

Media and Democracy in Zimbabwe

Lungisani Moyo¹ and Trevor Chabwinja²

*Department of Communication, University of Fort Hare, Private Bag X 1314,
Alice 5700, South Africa*

E-mail: ¹<lungie06@gmail.com>, ²<tchabwinja@gmail.com>

KEYWORDS Media. Statute. Freedom. National Unity. Constitutional Rights

ABSTRACT The nature and operation of laws and regulations that were and are still being used to limit the freedom of the media in Zimbabwe requires attention. Through a legal and political analysis of the evolution and use of these laws and regulations by successive governments in Zimbabwe, the study provided an important perspective on the struggle for media freedom in Zimbabwe. The focus of this study was to examine the extent to which the current media legislation in Zimbabwe is congruent with the constitution. Results of this study exposed that the government is cognizant of the shortcomings in the regulations and laws relating to the media, but is not keen to make genuine and comprehensive reforms. It was evident from the findings that media houses in Zimbabwe are vulnerable. The study concluded that there is restricted freedom of expression in media legislation as has been witnessed from the findings of the study.

INTRODUCTION

Ever since the colonial period Zimbabwean media has been subjected to varying degrees of control by successive governments. However, in recent years the media has come under tight restrictions from the government. This has been particularly compounded by the growing economic and political crisis in the country. The then Zimbabwean Constitution did not specifically protect freedom of the media. However, it was widely accepted that right to protection of the media was subsumed in the right to freedom of expression in Section 20(1) of the Constitution¹. The Section states that:

Except with his own consent or by way of parental discipline, no person shall be hindered in the enjoyment of his freedom of expression, that is to say, freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart ideas and information without interference and freedom from interference with his correspondence.

It is submitted that this clause has not been wholly observed after the year 1999. This was violated by repressive legislations such as the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act (AIPPA) [chapter: 20/2002], the Public Order and Security Act (POSA) [chapter: 18/2002] and the Broadcasting Services Act (BSA) [chapter: 19/2001].

It is noteworthy that, one of the aims of the struggle for independence in Zimbabwe was a guarantee for media freedom. This was supported by all the liberation movements which all clam-

ored for the repealing of several repressive media laws. The independent press had hitherto struggled to report in the country for many years as a result of many restrictive laws imposed by the minority regime of Ian Smith, the then Prime Minister of Rhodesia Zimbabwe. Such laws included the Official Secrets Act (OSA) 11/1970, which made it a crime to report on “classified information” and the Law and Order Maintenance Act (LOMA) 53/1960, under which a court could impose up to twenty years imprisonment for any violation thereof. Such acts were used to impose a media blackout on reporting on African political activities and the casualties suffered by the Rhodesian Government Forces. For example, the media could be ordered to focus on casualties on the other side and to report on the retreats to Zambia and Mozambique and not on anything reflecting the Rhodesian forces negatively.

Brief History of Zimbabwean Media

Zimbabwe with the changes in its name at different times, including Southern Rhodesia, Rhodesia, Zimbabwe-Rhodesia, and finally Zimbabwe in 1980 never really experienced genuinely free media (Melber 2004). Before the inception of the Broadcasting Act, the first newspapers, *The Mashonaland*, *Zambezi Times* and *The Rhodesian Herald* were owned by the South African company named Argus Press of South Africa. In the same way Cecil John Rhodes was the force behind the British imperialism in southern Africa, he was also the force behind the set-

ting up and growth of newspapers in the then Southern Rhodesia. A friend of Rhodes Francis Dorma was the editor of the first paper and Argus Press was given the monopoly to establish newspapers in Southern Rhodesia (Chari et al. 2003). Newspapers during this period were designed to promote the cause of the white settler colonialism and their business interests in South Africa (Windrich 1981). In fact, the papers were designed to sustain colonial imperialist system and to serve their narrow interests, which had nothing to do with the indigenous populations. Chari et al (2003) has argued that "Rhodes used negotiation and persuasion to establish an alliance against Africans, whom he dominated using brute force." One of the ways in which this was achieved is through a media propaganda, which was aided by the newspapers that he controlled.

