

In 2007, I decided to go to South Africa for my exchange, where I studied for five months at the University of the Free State in Bloemfontein. During my exchange I attended a history course called "The Land Question". The course explained the colonial history of both South Africa and Zimbabwe and described how the land question arose. I did not really know much about the colonial history of Africa and the fact that a lot of African countries are still suffering from this period was new to me. Zimbabwe, that for a long time, has been known as the granary of Africa, is now in a state of crisis. The lecturer of the course, Mr. Twala, who is a Zimbabwean himself, fled out of the country when the situation in Zimbabwe started to change. His stories about Zimbabwe were very impressive and, therefore, my interest in this country started to grow.

At the end of the course, I had to write an essay on the land crisis in Zimbabwe with special emphasis on the causes, the course and the impact of the land crisis to its citizens. While doing my research I discovered that Robert Mugabe's policies are the main reason for the current land crisis in Zimbabwe. After I finished the course I was really interested in learning more about Zimbabwe and its history, therefore I decided to write my thesis about this African country.

However, I had to find a connection between Zimbabwe and my specialization Public Administration before I could come up with a central question. Together with Mrs. van den Haspel, I decided that it would be interesting to look at the role of the International Community in Zimbabwe and how the attitude of this Community towards Zimbabwe has changed over time. Since the International Community as a whole is too broad to examine I decided to select a couple of important International Organizations that have been involved in Zimbabwe before and after the presidency of Robert Mugabe. Before I defined these organizations, I arranged an interview with Pascal Richard from Zimbabwe Watch (department of the Nederlands Instituut voor Zuidelijk Afrika) to obtain a better view of the International Organizations involved in Zimbabwe and what kind of role they play and have played in the country.

The current situation in Zimbabwe is very tense and complex. Many countries, organizations and people had hoped the presidential elections of March 2008 would finally put an end to Robert Mugabe's presidency. Nevertheless, it looks like Robert Mugabe is not yet willing to resign. The elections only made the situation worse and a run-off is needed to decide who will be the next president of Zimbabwe. These current developments made it difficult to write reliable recommendations. Still, I believe that the International Organizations I defined can really make use of and learn from the comparison I made in my thesis. Moreover, I think they can learn from each others role in Zimbabwe as well, and perhaps it is even possible that the organizations will build upon each others activities.

Maaike Kooijman

2008, May 14<sup>th</sup>

Nootdorp

---

<b>Preface</b>	
<b>Abbreviations</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1. History of Zimbabwe in bird's-eye-view</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1 The British South African Company	6
1.2 The opposition	8
1.3 The end of the white mastery	9
<b>2. The presidency of Robert Mugabe</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1 Political changes	10
2.2 Economic changes	10
2.3 Social changes	11
2.4 The land question	12
2.5 The relation between the black and the white population	13
2.6 The opposition	13
2.7 The reaction of the International Community	15
2.8 The current situation in Zimbabwe	17
2.8.1 Presidential elections of March 2008	18
<b>3. The International Organizations involved</b>	<b>19</b>
3.1 <i>Before the presidency of Robert Mugabe</i>	19
3.1.1 The World Bank & the International Monetary Fund	19
3.1.2 The Food and Agriculture Organization & the World Food Programme	20
3.1.3 The Southern African Development Community & the African Union	20
3.1.4 The European Union	22
3.1.5 The Commonwealth	22
3.1.6 Amnesty International	23
3.2 <i>During the presidency of Robert Mugabe</i>	23
3.2.1 The World Bank & the International Monetary Fund	23
3.2.2 The Food and Agriculture Organization & the World Food Programme	25
3.2.3 The Southern African Development Community & the African Union	27
3.2.4 The European Union	28
3.2.5 The Commonwealth	30
3.2.6 Amnesty International	31
<b>4. Comparison of the role of the International Community in Rhodesia and in Zimbabwe</b>	<b>33</b>
4.1 The World Bank & The International Monetary Fund	33
4.2 The Food and Agriculture Organization & The World Food Programme	34
4.3 The Southern African Development Community & the African Union	35
4.4 The European Union	36
4.5 The Commonwealth	37
4.6 Amnesty International	38
<b>5. Conclusion</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>6. Recommendations</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	

AI	Amnesty International
AU	African Union
BSAC	British South African Company
ESAP	Economic Structural Adjustment Programme
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
MDC	Movement for democratic change
NCA	National Constitutional Assembly
NDP	National Democratic Party
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NIZA	Nederlands Instituut voor Zuidelijk Afrika
SAC	Structural Adjustment Credit
SADC	South African Development Community
SRANC	South Rhodesian African National Congress
UANC	United African National Council
UDI	Unilateral Declaration of Independence
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WFP	World Food Programme
ZANU	Zimbabwe African National Union
ZAPU	Zimbabwe African People's Union

My thesis will examine the course of the relation between the International Community and Zimbabwe. To be more precise, I will describe both the relation between the International Community and Ian Smith's Rhodesia and the relation between the International Community and Robert Mugabe's Zimbabwe. Since the International Community as a whole is too broad to examine I decided to select nine International Organizations that have been active in Rhodesia as well as in Zimbabwe.

