995, 7).

The question of where legal justice fit in the South African TRC model was a tough one for the Commission. Ultimately, however, there were several reasons why it was decided not to follow in the footsteps of the post WWII Nuremburg Trials. The domestic situation was considered a military stalemate; neither the state nor the liberation movements had defeated the other. Therefore, neither was in a “position to enforce so-called victor’s justice” (Tutu, 1998, 5). Another reason not to put the perpetrators of human rights violations on trial is because the National Party would never have continued to participate in the negotiations knowing that they would be awaiting “the gauntlet of trials for their involvement in past violations” (Tutu, 1998, 5). There never would have been a relatively peaceful transition from white rule to a true participatory democracy if justice had been retributive.

Furthermore, logistically speaking, a Truth and Reconciliation Commission model based on the full utilization of the justice system was not a viable option for the Republic of South Africa. It would have been too costly and resource-intensive. Additionally, Tutu’s opinion was that “because such legal proceedings rely on proof beyond a reasonable doubt, the criminal justice system is not the best way to arrive at the truth”
The emphasis on the admission of truth, and not on victor’s justice, was at the core of the mission of the Commission. It is only when the traumatic experience of the victim is confirmed as real by the perpetrator’s admission that a sense of self and dignity can be restored to the victim. This restoration of human dignity, an active acknowledgement of *ubuntu*, was essential to the healing process between victims and perpetrators alike.

People have criticized that the TRC model sacrificed justice in the name of amnesty, thus allowing for impunity. However, Tutu, speaking as the Chairperson in the Foreword of the Report, responds “the amnesty applicant has to admit responsibility for the act for which amnesty is being sought…in a public hearing…in the full glare of publicity,” thus dealing with the matter of impunity (Tutu, 1995, 8-9). People criticized the Commission for being overly generous in granting amnesty. Tutu writes in the 1995 Report, however, that the “Amnesty Committee has granted only about 150 amnesties out of 7,000 applications, with a further 2,000 still to be dealt with” (Tutu, 1995, 12). As to the criticism that justice was sacrificed, Tutu and his colleagues believed in another type of justice. Rather than a retributive and punitive kind of justice, the Commission put their faith in a “restorative justice.” To the Commission, restorative justice is the kind that is concerned with “correcting imbalances, restoring broken relationships—with healing, harmony and reconciliation.” In light of being more attuned to healing and reconciliation, restorative justice is the kind that “focuses on the experience of the victims”, not just the perpetrators. (Tutu, 1995, 8).

The Commission’s underlying faith in restorative justice, the emphasis on truth telling and individual amnesty is what promoted an open dialogue between the
Commission, victims and perpetrators. The absence of retributive justice is actually what aided in the relative success of the South African Truth and Reconciliation model. In this model, perpetrators could feel they had less to risk and more to gain by admission of past human rights violations. Although not easy and often painful, the TRC was a way for perpetrators to acknowledge their crimes and in doing so, dignity was restored to victims and perpetrators alike, allowing each to acknowledge the humanity of the other. Tutu concludes the Foreword of the Report,

“South Africa wants and needs the Afrikaner, the English, the coloured, the Indian, the black. We are sisters and brothers in one family—God’s family, the human family...having asked and received forgiveness and having made amends, let us shut the door on the past—not in order to forget it but in order not to allow it to imprison us. Let us move into the glorious future of a new kind of society... ‘founded on the recognition of human rights, democracy and peaceful co-existence and development opportunities for all South Africans, irrespective of colour, race, class, belief or sex” (Tutu, 1995, 22).

The South African Truth and Reconciliation model’s emphasis on restorative justice, on truth telling, on transparency and publicity, and especially on ubuntu was an indispensible contribution to the relatively peaceful, albeit often rocky, transition to the development of a unitary post-apartheid South African national identity based on civic nationalism.

*Former President Nelson Mandela’s Rhetoric*

In Nelson Mandela’s autobiography, he expressed his belief that “No one is born hating another person because of the color of his skin, or his background, or his religion. People must learn to hate, and if they can learn to hate, they can be taught to love, for love comes more naturally to the human heart than its opposite” (Mandela, 1995, 623).