There was very little formulation of media policies under the United Federal Party of Sir Edgar Whitehead. The Native Affairs department to the office of the Prime Minister operated as a nucleus for a Southern Rhodesia information service (Frederikse 1990). During this era though there was no clearly written media policies, this department and the office of the Prime Minister were in charge of setting the conditions that guided the operations of the media.

The history of regulation of broadcasting in Southern Rhodesia dates back to 1933 but the first media policy, *The Rhodesia Broadcasting Act* (RBA 1957) was only passed twenty-four years later in 1957. Before the RBA in 1957 was adopted, the government relied on the Native Affairs department and office of the Prime Minister to come up with decisions concerning the parameters that guided the operations of television and radio broadcasting. The colonial broadcasting (RBA 1957) did not bring relief to the broadcasting media but in fact reinforced existing colonial ideologies on media regulation. Electronic broadcasting, just like the print media also revolved around protecting the interests of minority whites and consolidating colonialism. It was designed from the onset to promote the cause of the settlers and their colonial interests (Mazula et al. 2003). Broadcasting in this respect, became a cultural tool of reassuring whites their sense of belonging. It was used to strengthen the position of settlers in the country. This was intensified in 1965 when the Smith regime gave itself independence from colonial master, the

United Kingdom in his Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI) (Windrich 1981).

This paper therefore, proposes to review pre-independence media policies as a preface to a comparison with prevailing policies. Since Rhodesia became the independent Zimbabwe on April 18, 1980, there has been no direct censorship. But there has been government control of the print and broadcast media. Editors have also engaged in self-censorship. The Lancaster House Constitution of December 1979 became Zimbabwe's Constitution when the country became independent from Britain in 1980. It is a Westminster-type document designed to promote multi-party democracy. The Lancaster House Constitution of 1979 is still the Supreme Law of Zimbabwe today, thirty years after independence, itself being the parent Act to numerous colonial era Legislation (Chari et al. 2006). It is thus clear that Zimbabwe's laws are the pre-historic remnants of the colonial era.

After independence the government of Comrade Robert Mugabe did not implement the proposed media reforms from the colonial past. The pre independence media legislation was perceived as useful for disseminating information approved by the government. The only Act to be repealed was the Powers, Privileges and Immunities of Parliament Act (PPIPA, 1991). In January 1981, the government set up the Zimbabwe Mass Media Trust (ZMMT) as part of the government's new media policy. There have not been many changes and the basic provisions of LOMA have been re-enacted and adopted under POSA as well as the OSA, which remains on the statute books and has even been strengthened under provisions of AIPPA. The inescapable conclusion is that media freedom under the Smith regime is comparable in many respects to the current set up.

From 1991 to date, the Independent Press in the country has attempted to express its views but it has also been careful to reflect the government line when reporting through self-censorship. Private press is common and still exists. However, since the 2002 AIPPA was passed (which replaced LOMA that had been in place for 40 years earlier) the government has closed a number of media outlets, including the Daily News, a newspaper, which was perceived as supporting opposition politics in 2003. As a result, enterprising Zimbabweans have reacted by setting up radio and newspaper organizations

in both neighboring and Western countries. Reporters without borders claim that media regulation in Zimbabwe involves surveillance, threats, imprisonment, censorship, blackmail, abuse of power and denial of justice to keep firm control over news. Under this arrangement dissenting views are often scantily covered or not mentioned in the state media (media in which government has an interest, for example the Herald, Sunday Mail and Zimbabwe broadcasting cooperation), which has also criticized demonstrations and strikes against the government.

Current Media Legislation

It is noteworthy that there have been some changes in the freedom of expression and freedom of the media and this can be attributed to the amendment or rewriting of the current constitution of Zimbabwe. The government tried by all means to conform to the standards set out by the SADC Protocol on Culture, Information and Sport, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights Article 19, the African Charter Article 9, and the African Convention of Human and People's Rights (ACHPR), which advocates for freedom of media and expression. This is as stipulated in Section 61 of the Constitution of Zimbabwe.