My thesis will give answer to the question:

***“ What kind of role did the International Community play in Zimbabwe before Mugabe gained its power? What aspects changed in the attitude of the International Community during the presidency of Mugabe? ”***

In order to answer the central question, the following sub questions have to be posed.

- What is the history of Zimbabwe?
- How did Robert Mugabe become president of Zimbabwe?
- Which changes took place in Zimbabwe when Robert Mugabe became president?
- What have been the causes of these changes in Zimbabwe?
- What have been the effects of these changes in Zimbabwe?
- How did the International Community react on the changes in Zimbabwe?
- What kind of International Organizations have been involved in Rhodesia?
- What kind of International Organizations have been involved in Zimbabwe?
- What kind of tasks did the International Organizations fulfil in Rhodesia?
- What kind of tasks did the International Organizations fulfil in Zimbabwe?
- Are there any direct measures taken by the International Community to improve the current situation in Zimbabwe?

To give a proper answer to my central question and my sub-questions I made use of several research methods. First, I started with a secondary research. In this phase I made use of the Internet, I watched a couple of documentaries, I collected and read several newspaper articles and I consulted a number of books. Second, after I gathered all the necessary information from my desk research I approached the Royal Dutch Embassy in Harare, Zimbabwe, to obtain more information on which organizations have been most involved in Zimbabwe. With the information of my desk research and the answers of the Embassy, I started to define the International Community which will be further explained in the third chapter. During my field research I approached most of the Organizations I defined; unfortunately few were able to respond to my questions. Yet, I have been able to arrange an interview with Pascal Richard from Zimbabwe Watch (Nederlands Instituut voor Zuidelijk Afrika). The interview gave me a clear view on the relation between different International Organizations and Zimbabwe and the future prospects.

Zimbabwe has for a long time been one of Africa's biggest exporters of food. Nowadays, the country has got problems with feeding its own population. The inflation is very high and same counts for the unemployment rate. It is clear, that one of Africa's richest countries has dropped to one of Africa's poorest countries. Therefore, the purpose of my thesis is to explain how, a once prosperous country as Zimbabwe could end up in the demolishing

crisis it is right now and what is and has been the effect of the International Community on this crisis. Moreover, I believe it is very interesting and instructive to see how the attitude of the International Community has changed over time and which aspects influenced this attitude.

At the moment, there are a lot of new developments in Zimbabwe, therefore I decided to focus my thesis on the situation before the Presidential elections of the 29<sup>th</sup> of March 2008. In chapter 2 I will give a short description of the current situation in Zimbabwe, this will, however, not include any information on the reaction of the International Community on the elections. The current situation also made it difficult to give accurate recommendations. Therefore, my recommendations are based on two case scenarios: the chance that Mugabe will be re-elected and the chance that another president will be chosen.

My thesis contains four chapters, a conclusion and recommendations.

#### *Chapter 1*

This chapter focuses on the history of Rhodesia with special attention to the course of the Liberation War and the government transition, in which Mugabe played an important role.

#### *Chapter 2*

Chapter 2 holds the changes that took place in Zimbabwe. I examined the causes of these changes and how the International Community reacted on the worsening situation in Zimbabwe. Furthermore, one of Zimbabwe's biggest problems, the land issue, is being discussed.

#### *Chapter 3*

This chapter focuses on the International Organizations separately. I will explain the role of all these organizations in Rhodesia as well as in Zimbabwe.

#### *Chapter 4*

Chapter 4 is a summary of the International Organizations involved in Zimbabwe and the activities they have carried out. Furthermore, this chapter holds a comparison of the role of the International Organizations before and after Mugabe came into power. In addition, chapter 4 gives answer to the first part of the central question.

#### *Conclusion*

The conclusion will give answer to the second part of the central question and it gives a brief summary of my thesis as a whole.

#### *Recommendations*

The recommendations are aimed at the International Organizations individually. Moreover, the recommendations are divided into two case scenarios, one in case Mugabe will be re-elected and the second in case another president will be chosen.

# 1. History of Zimbabwe in bird's-eye-view

---

*Zimbabwe has got a stirring history which is mainly characterized by years of colonisation and civil wars. Research shows, that the Shona was the first tribe that settled down in Zimbabwe. The Shona lived already well over a 1000 years in Zimbabwe before other tribes entered the country. These foreign tribes, mostly farmers, settled down in the North of Zimbabwe. However, the Shona remained the biggest tribe living in the country. The Shona population is actually composed of different ethnic groups with similar cultures but different political ideas. In 1511, the first European, the Portuguese Antonio Fernandes, set foot on Zimbabwean land. In the course of years, the Portuguese gained more and more power in Zimbabwe. Their goal was to subjugate the Zimbabwean empire, however, the population of Zimbabwe did not let this happen. Nevertheless, Zimbabwe was highly affected by the attempt of the Portuguese to conquer their country. Soon after this, there arose another threat. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century the Ndebele, a South-African tribe, settled down in Zimbabwe. The Ndebele managed to conquer the country and they renamed it to Matabeleland. Together with the Shona they formed the biggest part of the population (Bossema, 1999, pp. 6-8).*