Mandela used his speech announcing the ANC’s victory at the polls to express the strength of collective leadership. He humbly said: “I am your servant, I don’t come to you as a leader, as one above others. We are a great team. Leaders come and go but the
organisation and the collective leadership that has looked after the fortunes and reverses of this organisation will always be there.” Rather than promoting his own self worth, he continued to say:

“the ideas I express are not the ideas invented in my own mind. They stem from our fundamental programme, policy document the Freedom Charter; from the decisions; resolutions of the National Conference and from the decision of the National Executive Committee. That is the nature of our organisation. It is not the individuals that matter, it is the collective leadership which has led this organisation so skillfully.”

Mandela concluded that paragraph saying, “I stand therefore before you humbled by your courage, with a heart full of love for all of you. I regard it as the highest honour to lead the ANC at this moment in our history, and that we have been chosen to lead our country into the new century.”

Continuing his role as a mediator, in a reconciliatory tone, Mandela expressed his desire for cooperation and unity of purpose to the newly elected Interim Government of National Unity: “I hold out a hand of friendship to the leaders of all parties and their members, and ask all of them to join us in working together to tackle the problems we face as a nation. An ANC government will serve all the people of South Africa, not just ANC members. We are looking forward to working together in a Government of National Unity” (speech announcing ANC election victory, May 2, 1994).

In a moving inaugural address on April 10, 1994, former President Mandela addressed the nation and the world. He spoke of reconciliation, building unity through an inclusive singular national identity, and liberty and justice for all. Mandela first spoke of “hope to newborn liberty.” He then spoke of every South African’s role in making that hope of an inclusive participatory democracy a reality, “Our daily deeds as ordinary South Africans must produce an actual South African reality that will reinforce
humanity’s belief in justice, strengthen its confidence in the nobility of the human soul and sustain all our hopes for a glorious life for all.”

Throughout his inaugural address, Mandela continually reiterated that an independent South African national identity would be all inclusive and non-racialized, “To my compatriots, I have no hesitation in saying that each one of us is as intimately attached to the soil of this beautiful country as are the famous jacaranda trees of Pretoria and the mimosa trees of the bushveld.” Again, he reiterated to the people of South Africa, “We trust that you will continue to stand by us as we tackle the challenges of building peace, prosperity, non-sexism, non-racialism and democracy.”

Mandela saw his mission as “one of preaching reconciliation, of binding the wounds of the country, of engendering trust and confidence” (Mandela, 1994, 619). In his inaugural address, Mandela spoke of reconciliation and of building a democratic South Africa as one, “The time for the healing of the wounds has come. The moment to bridge the chasms that divide us has come. The time to build is upon us.”

Mandela pledged that his elected Interim Government of National Unity would be one of peace and respect for human dignity, “We pledge ourselves to liberate all our people from the continuing bondage of poverty, deprivation, suffering, gender and other discrimination.” Taking from the theology provided by the concept of ubuntu, and from Bishop Tutu’s coined phrase (the “rainbow nation”), Mandela said that the newly elected government and the people of South African would work to build a society in which, “both black and white, will be able to walk tall, without any fear in their hearts, assured of their inalienable right to human dignity - a rainbow nation at peace with itself and the world.”
Mandela noted that there was “no easy road to freedom.” He understood that the country needed unity to achieve a truly inclusive democratic South African national identity. Mandela’s rhetoric was never about himself or just the government. Rather, he rhetorically united all South Africans irrespective of ethnicity, race, religious, cultural, or linguistic preferences: “We know it well that none of us acting alone can achieve success. We must therefore act together as a united people, for national reconciliation, for nation building, for the birth of a new world. Let there be justice for all. Let there be peace for all.” Mandela also spoke of equal opportunity for employment and sustainable living for all South Africans, “Let there be work, bread, water and salt for all. Let each know that for each the body, the mind and the soul have been freed to fulfill themselves.”

In Mandela’s May 24, 1994 Presidential State of the Nation Address, he recognized that the test of legitimacy of the rhetorical democracy he and his elected government spoke of would be found in the “programmes we elaborate, the government institutions we create, the legislation we adopt must be whether they serve these objectives.” Mandela said, “As an affirmation of the government’s commitment to an entrenched human rights culture, we shall immediately take steps to inform the Secretary General of the United Nations that we will subscribe to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.” He also asserted that the government will “take steps to ensure that we accede to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Social and Economic Rights and other human rights instruments of the United Nations.”