Freedom of Expression and Freedom of the Media

1. *Every person has the right to freedom of expression, which includes,*
 - a. *Freedom to seek, receive and communicate ideas and other information*
 - b. *Freedom of artistic expression and scientific research and creativity*
 - c. *Academic freedom*
2. *Every person is entitled to freedom of the media, which freedom includes protection of the confidentiality of journalists' sources of information.*
3. *Broadcasting and other electronic media of communication have freedom of establishment, subject only to State licensing procedures that,*
 - a. *Are necessary to regulate the airwaves and other forms of signal distribution*
 - b. *Are independent of control by government or by political or commercial interests.*
4. *All State-owned media of communication must,*

- a. *Be free to determine independently the editorial content of their broadcasts or other communications*
- b. *Be impartial*
- c. *Afford fair opportunity for the presentation of divergent views and dissenting opinions.*
5. *Freedom of expression and freedom of the media exclude,*
 - a. *Incitement to violence*
 - b. *Advocacy of hatred or hate speech*
 - c. *Malicious injury to a person's reputation or dignity*
 - d. *Malicious or unwarranted breach of a person's right to privacy.*

Literature Review

Although Zimbabwe has always had an array of legislations, which have stifled freedom of expression from the UDI era to independence, in 2002 further media repression was reinforced. The government brought into effect laws such as POSA, AIPPA, BSA and the Private Voluntary Organizations Act (PVOA).

AIPPA governs the operations and general conduct of the media in a way that leaves media with little breathing space. AIPPA was passed by the parliament of Zimbabwe on 31st January 2002 and signed into law by President Mugabe on 15th March 2002. Since its enactment, Zimbabwean journalists and media practitioners have continued to endure harassment and threats as the media landscape continued to shrink following the closure of privately owned newspapers. This left the media with little space to fulfil its public watchdog status as the fourth estate, which plays an adversarial role against the government. Citizens have thus been deprived of their right to freedom of expression and the right to access information. AIPPA provides for access to information held by public bodies [Section 78], but it is up to the heads of these bodies to decide what they will and will not release "in the public interest". Ironically, it is not the public that decides what is in their interest but the government officials. The Act allows public officials to hold information for thirty days after a request for information is made, which may be impractical for journalists (Feltoe 2003).

Thakurta (2009) revealed that the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) was banned in Zimbabwe in 2001 and this was as a result of

restrictive media laws that were put in place by the Zimbabwean government. However, the BBC was granted the permission to report in Zimbabwe on 29th July 2009, and the breakthrough followed meetings between the broadcasters and senior government representatives, according to a report with the Zimbabwe Times on 29th July 2009.

AIPPA's trail of destruction, both emotional and physical, can be traced to its enactment in 2002 and the plethora of arrest, intimidation, harassment and measures of control, which immediately followed. These have been directed at media workers of all sorts including journalists, photographers, vendors and even newsroom drivers, as well as media outlets, in particular independent print media. Media space in Zimbabwe has continuously shrunk since the closure of Associated Newspapers of Zimbabwe (ANZ), publishers of the mass circulating, The Daily News and The Daily News on Sunday, on 12th September 2003. The government's determination to maintain AIPPA as its shield against criticism and exposure of corruption in higher offices came in the wake of the closure of the African Tribune Newspapers in February 2005.

Chari et al. (2003) also revealed that in 2000 the government of Zimbabwe took some steps to try and protect its hegemonic position from internal threats by strengthening its Ministry of Information. This notion was supported by Pottie (2000) who noted that the government employed a once ZANU PF critic outspoken Professor Jonathan Moyo into the party and government. He was given a very strategic position in the government to run the former Chen Chimutengwende headed Ministry of Information, Posts and Telecommunications, now the Ministry of Information and Publicity in the President's Office (Chari et al. 2003). Professor Jonathan Moyo was responsible for promoting ZANU PF's hegemony, a job he did well given his previous experience as a government critic. Former Director of Information in the Office of the President, George Charamba, was appointed the Permanent Secretary in this new strategic Ministry (Feltoe 1993). The Ministry reorganized and reoriented the Department of Information in the onslaught of a possible challenge in the upcoming 2002 Presidential and Parliamentary elections from the opposition Movement for Democratic Change (MDC), which was enjoying international media support.