## 1.1 British South African Company

---

In 1880, Matabeleland raised the attention of the Brits and 43 years later Matabeleland officially became a British colony. The British imperialist, Cecil Rhodes, played an important role in this period. After his search for diamonds in the Cape he decided to explore Matabeleland (Akker & Teeffelen, 1998, p.6). He established the British South African Company (BSAC) and he started to exploit the natural resources of Matabeleland, primarily ore (Bossema, 1999, pp. 9-10). In 1888 Rhodes made an agreement with the king of the Ndebele people so that he could purchase some of the natural resources of Matabeleland for a certain amount of money. There were, however, no agreements made between Rhodes and the king concerning land rights. Nevertheless, Rhodes did not care about that and he decided to capture the country and to name it to himself, Rhodesia ("Zimbabwe the battle for land", n.d., "before the settlers", para. 4). In 1896, the Shona and Ndebele revolted against the colonists. They attacked British military entities which led to vehement fights. The African population could not defend themselves against the fire weapons of the Brits, thus eventually they had to give up the fight (Shillington, 1998, p. 11).

Rhodes convinced the British public and the South African farmers to come to Rhodesia by offering the first 200 free land and gold. The system worked and after a short period of time, a lot of Brits came to Rhodesia ("Zimbabwe the battle for land", n.d., "before the settlers" section, para. 5). The white colonists had a hard time to survive on their farms. They tried to imitate the agricultural methods of the Shona but this did not work out well. They simply could not compete with the African farmers. As a consequence, the number of poor white farmers in the country started to grow. Naturally, this was not a development the BSAC had in mind. The BSAC believed that the white farmers would not make it if they did not interfere. That is why the BSAC implemented some new measures in order to support the white farmers. Still, despite these measures, the African farmers anticipated very well in the new market for agricultural products (Bossema, 1999, p. 10).

Immediately after the first revolts in 1896, the BSAC decided to establish reserves for the African population. The Shona and the Ndebele, without permission, were put into these reserves. Rhodesia was literally separated into a black and a white area. Initially, the BSAC did not proceed to deportations, however, after the white population put pressure on the BSAC they decided to implement more rigid legislation. In 1908, they introduced a new law that

left the African population with three options. The first option was to work in the mines or at the plantations of white farmers. The second option was to become a leaseholder at the land of the white farmers who did not have the knowledge to cultivate the land. The last option was to move to the reserves. In several ways the BSAC made sure that it became harder for the African population to manage. The taxes were rising, the agricultural equipments became more expensive and the African farmers who lived outside the reserves had to pay rent. These measures led to an enormous removal of the black Africans to the cheap but poor soil in the reserves. On the contrary, the white farmers were favoured, they received grants from the BSAC and the black Africans who could not pay their rent were obliged to work on the land of these white farmers for free. In this period, more and more colonists settled down in Rhodesia (Bossema, 1999, p. 11).

From 1889 till 1923 the BSAC governed Rhodesia as a private enterprise, yet under the flag of the British Crown (Bossema, 1999, p. 10). In 1923, Rhodesia obtained its own governing board and it officially became a British Colony named, South-Rhodesia. The new government implemented even more laws that strongly harmed the black African population (Bossema, 1999, p. 11). The Brits developed a commercial agricultural regime, in which only a few areas were granted to the African population. The land in these areas was not suitable for agriculture and the climate was really bad. In 1930, the Land Apportionment Act even disallowed all locals to own any land outside the reserves. This act divided the country, mainly to the benefit of the whites. The locals were officially chased away from the land where they had lived for generations. Further, the Native Registration Act made sure that the freedom of movement of the black Africans became restricted. Additionally, the white farmers received a higher price for their products than the black farmers. This resulted in a lot of anger and unrest ("Zimbabwe the battle for land", n.d., "Colonisation" section, para. 3-6).

The Second World War meant a massive economic growth for South-Rhodesia. More and more Europeans and South Africans settled down in the country. There arose a more varied industry of consumption products. The new factories needed cheap fulltime workers who would not go back to the reserves by the time they had earned enough money. That is why, the government decided to build special districts (townships) around the cities where the black workers and their families could live. Nevertheless, these black families lost their right to land in the reserves. Through these measures the government was hoping to tackle the problems in the overpopulated reserves. Because the black workers were obliged to move to the townships, there was more land remaining for the ones left behind in the reserves. The government believed that the black farmers in the reserves could develop themselves into capitalistic farmers. However, the white farmers did not agree with this idea because they were afraid of the competition. Eventually, the government gave in to the pressure and they restricted the cultivation of certain cash crops of the black farmers (Bossema, 1999, pp. 12-14).