Former President Mandela concluded his inaugural address in declaration of a new era of liberty, respect for human dignity, and complete democratic equality: “Never,
never and never again shall it be that this beautiful land will again experience the oppression of one by another and suffer the indignity of being the skunk of the world”

VI. Analysis

Zimbabwe

Impact of Land Issue & 2 Stage Theory of Revolution on Zimbabwean People & National Identity

The reason why ZANU-PF was ambiguous about their policy on the land issue is precisely because of the ideology of the two-stage theory of revolution. The promotion of the capitalist system Zimbabwe adopted as part of their two-stage revolution that was designed to end in a socialist revolution made it difficult for ZANU to promote nationalization of high-producing farmland. Because ZANU-PF was among the more radicalized nationalist movements, they could not afford to alienate the support base of the African masses by promoting the capitalist notions found in their first stage of the national democratic revolution. Therefore, ZANU made their rhetoric on the land issue ambiguous, only using rhetoric of nationalization around election times. When the proletariat of the African masses, who continually felt the burden of ZANU’s period of capitalist growth, criticized ZANU’s policies, Mugabe would use rhetoric to explain “the realities of their environment,” which he used to refer to the capitalist system. Mugabe’s acceptance of capitalism as an inherent and lasting component of Zimbabwe’s economic structure reveals that ZANU’s socialist stage of their political ideology is completely rhetorical, just as he admitted that the socialist rhetoric he used during the civil war leading up to the election was only part of a wartime ‘propaganda campaign’.

The national democratic stage of ZANU’s two-stage theory of revolution contradicted the aims and goals of the socialist revolution. The first stage worked to
benefit the petit bourgeois at the expense of the African masses. This contradicts the socialist aims of the second stage, which is meant to benefit the African masses.

Especially during the first 18 months of Mugabe’s presidency, the first stage, the national democratic revolution, allowed ZANU to take advantage of the capitalist system. During that time ZANU received aid from the US, Britain, the IMF and the World bank. That period of capitalist growth did much to advance the interests of the petit bourgeoisie.

However, the national democratic revolution did very little to advance the well-being of the average underemployed, underpaid, and impoverished black Zimbabwean. On page 23 of the *Financial Mail* on January 2, 1986, it was reported that ‘the first ZANU-PF budget in 1980 was virtually indistinguishable from some previous budgets presented by the Rhodesian Front Ministers in the Seventies’ (Astrow, 1983,175).

The second stage, the socialist revolution, was a misconception. Most Zimbabweans who voted ZANU into office in 1980 expected ZANU to match their rhetoric of nationalization with actual socialist policies. Instead, the second stage of the revolution in the minds of ZANU officials was a far-off goal, one that came only after the completion of the democratic revolution. The problem with revolutions in theory versus revolutions in practice is that it can be difficult to identify when one has truly been completed. ZANU never gave a deadline for the national democratic revolution nor explained when and how they would know that it had successfully ended. ZANU’s belief in their two-pronged political ideology as a resolution for Zimbabwe’s socio-economic problems is always continual and looks towards the future which is a big part of what allows Mugabe and his regime to stay in power.
Therefore, each stage’s ideology of ZANU’s two-stage theory of revolution allowed Mugabe’s rhetoric to be flexible. This helped to create a complex national identity that can simultaneously include or exclude people along racial, ethnic or class conscious lines. Each stage of the revolution served two rhetorical purposes for ZANU. The first stage of the revolution supported the land and business-owning white population through capitalist policies and rhetoric at the expense of the African majority. As Mugabe and ZANU’s rhetoric throughout the decades have proven, the second stage—the socialist revolution, is purely rhetorical. It allows Mugabe’s to rally African support and alienate land-owning whites around ideas of nationalization and land redistribution. Because this stage appeals to the masses it is no surprise that this rhetoric becomes more prevalent around election periods. Also, the second stage served as a tool to threaten and blame the prosperous land-owning whites for all of Zimbabwe’s social and economic problems—unemployment, poverty, homelessness, and even draughts. These racial, ethnic, and class-conscious identities are flexible, they can fit in socialist or imperialist boxes. Essentially, ZANU could scapegoat racial, ethnic, or class-conscious identities by using anti-capitalist, anti-Western, or anti-colonialism rhetoric.