POSA was promulgated in 2002, and was meant to repeal LOMA but in effect POSA may appear as a re-reworded version of LOMA. POSA contains provisions that curtail freedom of expression. POSA re-introduces provisions of the 1964 Preservation of Constitutional Government Act (repealed in 1999), which the Rhodesian government used to suppress nationalist movements such as Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) and ZANU PF. The new provision carries a penalty of twenty years imprisonment without the option of a fine for deliberately publishing falsehoods.

Pottie (2000) further noted that, whilst the Constitution proclaims the right to freedom of expression, association and assembly, these rights might be limited in the interests of defense, public order or public safety. Section 15 of POSA deals with publishing or communicating "false statements" considered prejudicial to the state. Section 15(1) of POSA makes it a criminal offence for a person inside or outside the country to communicate a statement that is wholly or materially false, and which promotes public disorder or endangers public safety, adversely affects the defense or economic interests of Zimbabwe, undermines public confidence in the security forces and disrupts any essential service. Proof that the statement was intended to cause any of the above is enough to bring about a conviction, which carries a fine and or a five-year prison sentence. The law applies not only to mass media, but also to reports produced by businesses and other civil society organizations. This false statement's provision is a re-enactment of Section 50 of LOMA. It however takes into account the Supreme Court's judgment in *Chavunduka and Anor versus Minister of Home Affairs and Anor*, in which Section 50 of LOMA was ruled to be in contravention of Section 20 of the Zimbabwean Constitution.

Mudzengi et al. (2003) further rubberstamped other authors' ideas by stating that in Zimbabwe, the broadcasting industry has not been expanded in any form since independence in relation to the growth of other media, including print and online publications. Chari et al. (2003) substantiated that the operations of ZBC are controlled by a Board of Governors, constituting between six to nine members appointed by the Minister of Information in consultation with the President.

Although ZBC is publicly funded by public funds earned through licensing and other pub-

lic support grants, the Minister of Information approves this budget, and thus it is not autonomous from party politics (*ibid*). Though headed by one government appointed Director General, ZBC consists of Television and Radio. The leadership of these two entities is selected based on their allegiance to the ruling party (Mudzengi et al. 2003). ZTV consists of one channel, which has a monopoly over the airwaves. ZBC radio consists of four channels, that is, 3 FM, Spot FM, Radio Zimbabwe and National FM, and ZBC programming is now guided by the BSA of 2001.

The delay in enacting new broadcasting policies is not a unique scenario to Zimbabwe but also occurred in other African countries that share the same colonial history. For instance, in Ghana, which attained its independence in 1957, broadcasting remained a *de facto* monopoly of the state for nearly 40 years (Quarmyne et al. 2000). "In Zambia, the public service broadcasters formed part of the government ministry of information and served the needs of the government" (Ndlela 2007). However, South Africa is one of the first African countries that promptly changed colonial laws to suit the new political order. Out of the constitutional negotiation processes of 1993 emerged the Independent Broadcasting Authority Act No 153. The major tasks undertaken by the IBAA after the country gained political independence in 1994 was to develop a national broadcasting policy (Ndlela 2007).

It is argued that the policy crises that are predominantly affecting most African countries including Zimbabwe are a legacy of repressive laws from the colonial and apartheid era. These have remained in the statute books of the majority of the countries in the region for too long despite the fact that such laws were strikingly incompatible with the new constitutional protection (*ibid*).

POSA, AIPPA and BSA violate fundamental human rights enshrined in the Zimbabwe Bill of rights as well as African Convention of Human and Peoples' Rights (ACHPR), Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) Protocol on Culture, Information and Sport and many other instruments to which Zimbabwe is a party to. POSA, AIPPA and BSA violate the freedoms embedded in Article 9 of the Charter, in that they impede on general public's right to receive information as this is subject to regulation by the executive and state's bureaucracy. The African Charter Article 9 states that, "Every individual

shall have the right to receive information. Every individual has the right to express and disseminate his opinions within the law".