In 1953, South-Rhodesia formed a federation that consisted of South-Rhodesia, North-Rhodesia and Nyasaland. This was only for a short period of time because 10 years later the federation fell apart because of unrest. North-Rhodesia was renamed to Zambia and Nyasaland to Malawi. In 1965, Ian Smith, the Prime Minister of Rhodesia, pleaded for the independence of South-Rhodesia, the so called Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI). The International Community, especially the United Nations (UN) and the United Kingdom (UK), was of the opinion that the UDI was illegal. As a consequence, International sanctions were implemented against the white minority in Zimbabwe (Shillington, 1998, p. 44). No other country recognized the Rhodesian government. Only South-Africa worked together with Ian Smith because South-Africa wanted to maintain the leadership of the white minority in South Rhodesia ("Landen en Staten", n.d., "Eenzijdige onafhankelijkheidsverklaring" section, para. 1).

In the same year, the reserves for the black African population were renamed to Tribal Trust Lands. The situation in these Tribal Trust Lands was horrible, mainly because they were overpopulated. The communal lands and the Tribal Trust Lands that were granted to the black Africans were most of the time neglected because they did not have the money to purchase the means required to cultivate the land. On the contrary, the white farmers were being financially supported by the government, thus they had enough money to purchase agricultural equipments. This made it even harder for the black farmers to compete. One percent of the total population was white and they owned 70 percent of the best land. Approximately 2000 white farmers supplied the whole country with food (Bossema, 1999, p. 15).

## **1.2 The opposition**

Since the 1950s the resistance of the black African population began to grow. The black trade unions and well-being associations became more radical. Different kinds of organizations were established, for instance the South Rhodesian African National Congress (SRANC) and the National Democratic Party (NDP). The organizations strived together for independence and for the right to vote. However, the government prohibited the existence of these kinds of organizations. In 1961, the situation started to change with the establishment of the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) which was founded by the former NDP members Joshua Nkomo and Robert Mugabe. However, soon after ZAPU was founded it was banished by the government. In 1965, Ian Smith called out the state of emergency, so that he could randomly arrest his counterparts. Nevertheless, ZAPU continued to exist as a resistance movement. But there arose some discord within ZAPU about the best way to reach independence. As a consequence, ZAPU decided to split up (Bossema, 1999, p. 15-16).

The Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) was founded by the dissatisfied ZAPU members. Both parties mainly operated from out of Tanzania ("Landen en Staten", n.d., "Conflict blanken met Afrikaanse meerderheid" section, para. 1). The members of ZANU were not afraid to use violence against the white minority. However, in the first 10 years little progress was made and the most important leaders were thrown into prisons. Also, both ZANU and ZAPU had to deal with an internal power struggle. Eventually, in the late 70s Robert Mugabe was chosen to become the leader of ZANU. In the same period, the government of South-Rhodesia was ravaged by guerillas which meant the beginning of a Bush War which lasted eight years. The guerillas were members of ZANLA and ZIPRA, the armed forces of both ZANU and ZAPU. The land question was the most important cause of the civil war. The guerillas found support in the Tribal Trust Lands where they could recruit new warriors. This way, the guerillas were able to draw further into the country. ZANU wanted to provoke an economic crisis by chasing away the white farmers. The guerrillas tried to reach their goal by the use of terror. The government reacted in the same way against the guerillas with a harsh approach. On both sides human rights were being violated (Bossema, 1999, p. 16-17).

Besides organizations such as ZANU and ZAPU, more and more black internal political parties came into being, of which the United African National Council (UANC) was the most important one. Harmed by the guerrilla attacks Smith had to negotiate with the growing black opposition. Ian Smith together with the internal parties tried to gain more black Africans in the government without involving ZANU or ZAPU. For a short while, Smith was leading the government together with some members of the UANC. In this period, Smith renamed the country again, as Zimbabwe-Rhodesia. However, this was only for a short period of time because Great Britain did not approve the new regulation. Smith was forced to negotiate with ZANU and ZAPU. ZANU and ZAPU decided to work together,

as the Patriotic Front. Eventually, the neighboring countries and the organization of African Unity were tired of the continuous violence in Rhodesia and they wanted the civil war to end. Therefore, they arranged a meeting in 1979 that took place in the Lancaster House in Great Britain. This meeting laid the foundations for the Lancaster House Agreement (Bossema, 1999, p. 18).

### **1.3 The end of the white mastery**

The name Zimbabwe arose from the Lancaster House Agreement which was signed by the British and South-Rhodesian government and the Zimbabwean opposition parties in London. This agreement finally put an end to the Bush War between the black freedom fighters and the white minority government. What is more, the parties agreed on a new constitution. It was an important step towards democracy. In 1980, Zimbabwe officially gained its independence. The Patriotic Front decided to split up, this time into ZANU-PF and ZAPU. ZANU-PF, under the leadership of Robert Mugabe, won the democratic elections and they became the ruling party in the new government (Bossema, 1999, pp. 19-20). The white minority feared for their privileged position and they were afraid that the new government would ruin their lives. This, however, did not happen; the white minority was protected by a peace agreement and Mugabe also recognized the crucial role of the white farmers in the economy of Zimbabwe (Bossema, 1999, p. 5). In the beginning, Mugabe pursued a reconciliation policy. Things were starting to change when in 1982 Nkomo, Minister of Home Affairs, was removed from government because he did not agree with some of Mugabe's ideas. After this incidence, the tension in the country started to grow which exploded in a massacre, caused by the government's army, in the birthplace of Nkomo, the province Matabeleland North ("Landen en Staten", n.d., "Verkiezingen en onafhankelijkheid" section, para. 1).