*Impact of ZANU’s Promotion of Capitalism*

Guided by the ideology of the first stage of their two-pronged political program, ZANU’s continued adherence and promotion of capitalist policies (as they have been carried out by ZANU) have had devastating effects both economically and politically for the majority of Zimbabwe’s African population. When the newly elected PF government showed no signs of promoting policies that would encourage nationalization, or increase the rights and livelihood of working Africans, they began to strike by the thousands.
Within two weeks after the election in 1980, more than 16,000 workers in 46 firms went on strike demanding higher wages, pensions and better working conditions\textsuperscript{39}.

ZANU reacted swiftly by reverting to the same oppressive legislative orders invoked under Smith’s Rhodesian Front. ZANU invoked the labor code included in the Emergency Powers Act and the Industrial Conciliation Act. These acts attacked basic democratic rights like “the right to personal liberty, protection from arbitrary search or entry, protection from discrimination, and the freedoms of expression, assembly and association, and movement” (Astrow, 1983, 181). Among other actions, these acts made it illegal for employees to strike, organize, form, or join unions. The government threatened to dismiss workers who failed to comply with the legislative orders, and they followed through on their threat. For example, 1,000 workers at Swift Transport in Harare were fired for striking\textsuperscript{40}. Astrow finds that “between March and June, 172,000 working days were lost owning to wildcat strikes” (Astrow, 1983, 176).

The PF government labeled the frustrated employees as dissidents. Mugabe viewed the strikers as ‘counter-revolutionary’ elements trying to undermine the Government (Astrow, 1983, 179). Robson Manyika, the deputy Labor Minister said “there are agitators who are opposed to ZANU-PF who are instigating these strikes” (Astrow, 1983, 179). Manyika believed that whoever was behind the strikes must be ZANU opposition, rather than simply frustrated underpaid Zimbabwean workers.

After nearly half a year of opposition from an angry Zimbabwean workforce, thousands of dismissals, and months of undemocratic government oppression, ZANU decided to grant some conciliatory benefits to workers. ZANU introduced free medical
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care to those with an income of less than Z$215 a month, and gave free primary
education for 1,200,000 children attending government primary schools\textsuperscript{41}. However,

\textit{Financial Times} pointed out that although the government initiatives were well
intentioned, much of the country remained well below the estimated poverty line for
Zimbabwe. According to the \textit{Financial Times}:

“A national minimum wage in commerce, industry and mining of Z$70 a month
(48 British Pounds) and of Z$30 a month (20 British Pounds) in private domestic
service and agriculture. Not only is the Z$70 below the Poverty Datum Line
figure calculated nine months ago by the University of Zimbabwe, which was
over Z$100 a month. It was also well below what the workers themselves had
been anticipating” (Astrow, 1983, 179).

ZANU’s political and economic policies are riddled with contradictions and
inconsistencies that further destabilize the economic and political culture of Zimbabwe.
ZANUs contradictory pattern of promoting capitalism, while delegitimized international
institutions like the World Bank and the IMF and the countries that support them has
continued to hurt the black majority. The CIA has currently listed Zimbabwe’s Gross
Domestic Product (Purchasing Power Parity) at 159 out of 227 countries worldwide—just
behind the failed state of Somalia.

\textit{Impact of Restrictive Citizenship & Mono-Citizenship Policies}

ZANU’s definition of citizenship is not as clear as it is in the United States or
South Africa because “Zimbabwe’s 1984 Citizenship Act did not define citizenship, nor
its rights and obligations. Instead, minimalist definitions exist in the text of the
declaration of allegiance” (Cheater, 1998, 196). These definitions, Cheater finds, are not
even widely available to Zimbabwean citizens, “and there is no [formal] teaching on
issues of citizenship within the state educational systems” (Cheater, 1998, 197).