METHODOLOGY

Qualitative and quantitative approaches were adopted in this study. A sample size of 55 participants, which comprised of (17) University Zimbabwe Media students, (16) Media Analysts and (17) Polytechnic Media students, (2) editors, (1) journalist and (2) human rights lawyers since they had in-depth knowledge in media laws in Zimbabwe was adopted. There were 600 participants as the total population from which only ten percent was used as the sample due limited time and resources. Qualitative approach was the principal methodology of data collection mainly because it allowed the media officers to talk for themselves and to pick abstract features of media laws. The quantitative methodology was used to convert data into numerical form in order to subject it to statistical analysis.

RESULTS

Analysis of Whether Participants Think that Media in Zimbabwe is Free to Air its Views

Respondents were asked their opinion on the freedom of the Zimbabwean media to air its views. Fifteen percent of the total respondents pointed out that to some extent the media laws were free to those who had access to them, but were also biased on political basis. Seventy-two percent of the total respondents said that the media was not free to air its views in Zimbabwe, because the laws that were currently in place deprived them of certain information they wanted to hear, especially on political issues. However, thirteen percent of the total respondents said that the media is free to air its views because of the availability of different media spheres opposing the state run media. They further pointed that the media is free as was seen during the run off to the elections where all the political parties were given the platform to reach out to the voters through the use of media.

Autonomy of Journalists to Report Freely in Zimbabwe

Eleven percent of the participants agreed that journalists reported freely in Zimbabwe and

eighty-nine percent of the participants did not agree that journalists reported freely in Zimbabwe about political issues, because of the repressive media laws that were in place, that is, BSA, AIPPA and POSA. Journalists were not allowed to report on information that is viewed as an attack on government policies. AIPPA's trail of destruction can be traced to its enactment in 2002 and the plethora of cases of arrests, intimidation, harassment and measures of control, which immediately followed. These have been directed at media workers of all sorts like journalists, photographers, vendors and even newsroom drivers, as well as media outlets, in particular independent print media. This left the media with little space to fulfil its public watchdog status as the fourth estate.

Media Laws in Zimbabwe's Allowance for Media Freedom

Media laws in Zimbabwe have a certain degree of limitation on freedom of expression. These laws contradict Section 20 of the Zimbabwean Constitution, which states that:

Except with his own consent or by way of parental discipline, no person shall be hindered in the enjoyment of his freedom of expression, that is to say, freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart ideas and information without interference and freedom from interference with his correspondence.

75.5 percent of the participants agreed that the media laws in Zimbabwe do not allow for media freedom, because they hinder freedom of expression, 24.5 percent of the participants said the media laws in Zimbabwe allow for media freedom and this is due to the fact that most of them were aligned to ZANU PF. The general feeling was that media laws in Zimbabwe did not allow media freedom at all, as they were biased because they were crafted to serve political interests of a single party and very few individuals.

To support the above the following dominant responses were gathered

"Media laws in Zimbabwe cannot be incongruent with the Constitution because the Constitution is void. The Constitution was drafted by concerned parties, that is, the British government, ZANU and ZAPU during the Lancaster House agreement. Even the current process of media reforms was initiated by talks from the three parties (the ruling ZANU PF, MDC-T and

MDC-M) and the same talks centered on the issue of a new Constitution for Zimbabwe." Therefore the reforms, which are taking place, are certainly not in congruent with the Constitution and even the current Constitution does not call for freedom of expression. "Zimbabwe is a constitutional democracy. What it means is that the Constitution is the supreme law of the land and all acts of Parliament are subject to Constitution scrutiny." Section 3 of the Constitution aptly captures this concept. Legislation governing the media in Zimbabwe is fragmented. Some provisions are found in security legislation and some in properly so-called media laws such as AIPPA Section 20 of the Constitution, which provides for media freedom.