Mugabe, and its party ZANU-PF, were able to win the elections because he promised that the indigenous black population would get their land back. He told the black Africans exactly what they wanted to hear. Yet, in the first eight years of his presidency, Robert Mugabe did not make any changes when it comes to the distribution of land (Bossema, 1999, p. 20).

## **2. The presidency of Robert Mugabe**

---

*When Mugabe came into power, thousands of white farmers applied for the Zimbabwean nationality. Mugabe became the status symbol for a promising African statesman (Akker & Teeffelen, 1998, p.15). He gradually implemented a couple of political, economic and social changes with disastrous consequences. It was not really a radical break from the former policies but it was a progressive course to the left (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007). In the first years after independence, the government implemented some social reforms in order to improve the situation with regard to the black population, both men and women. Education and health care became accessible for the whole population. Furthermore, the black population gained more rights and the government introduced a minimum-wage. These social reforms can be explained by the fact that Mugabe has got a socialist background related to the Liberation War. However, there has also been a dark side to Mugabe's regime. Mugabe did not tolerate any objections of the opposition parties. This was the beginning of the growing poverty and years of terror (Bossema, 1999, p.5).*

### **2.1 Political changes**

The Lancaster House Agreement changed the type of government in Zimbabwe similar to the type of government in Great Britain. The economic structure, however, stayed the same. Mugabe became Prime Minister and Canaan Banana fulfilled a ceremonial function as president. In 1987, the government changed the constitution which made sure that Mugabe became president with a lot of power. The white ministers, who were still members of the parliament thanks to the Lancaster House Agreement, were removed from the office. As mentioned in the first chapter, Nkomo was removed from government because he did not agree with Mugabe's Marxist ideas. Mugabe wanted Zimbabwe to become a single-party-state. In 1988, Nkomo agreed to the fact that his party, ZAPU, would merge into Mugabe's ZANU-PF. In this time, the opposition only consisted of some small parties. Mugabe was re-elected during the elections of 1990 with a huge majority. Due to the amendment of the constitution, the parliament only consisted of one room. ZANU-PF was the most powerful party in parliament; they occupied no less than 117 of the 120 seats, which means that the opposition only consisted of three seats (Bossema, 1999, pp. 20-21).

### **2.2 Economic changes**

As mentioned in the former chapter, the new government maintained the capitalist economy. This was also due to the fact that Zimbabwe was bound to several debts and agreements (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007). At that moment, Zimbabwe had one of the best developed economies in Africa. Thus, there was a lot at stake. Moreover, Zimbabwe did no longer have to suffer from International sanctions thus the economy was able to develop itself even further. The economy could benefit from new consumer markets and the Zimbabwean industry could finally make use of more modern industrial machines that could replace the old-fashioned ones. Between 1980 and 1981, the economy grew with approximately 13 percent. In 1982, the economy started to stagnate as a consequence of years of droughts and the world recession. Nevertheless, the economy of Zimbabwe was still growing with 4, 5 percent each year. The biggest disappointment was that the large-scaled foreign investments and loans stayed away. Foreign investors were scared of the unstable political situations in other African countries. Besides, the investors did not agree with the government's socialist policies. To gain the confidence of these investors, Mugabe implemented a binding monetary policy. This strategy worked for a while,

but eventually the costs of Mugabe's socialist policy began to take its toll, as can be read in the next few sub-paragraphs (Bossema, 1999, pp. 45-47).

### **2.3 Social changes**

During the regime of Ian Smith only 42 percent of all children went to school. Almost 50 percent of all adults was illiterate. The new government approached the problem of educational delay in a dynamic way. Education became free for all children. After these new measures were implemented, the number of children going to school grew rapidly. However, this progress also had a downside, it became very difficult to find adequate teachers and the level of education turned out to be hard to improve. Education was mainly focussed on basic knowledge similar to the British educational system. Most students did not pass their exams and the unemployed rate was rising rapidly (Bossema, 1999, pp. 35-36).

Looking at the health care in Zimbabwe, the situation before independence was comparable to the situation with regards to education. The difference between the black and white population was enormous. In the rural areas there were hardly any medical facilities. The new government tried to reorganize the health care. They mainly focussed on the former Tribal Trust Lands, where they built a network of hundreds of infirmaries. In addition, they tried to eliminate the main causes of the diseases, primarily unsafe drinking water and the lack of food. Nonetheless, this socialist policy did cost the government a lot of money which put an end to further social improvements (Bossema, 1999, pp. 36-37).