\textsuperscript{41} Astrow, 1983, 179
Like most states, ZANU’s citizenship policies create distinctions between those born in the country (or born from a national of that country) and those born outside of the country. However, unlike most states, the economic, social and political rights afforded by citizenship along those classifications are inequitable across ethnic and racial lines. Also, since 1984, Zimbabwe amended its citizenship policies so that birth in Zimbabwe no longer carries guarantees of either citizenship or residence rights. This amendment completely violates the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which makes it illegal to remove a national’s rights to residency. Policies like these lead Cheater to believe that “the Zimbabwean state’s explicitly patrilineal view conflicts with changing international understandings of citizenship entitlements and their transmission through women to children, via the principal of bilineal descent” (Cheater, 1998, 192).

Furthermore, Zimbabwe’s mono-citizenship policies are meaningless when other countries accept and adopt multi-national citizenship policies. Yet, the Government still illegitimately and unjustly enforces the policy and denies residency and citizenship rights to those that declare dual citizenship.

Zimbabwe’s citizenship policies are not clearly defined or transparent to the public. These policies restrict people’s mobility and confine them to oppressive national culture. They also limit people’s personal liberties to find economic and social opportunities. In the end, Zimbabwean’s rights of citizenship are selective and restrictive along ethnic and racial lines and reinforce a selective ethnic national identity. Therefore, Zimbabwe’s citizenship policies support the thesis that ZANU’s promotion of an ethnic national identity creates an oppressive dictatorial political, economic and social culture.
Impact of Disregard of Independent and Equal Branches of Government & Human Rights Abuses

Mugabe is always looking to further entrench his party’s power into the government. Showing a disregard for an independent and equal legislature, in 1986, ZANU took away the 20 reserved seats for minorities provided by the Lancaster House agreement. ZANU replaced those seats with nominated ones meant for ZANU loyalists to further secure the PF’s power in Parliament.

Mugabe’s disregard for the rule of law is continually evident as he has frequently utilized the same authoritarian legislative acts introduced under Smith’s Rhodesian Front administration. For example, ZANU has used those Emergency Powers Acts to deny workers rights to strike, form or join unions, to deny people’s freedoms of assembly and speech, to conduct illegal search and seizures, to enforce curfews and restrict people’s mobility.

Mugabe has shown throughout his dictatorial presidency that an independent and equal judiciary branch will not be tolerated. Judicial rulings have found ZANU guilty of violations like obtaining evidence through the use of intimidation and torture, illegal search and seizure, and practicing illegal executions. Mugabe’s reactions to judicial rulings have been to dismiss the offending federal judge. When a report commented that the President did not have the power to do so, he coerced the judge to retire through intimidation. Mugabe’s undermining of law and order has resulted in a culture of fear. ZANU’s extralegal actions have stripped Zimbabwean’s of their rights, resulting in illegal search and seizures, illegal detentions, illegal executions (without trial or even notice of death to the public), violations of privacy, and the right to fair trial.
ZANU’s disregard for an independent security force is just as evident as his complete lack of respect for human rights. Mugabe adds to the country’s security force by creating a special team of loyalists, which he uses to operate outside the realm of law. He created the 5th Brigade, a special army comprised of Shona-speaking ex-Zanla forces. Trained by North Koreans and loyal only to Mugabe, they terrorized the countryside around election times in Matabeleland. The 5th Brigade has also conducted illegal land seizures, used terror tactics, violence, and torture. Mugabe’s utilization of his loyalist police force has resulted in the death, torture, and starvation of thousands of Zimbabweans.

Impact of Election Time Rhetoric and Fraudulent Elections

Mugabe’s most violent rhetoric can be found during election periods. This rhetoric most illustrates his world view. It shows his desire to stay in power and his emphasis on an ethnic national identity defined along ethnic, regional, racial and party affiliation lines. Mugabe’s rhetoric presented in the qualitative findings section illustrates the flexible nature and adaptability of rhetoric, defining a national identity based on victimization.

Mugabe frequently speaks in the tribal tongue of chiShona around election time. His use of chiShona allows him to speak violently under a veil, completely hidden from the ears and eyes of the Western world. Mugabe’s use of chiShona also excludes non-chiShona speakers from understanding him, and encourages violence along ethnic lines. This creates a distinction in Zimbabwe’s national identity that excludes anyone who does not support Mugabe in an election. A loss for ZANU in any election threatens the current nationalism. Therefore Mugabe’s worldview seems to be that as long as ZANU stays in
power there will be peace, but not voting for ZANU immediately means war. He frames his rhetoric in such a way that ZANU and its national identity will be the victim, and the people of Matabeleland will be the culprit.