"As would be expected, the freedom granted is limitless but subject to claw back clauses of the Constitution on the grounds of national security and health morality, and what it means therefore is that the Constitution allows for any law to be enacted, which allows for a limitation of Constitutional rights provided such laws are justifiable in a democracy. The question one has to ask therefore is whether POSA and AIPPA are justifiable in an open democracy. POSA has provisions, which in my submission on are inconsistent with the Constitution. For example Section 16, which criminalizes criticism of the office of the President in both the private and public capacity. Criticism for any person holding public office should be seen as an occupational hazard and if it was necessary to protect the reputation of the President, that could have been achieved through the common law of defamation. This section is hardly justifiable in a democracy. Sections of AIPPA also appear to be inconsistent with the Constitution, for example, the provision that provides for registration of journalists. This is inconsistent with an open democracy in more open democracies".

"The media at the present moment is polarized into the state controlled and the private media. The polarization has affected how people get accurate, truthful and unbiased information. The information that has been reported by the private media has been termed Western ideology. In those circumstances it is difficult to get the truth and participate in politics from an informed position, but do not try in any way to disclose my name because I will refuse having any dialogue with you."

“Of course the government should set up statutory bodies to control the media but this must be done in such a way that the freedom of individuals are not infringed. In fact government efforts should be corroborated by self-regulatory mechanisms within the media. The most important thing would not only be to ensure there is freedom of expression but also freedom after expression.” As Edison Zvobgo a former Minister of Justice once said, “I might have freedom to express myself but I am not sure if I will remain free after that expression”. The solution is both political and legal. Because any changes to the law, which lack political will, will be nothing more than deception. There is an urgent need to depoliticize public institutions such as ZBC and also develop a culture of human rights in which people are not only free but prepared to ask and fight for their rights and also to be accountable. Freedom should always be accompanied by responsibility”.

The above findings dispute with what the European Commissioner to Zimbabwe Mr. Aldo Dell’Ariccia said during an interview with Fari-rai Machivenyika in the Herald of 17th September 2010. Mr. Aldo Dell’Ariccia acknowledged the existence of a free Press in Zimbabwe. He also said, “I have been in this country for the past eight days and what I can tell you is that there is a press that is free. You can read newspapers in this country and have a feeling of independent information”.

CONCLUSION

The study revealed that as a matter of law, AIPPA along with related legislation such as POSA and the BSA, are quite clearly in serious breach of the right to freedom of expression as guaranteed under international law in a number of key ways. These laws significantly fail to strike a balance between the legitimate interests of the state, for example in preserving national security and public order, and the rights to freedom of expression and democracy.

The study also recognized that there are current media reforms that are being mooted by the government. However, as good as it may seem, these reforms are not holistic and credible even before their implementation because of continuous political bickering amongst parties in the inclusive government. A closer look at the changes in the media sector shows a huge gap

between the changes in print as compared to broadcasting. Potential private radio and television operators have been waiting for many years and there seems to be no light at the end of the tunnel concerning any concessions especially by ZANU PF with regard to freeing the electronic broadcasting sector.

It is evident from the findings that political institutions in Zimbabwe are fragile in the absence of democratic political culture. Respondents showed considerable skepticism about significant changes without having political consensus. The lack of any consensual model of democracy and the political intolerance reinforce this fragility. Freedom of the media is being affected by the presence of hostile politics, media regulations and laws. Since partisan conflict is intense, it is therefore difficult for the partisan media to be effective and objective in expressing public opinion. These findings correspond with Khupe who said, “It’s my view that current media laws in Zimbabwe are restrictive...calls for self-regulation and reforms were genuine”.

The post-independence regime at each stage of the political evolution of Zimbabwe kept most of the media regulations, including Rhodesian colonial media legislations to serve their vested interests. The historical review presented here strongly supports that a free media is a prerequisite for the development of democratic institutions. However, it is arguable that a free media is difficult to achieve in an atmosphere of strong ideological differences as currently obtains among the inclusive government parties.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations to the Government of Zimbabwe

This study recommends that the Government of Zimbabwe must practically repeal AIPPA as well as POSA and the BSA to match with the current Constitution. Repressive laws like these have no place in a democratic country since they seriously limit the freedom of expression, undermine participation, good governance and accountability, as well as the exposure of other human rights abuses. The government should urgently institute comprehensive and broad media reforms that will facilitate the establishment of a transparent and democratic media regulating mechanism to foster and protect diverse

media and the free flow of information and access to alternative sources of information.