In 1990, Mugabe suddenly put an end to his idea of Zimbabwe becoming a single-party-state. The foreign donors made clear that they did not believe in these ideas. The new educational and health care system increased the foreign debt and Zimbabwe was facing more and more financial problems. The economy of Zimbabwe was declining and Mugabe really needed the money of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) (Bossema, 1999, p. 21). The IMF and the World Bank were only willing to provide loans to Zimbabwe if Mugabe would diminish the government expenditures. Mugabe decided to change his policies, which resulted in a more liberal economy. In 1991, Zimbabwe signed an agreement with the IMF which resulted in the Economic Structural Adjustment Programme (ESAP). This programme placed strong charges on the social and economic sector (Bossema, 1999, p. 48). However, this programme only worked for a couple of years because of long periods of droughts throughout the country (Chitiyo, 2000, p. 17). In time, all these changes only brought about more corruption and it put an end to a period of reconciliation between the labour unions and the government (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007).

The changes in the government's policies also put an end to the social welfare services. The government's expenses on education and health care were strongly declining. The system of free education was discontinued and parents had to pay tuition if they wanted their children to go to school. A lot of parents could not afford this. Eventually, the ideal of a broad education for everyone did no longer exist. The same happened with health care, the prices for medicines and medical help became more and more expensive. Many people still tried to obtain these facilities, which resulted in a further pauperization of the population. In addition, the wages for doctors and nurses declined, many of them were forced to look for other jobs in different sectors. In the end, there was a lack of qualified medical staff. In the late 90s, the AIDS epidemic made the situation even worse (Bossema, 1999, pp. 35-37).

## 2.4 The land question

In 1980, the land issue was really becoming a problem. Mugabe blamed the land crisis on the fact that Zimbabwe had been colonized. He stated that the distribution of land was necessary to create political and economic stability. The government had huge plans concerning the resettlement of thousands of people. They mainly focused on the areas that were forbidden to the black population during the domination of the Brits. However, after the government pronounced their plans concerning the land reform nothing actually happened (Chitiyo, 2000, p. 15).

Around 1985, the black Africans were tired of waiting on their “promised” land and they did no longer want to wait for arrangements by the government. They decided to unite themselves in special groups, the so called squatters, and seized the land of politicians and elites by themselves. The government did not accept this and took strong actions against these squatters (Foldvary, 2000, para. 1-3). In the same year, the Land Acquisition Act came into being. This gave the government the right to purchase land for redistribution. The main principle was “willing seller, willing buyer”. This act did not change a lot because the government did not have enough money to purchase the land. In the eighties, only 71.000 families, living on farms, of the 162.000 were resettled. In 1981, the black farmers started to attack the white farmers. The attacks were violent and sometimes even resulted in murder. Around 1990, it became clear how serious the situation concerning the land crisis truly was (“land reform in Zimbabwe”, 2008, “1980s” section, para. 1).

In 2000, the situation was really dramatic, hundreds of black farmers invaded farms of the whites and a lot of people were killed. In the same year, the government decided to implement a new constitution. This constitution gave the government the right to take the land of the commercial farmers for redistribution without paying. Naturally, the white farmers did not accept this constitution and decided to boycott the statute. The government decided to ask the population what they thought about the constitution by means of a referendum. Provided that the majority would vote in favour of the new constitution it would be implemented. The constitution was rejected with 55 percent of the votes. A few weeks after this, the followers of Mugabe invaded the land of the commercial farmers and claimed they had seized it (“land reform in Zimbabwe”, 2008, “2000” section, para. 1).

In 2005, another law was implemented that made all the agricultural ground national property. It was impossible for the farmers to go to court and object to this new law (“land reform in Zimbabwe”, 2008, “2005”, section para. 1). Mugabe also introduced Operation Murambatsvina, this operation removed the townships in Zimbabwe without ensuring that the inhabitants had some other place to stay (“Zimbabwe’s operation Murambatsvina: the tipping point?”, 2005, “executive summary” section, para. 1). In 2006, the government made plans for the banks. They wanted the banks to lend money to the disadvantaged African peasants so that they could purchase the appropriate equipments to cultivate their land. If the banks resisted, they lost their license. As one might expect, these plans did not work out well because the African peasants had no experience in the field of commercial farming (“land reform in Zimbabwe”, 2008, “2006” section, para. 1-3).

The land reform was something that needed to happen, however, it was not carried out in the right way. The African peasants did not have the means and knowledge to cultivate the land, thus the land was being neglected. Apart from this, a lot of land, meant for the resettlement of the black Africans, came into the hands of rich ministers and businessmen who did not know anything about agriculture (Chitiyo, 2000, p. 25).

## **2.5 The relation between the black and white population**

In the years before independence, many white farmers moved to another country. Since then, the white population only consists of one percent of the total Zimbabwean population. In the first year of independence, there was a lot of tension between the white and the black population, which sometimes resulted in violence. Nonetheless, this tension soon ebbed away and both sides had confidence in Mugabe's policies because he promised not to take any drastic measures. Nevertheless, the white population shrank into their own world and they did no longer care for politics. It is clear that there was no integration between those two groups. Yet, the new generation of white and black Zimbabweans did get more in touch with each other (Bossema, 1999, pp. 28-29).