Mugabe’s rhetoric around election time illustrates the truly selective and restrictive nature of ZANU’s conceived national identity. In 1985 when Smith’s RF party won 15 out of the 20 seats reserved for minorities provided by the Lancaster House agreement, Mugabe called Zimbabwe’s white population “racists”. Mugabe said that the elections results showed that whites could not accept “the reality of a political order in which Africans set the pace.” By saying so, he distinctly removed whites’ claims to Zimbabwean nationality by calling them non-Africans. Importantly, this shows his disregard for the legitimacy of the Lancaster House agreement which reserved 20 minority seats. Utilizing the ideology afforded to him by the second stage of ZANU’s two pronged political program, Mugabe has also called white voters capitalists and supporters (or agents) of Western imperialism.

Mugabe’s ethnic nationalism is not limited only to the exclusion of whites. Going on the belief that ZANU is best for the nation, anyone that disagrees and supports any opposition party is viewed as a dissident. Black Africans who support opposition parties have also been considered to be supporters of a subversive Western, capitalist ploy to delegitimize the PF government. Black Africans who supported Nkomo’s ZAPU party, or Tsvangirai’s MDC party has also been perceived by the PF government as a threat to the nation and therefore an illegitimate member of Zimbabwe’s national identity.

Zimbabwe’s post-colonial history has been marked by fraudulent elections. Although intimidation was used by most of the participating parties in the first open
election in 1980, the election was monitored by the international community, and was considered a legitimate victory for ZANU. Since then however, the majority of elections in Zimbabwe have been tarnished by terror, coercion and fraud. In particular, the Zimbabwean presidential election of 2002 was so obviously won by terror and fraud that the U.S., Britain, and the European Union publicly stated that the election was considered illegitimate.

ZANU’s actions to stay in power have robbed Zimbabweans of a true political voice. These elections have denied Zimbabweans of a free and fair political culture. Zimbabweans have been denied their rights to speak freely, assemble freely, and to create, join or support political opposition. ZANU’s reign of terror and intimidation at the polls have violated Zimbabweans physical security. Through Mugabe and ZANU’s election time rhetoric, Zimbabweans have also been excluded from membership in the national identity along racial, ethnic, and regional lines. They have been deemed either racist or agents of a subversive Western capitalist ploy to delegitimize the PF government.

*Impact of Ethnic National Identity*

Zimbabwean’s restrictive citizenship rights are selective along ethnic and racial lines, and reinforce a selective ethnic national identity. Therefore Zimbabwe’s citizenship policies support the thesis that ethnic nationalism creates an oppressive dictatorial political, economic and social culture. Mugabe’s desire to keep ZANU in power through fraudulent elections is just as evident as his disregard for a balanced, independent judiciary or legislative branch. ZANU’s selective national identity is invoked around the protection and perseverance of Zimbabwe, which has led to extreme political violence
and massive human rights violations. ZANU’s contradictory two-stage theory of revolution that guides its political program allows for a flexible rhetoric. It allows for rhetoric that creates a complex national identity on the basis of race, ethnicity, class, political affiliation and economic orientation. When Mugabe declared in 1979 that Zimbabwe was a nation based on the “People’s power” and said that the “People are a revolutionary storm”, as well as when he affirmed in 2000 that Zimbabwe is “our country” and “our land”, he used rhetoric in the singular form. Also, after the 1985 election when Mugabe announced to his supporters in chiShona saying “We will kill those snakes among us” he dehumanized people who do not vote for ZANU. By using the singular form and by dehumanizing his political opposition, he creates a collective national Zimbabwean identity that excludes those people whose traits he deems to be subversive to the security of the state. The endurance of Mugabe and ZANU’s national rhetoric comes in part from a rhetoric based on victimization, which is flexible and can include imperialism, capitalism, and any other internal opposition.