More so, the Zimbabwe Media Commission should be encouraged to be independent in its execution of duties and be allowed to make apolitical appointments. The government must also give licenses to new players in the broadcasting industry rather than to maintain the monopoly of ZBC as well as media houses in order for the society to have a wider choice unlike just listening to propaganda of the state.

Thus, Zimbabwe must follow in the footsteps of South Africa, Botswana and also Mozambique where media is self-regulated and there is no government interference. This is so because self-regulating media authority working within a democratic media framework compatible with international instruments on freedom of expression is the only obligatory route to achieving a genuinely free and diverse media environment.

The researchers also noted that there is need to have an investor friendly environment to boost the growth of the industry. Hence the final recommendation is that the Government of Zimbabwe should initiate a broad, open consultative process to develop legislation giving effect to the right to information, which is consistent with international standards and best practices. This should include the establishment of an independent media monitoring body. The Government of Zimbabwe is also advised to undertake a comprehensive program of public education on the right to information once the legislation has been passed. This entails reviewing all laws and official practices, which reflect freedom of expression and ensure that they are consistent with international constitutional standards.

Recommendations to Civic Society

Civic actors are advised to actively lobby legislators and other decision-makers to promote the adoption of right to information legislation and constantly remind the government to defend the Constitution they are saying to be advocating for adherence to.

They are also advised to integrate the right to information as an element of corporate governance even in their varied organizations.

NOTE

1. Masiyiwa Hldgs (pvt) Ltd & Anor V Minister of Information 1996 (2) ZLR 756

REFERENCES

- Chari TJ, Byuma TS, Maputsani C 2003. *Media and Communication in Zimbabwe and Africa*. Harare: Zimbabwe Open University.
- Feltoe G 2003. *A Guide to Media Law in Zimbabwe*. Harare: Legal Publications Unit, Legal Resources Foundations.
- Feltoe G 1993. Institutionalising and human rights and the role of a press in the promotion of human rights. In: P Nherere, M d'Engelbronner-Kolff (Eds.): *The Institutionalisation of Human Rights in Southern Africa*. Oslo: Nordic Human Rights Publications, pp. 165-186.
- Masiyiwa Hldgs (Pvt) Ltd and Anor V Minister of Information 1996 (2) ZLR 756. From <crm.misa.org/upload/web/T%20S% 20 MASIYIWA% 20HOLDINGS .pdf.> (Retrieved on 28 October 2010).
- Mazula R, Hussein T, Mararike C, Deketeke P, Mandigora T 2003. *National Survey on Broadcasting in Zimbabwe: A Report on a Survey Carried Out by the Broadcasting Authority of Zimbabwe*. Harare: BAZ.
- Melber H (Ed.) 2004. *Media, Public Discourse and Political Contestation in Zimbabwe*. Uppsala: The Nordic African Institute.
- Mudzengi E, Gunduza MC, Nyakupinda D 2003. *Radio and Television Studies*. Harare: The Zimbabwe Open University.
- Ndlela N 2007. Broadcasting Reforms in Southern Africa: Continuity and Change in the Era of Globalisation. From <http://reference.kfupm.edu.sa/content/b/r/broadcasting_reforms_in_southern_africa_77599.pdf.pdf> (Retrieved on 28 October 2010).
- Pottie D 2000. *Zimbabwe: Constitutional Referendum in Zimbabwe*. Harare, Zimbabwe: Government of Zimbabwe.
- Quarmyne AT, Ansah K, Apenteng B, Asante KB, Gordon D 2000. Ghana National Media Policy. From <<http://www.ict.gov.gh/pdf/NMC-MEDIA-POLICY.pdf>> (Retrieved on 28 October 2010).
- Thakurta PG 2009. *Media Ethics: Truth, Fairness and Objectivity*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Windrich E 1981. *The Mass Media in the Struggle for Zimbabwe: Censorship and Propaganda under Rhodesia Front Rule*. Gweru: Mambo Press.

Paper received for publication on July 2015
Paper accepted for publication on December 2015