However, the inequalities concerning land ownership remained to exist. This can be seen as the biggest problem of the relation between the black and the white population. The black African population was tired of waiting on their promised land. A lot of them shared the opinion of Mugabe namely, that they did not steal the land but just took back what belonged to them. One should keep in mind that a lot of black Africans worked on the land of white farmers. They were also being the victims of the violence but they did not have the ability and money to flee like the white farmers did (Mdlongwa, 1998, p. 10).

The white farmers united themselves in organizations such as the Commercial Farmer's Union. A lot of them have got a different opinion on the distribution of the land. Some of them consider it to be necessary to sell some of their land while others reject this idea and want to keep all the land for themselves. Because of all the violence they are scared and they feel like victims, that is why a lot of them fled to neighbouring countries, such as South Africa (Chitiyo, 2000, p. 17).

## **2.6 The opposition**

Throughout the years, Mugabe started to move more and more towards a dictatorial regime. Yet, he was re-elected again in 1995 with 92 percent of the votes. Though, the turnout of the election was very low, less than one third of the population decided to vote. After the elections, one district was accused of election fraud. Therefore, one independent candidate won a seat in parliament. After this occurrence, more and more independent candidates have thrown themselves in the election battle (Bossema, 1999, pp. 21-22).

The Zimbabwean population was disappointed in the new government, this explains the low turnout of the presidential elections of 1995 (Akker & Teeffelen, 1998, p. 13). The genocides that took place in Matabeleland north caused bitterness and apathy among the Zimbabwean population. It became clear that Mugabe made a distinction between different ethnic groups. Only the Ndebele people were granted more rights. As a consequence, the population lost its confidence in Mugabe. The problem concerning the redistribution of land continued to exist and the standard of living of most Zimbabweans did not improve. The white farmers still occupied big parts of the best land and the poor black families still lived in the overcrowded reserves owning small pieces of land. The new government promised to redistribute the land but this did not go as easy as they thought it would go. In the beginning, the government did purchase big parts of the land, which they divided among the black Africans but this process did not continue very long. The government tried to defend themselves against the criticism by blaming the economic circumstances and the lack of money. However, at the same time, the black elites enriched themselves with money from the government (Bossema, 1999, p.22).

The biggest opponent of Mugabe's regime was the National Labour-Union. The leader of the Labour-Union, Morgan Tsvangirai, was the most influencing critic against the government in that time. He established, together with the Council of Churches and several Human Right Associations, an organization called the National Constitutional Assembly (NCA). The NCA strived for a new constitution. In addition, the organization claimed the abolition of 30 appointed seats in parliament and they wanted to establish an independent National Electoral Commission. Moreover, the NCA wanted to put an end to the corruption within the government. The newspapers also became more critical with regard to the government. But the government still had a lot of influence on the daily papers and they practically ruled the television and radio. Therefore, the biggest part of the Zimbabwean population only heard positive news about the government. In the course of years, the government completely restrained the free press, furthermore the foreign media was being excluded (Bossema, 1999, pp. 22-23).

The NCA and other political organizations had a hard time to succeed because the government worked against any new political organization that criticized the government's policies. The state of emergency, declared by Ian Smith, was ended in the early 90s. But Mugabe enforced the security laws, which were implemented during this period, so that he could legally take strong actions against political opponents, journalists and human right activists (Bossema, 1999, p.34).

In 1996, the first protests against the government took place. These protests were the results of false promises, corruption and the lack of money. The economy was declining, thus the government was forced to economize, mainly on the wages of the civil servants. Soon after the government pronounced these plans, thousands of people went on the street to protest against these plans (Bossema, 1998, p. 25).

In 1997, Mugabe tried to regain the confidence of the population by taking over 1500 white companies, if necessary without compensation. He distributed this land among the black Africans. Naturally, the white population did not expect these new plans. This caused even more tension between the white and the black population (Bossema, 1998, p. 26). The government had to deal with a serious lack of money; therefore Mugabe decided to drastically raise the taxes and the excises so that he could fill up his budgetary deficit (Bossema, 1998, p. 48). Zimbabwe, which used to be one of Africa's richest countries, now had to deal with an economic crisis with the highest inflation in the world. The prices of several products increased drastically, sometimes even with a 100 percent. The inflation also devalued the Zimbabwean currency, the Zim-dollar (Akker & Teeffelen, 1998, p. 14). At the end of 1997, the first revolts broke out; the Zimbabwean people claimed Mugabe's resignation. Especially the members of the pension funds for the veterans of the Liberation War revolted against the government because these pensions almost lost all of their worth. The veterans started to criticize the government. They claimed that Mugabe let them down while they were fighting for him during the Liberation War.

*An old freedom fighter: "I have nothing to be proud of. I have not achieved anything.*

*The only thing I can be proud of is my participation in the Liberation War, but this whole occurrence, which is my only pride, has been put in a bad daylight because of people like Mugabe. He disgraced the fight (Ooij & Reiff, 2007).*

Eventually, Mugabe tried to satisfy the old veterans by giving them their well-deserved money. This occurrence was the main reason for the economic crisis because Mugabe spent money he actually did not have. His decision

to expropriate 1500 farms only made the situation worse, both in Zimbabwe and abroad people started to express their criticism on Mugabe's regime (Ooij & Reiff, 2007).