**Republic of South Africa**

The road to negotiation and the negotiation itself was not an easy feat for the Republic of South Africa. Similar to Rhodesia’s experience during negotiations in Lancaster, South Africa’s negotiations nearly fell apart on several occasions. South Africa managed to avoid outright civil war on several occasions throughout its course to independence. But throughout the liberation movement and during Nelson Mandela’s presidency, the leadership of the National African Congress (ANC) worked hard to promote a singular, unified South African national identity based on civic membership.
The nationalist leadership defined civic membership through total equality, beginning with the de-politicization of ethnicity and race.

In the end, the success of the negotiations between the African National Congress and de Klerk was brought about through discipline, pragmatism, and deliberate tactics and strategic decision making. The leadership also possessed an understanding of how to quell a volatile storm while engaging in alternative non-violent modes of peace-making (like allowing a public vigil following Hani’s assassination). This contributed to the formation of the post-apartheid South African state and influenced the formation of a more unified South African national identity. The ANC’s overarching emphasis on equality, democratic rights for all irrespective of sex, race, ethnicity, religion or linguistic and cultural practices is the most significant contribution to the formation of a more homogenous South African national identity.

Used as a statement of interdependence and interconnectedness the concept of *ubuntu* stressed upon South Africans the importance of recognizing the humanness in others first and foremost above other characteristics. Bishop Desmond Tutu incorporated the concept of *ubuntu* into his theology and utilized it to guide the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. The theology of *ubuntu*, along with an emphasis on accountability and a non-retributive form of justice based on restoration not vengeance, contributed to the success of the South African TRC model. Through the nationalist leadership’s encouragement and emphasis on *ubuntu*, despite the pain, resentment, and anguish brought to the surface through the Truth and Reconciliation process, the country was able to move forward and focus on working towards a more democratic and equitable future.
Using his skills as a mediator throughout, Mandela created reconciliation among members of the newly elected Interim Government of National Unity. This allowed for greater cooperation through the ranks of a diverse government to implement equitable policies in all sectors of society including, the workplace, education, the justice system, housing, and more. The implementation and enforcement of these policies worked to eliminate the vestiges of institutionalized discrimination characterized by the apartheid-era regime.

Mandela showed great statesmanship through the acknowledgement that the election was just the beginning, and it would take unity and hard work from all to achieve the goals of the government. Furthermore, Mandela’s rhetoric purposefully and artfully emphasized reconciliation, peace, and unity through acceptance of *ubuntu* and respect for human dignity. He knew that government policies were only the first step towards achieving equality. To truly achieve a productive and equitable democratic state, Mandela knew that the people of South Africa would have to learn to accept humanity in others. Therefore every speech, every policy and development program throughout Mandela’s presidency consistently emphasized those policies of equality, non-racialism, and non-sexism.

It is fair to say that South Africa was able to bridge a deep chasm to come together on election day April 27, 1994. The election results that brought Nelson Mandela to the presidency showed a strong democratic political voice that desired a new South Africa based on civic membership and liberty for all.
VII. Conclusion

Mugabe may have been certain that he could have led ZANU to victory on the battle field, but the Lancaster House agreement ultimately led Mugabe to a presidential victory via the ballot box. Yet throughout his presidency Mugabe exclaimed that he should have finished the war “in the trenches” when he had the chance. Throughout Mugabe’s decades in power he continually blames the land and business-owning whites, as well as imperial Britain, and international institutions like the World Bank and the IMF for being the cause of Zimbabwe’s economic and social woes.

The truth is, however, that Zimbabwe’s problems stem in part from the fact that ZANUs political program is guided by a contradictory two-stage theory of revolution. In the first stage, the national democratic revolution actually promotes capitalism over true democracy so that an unspecified socialist revolution can take place. This has only forwarded the interests of the petit bourgeoisie at the expense of the largely underemployed, underpaid, impoverished, and uneducated Zimbabweans.

The consequences of adhering to a political ideology based in two opposing philosophies has allowed for the creation of a selective ethnic national identity. The socialist revolution, the second stage of ZANU’s two-stage theory, supports anti-capitalist and anti-colonial rhetoric, making the white land and business-owning Zimbabwean’s out to be enemies of the state. This perception excludes whites from a Zimbabwean national identity. The government’s vision of a national identity allows for flexible rhetoric that reinforces divisions along racial, ethnic, class-conscious, and
political affiliation lines. In Zimbabwe, ethnicity, race, political preference, and class are a measure of one’s true membership in the nation. This affects the rights, freedoms and benefits provided and protected by the state. These attributes create a flexible national identity centered around rhetoric of victimization against capitalism and imperialism, the West, international institutions, whites, and any political opposition.

The dual political ideology adopted by ZANU did not make it necessary to attempt true reconciliation in the way that the ANC’s political ideology did in South Africa. Because the ANC’s singular democratic vision rested on the achievement of unity through reconciliation, a Truth and Reconciliation Commission was necessary for South Africa. However, this was not the case for a Zimbabwean government dominated by ZANU. The government’s vision of an independent Zimbabwe relied on national democratic revolution that actually emphasized capitalism with the goal that it would create the proper condition for an eventual socialist revolution. ZANU’s emphasis on capitalism actually reinforced divisions along ethnic, racial and class lines. This allows the retention of colonial era hatreds and continues to disserve Zimbabweans. Therefore, ZANU’s misguided political program did not make reconciliation a vital component of post-colonial development because they thought they would solve Zimbabwe’s inequality through an undefined two-stage revolution whose second stage—the socialist revolution, which turns out to be admittedly rhetorical.

The consequences of not adhering to a singular political program based on one ideology, like the nationalists leadership of the Republic of South Africa, have been grave indeed. ZANU’s rhetoric, policies, and actions have defined a national identity based on ethnic nationalism. Out of a narcissistic desire to stay in power, Zimbabwe’s
nationalism is defined by loyalty to ZANU and its leader, Mugabe. This allows ZANU to create policies (like mono-citizenship) and take actions (like illegal search and seizures, election fraud, the creation of an extra-legal security force, and utilization of Emergency Powers acts) in the name of protecting and defending the nation. Ultimately, Mugabe and his PF government’s lack of respect for democratic elections, lack of respect for human rights, and disregard for a true democratic government are to blame for Zimbabwe’s poverty, homelessness, underemployment, economic decline, health and security issues.

A state’s emphasis on a certain type of nationalism is important because state policies like security, immigration, and citizenship rights are all made in the name of protecting and securing the nation. Under apartheid, the nationalist leadership of the Republic of South Africa desired to extend existing rights meant only for whites. The ANC believed that equality and democratic rights for all irrespective of sex, race, ethnicity, religion or linguistic and cultural practices were vital to create a truly inclusive participatory democracy based on majoritarianism. The leadership knew that none of these objectives could be achieved without a legitimate spirit of reconciliation among South Africans. South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation model was successful because of its emphasis on publicity, ubuntu, accountability, and a non-retributive form of justice.

To create a singular South African national identity, the first elected Interim Government of National Unity led by former President Nelson Mandela implemented equitable development programs and created and enforced policies that de-politicized race and ethnicity. With a single political ideology guided by reconciliation and democracy, Mandela and the National Unity government worked hard to eliminate the systematic and institutionalized discrimination characterized by the apartheid-era regime.
While Mugabe acts as an anointed protector of Zimbabwe, Mandela professed himself to be a humble agent acting on behalf of the people of South Africa. Mugabe’s style of leadership as protector of the state defines a national identity based on loyalty to his ZANU regime, which is what enables Mugabe to stay in power. This allows Mugabe to exclude people who he thinks are subversive to the security of the state and creates a selective ethnic national identity. Zimbabwe’s promotion of ethnic nationalism through dictatorial rule has created a culture of fear and oppression. Mandela’s style of leadership allowed participatory democracy to take root in South Africa. South Africa’s emphasis on civic nationalism, equality, and democracy has afforded South Africa greater opportunity for peace, political stability, and economic success.

Despite South Africa’s rising crime levels and recent experience with xenophobia, it is undisputable that South Africa remains one of the continent’s most successful democratic post-colonies—especially in comparison to the forty percent of African states that are considered weak or failing. South Africa’s stable economy is partly a measure of such success. According to the CIA, South Africa’s economy ranks 26th in the world compared to Zimbabwe’s 159th ranking out of 227 countries. There have been four post-apartheid presidents in South Africa in the last 17 years. South Africa’s constitution limits presidents to two five-year terms. Participatory democracy remains South Africa’s strongest asset in ensuring a strong political voice for all South Africans.
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