In 1998, Zimbabwe began to cause political unrest within the region. The country interfered in a political conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Some political opponents of Mugabe claimed that Mugabe only interfered in that political conflict so that he could distract the attention from the problems in Zimbabwe. Many Zimbabwean soldiers died during that war in the Democratic Republic of Congo and once more corruption played an important role. The social and political tensions kept on rising and the government took stronger actions against rebels (Bossema, 1999, pp. 26-27).

Mugabe knew that if he wanted to win the elections of 2000 he had to satisfy the war veterans, thus he used the land as a means of payment. Originally, the redistribution of the land was something ideological but in this case it was purely a political move, Mugabe just gave away the only thing he had left (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007). The outcome of the elections of 2000 was remarkable because the new political party, Movement for Democratic Change (MDC), obtained 18 percent of the votes. Most supporters of MDC live in the urban areas while the supporters of Mugabe can mostly be found in the rural areas. Provided that the government would not have committed fraud the MDC would have won the elections of 2000 ("Inwoners Zimbabwe kiezen nieuwe president" section, 2008, para. 3-4). The MDC consists of several opposition parties that are against the constitution, Morgan Tsvangirai is their leader. The political party is still growing in its followers; it can be seen as the most important opposition party in Zimbabwe. According to the MDC all the elections after 2000 were being rigged and manipulated by the government. The government tried and is still trying to silence the MDC by the use of violence and by throwing them into prisons ("Moverment for Democratic Change", 2008, para. 1-3).

## **2.7 The reaction of the International Community**

The International Community reacted in different ways on the changes in Zimbabwe. They did not really give a reaction on the changes in Zimbabwe until the land question really began to play its part (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007). Only the United States (US) already discontinued their development aid in 1986 after Zimbabwe criticized the attitude of Reagan's government with regard to South-Africa ("Zimbabwe", n.d., para. 12).

In 1998, there has been a land conference in which different parties brought up a rather large amount of money. However, these parties only wanted to provide money under certain conditions. The Zimbabwean government did not agree on these conditions. At that moment, the International Community and Zimbabwe ended up in a confrontation phase. It did not mean that the International Community did not want to help Zimbabwe but from both sides there were certain conditions that just did not match. In 2000, the International Community started to express their criticism on Mugabe's regime mainly because of the land crisis and the slum demolition campaign (Operation Murambatsvina). Besides this, 2000 was also the year in which the referendum, concerning the constitution, took place. The majority of the population voted against the proposal of the government. In the same period, the number of followers of the biggest opposition party, the MDC, started to grow. There were six months between the referendum and the actual elections. During these six months the government ruled with a heavy hand. Because of this, more and more people started to criticize the Zimbabwean government. These three aspects, the referendum, the rising of the opposition party and the way the government acted, came together and raised the attention of the International Community. The International Community was hoping that the MDC was

able to defeat the government during the elections. At that moment, the MDC received a lot of support from outside. However, Mugabe used this occurrence to argue that all the western countries worked against him and Zimbabwe (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007).

The International Community mainly reacted in two ways. On the one hand, they, especially Europe and the US, tried to put pressure on the government of Zimbabwe. On the other hand, they supported the MDC. Europe tried to put pressure on the Zimbabwean government in several ways, especially through the Commonwealth. Germany, the UK, Scandinavia and the Netherlands were the most active countries in Europe. The Southern European countries were far less active. However, the approach of pressuring Mugabe and his government did not work out well, and the situation started to escalate. According to Pascal Richard of Zimbabwe Watch, the International Community forgot to work towards the regions. Initially, they tried to operate from out of South-Africa, but this did not have much effect because they only used bilateral pressure (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007).

The International Community was mostly concerned about the violation of human rights in Zimbabwe. In 2000, European election observers were still allowed to monitor the elections in Zimbabwe but during the presidential elections of 2002 most of them were thrown out of the country. Mugabe only invited elections observers from countries with a more positive view of Zimbabwe, mostly African countries. This is why the West, Europe and the US, has got a totally different view of the situation in Zimbabwe than the African countries (Laakso, 2002, "Abstract" section, para. 1). In brief, the situation concerning human rights has been the biggest concern of the International Community. In the same year, Europe reached a common position on the situation in Zimbabwe (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007).

The neighbouring countries of Zimbabwe, especially South Africa, were the last ones who reacted on the situation in Zimbabwe. One reason for this is that many African leaders are not much better than Mugabe. Moreover, the African countries made the same mistake as the western countries because they misjudged the situation in Zimbabwe. South Africa is often blamed for the fact that they have chosen the approach of quiet diplomacy. However, South Africa has tried, although there was a lot of tension, to support the opposition parties in Zimbabwe. Yet, there have been a few African ministers who have expressed their opinion on the situation in Zimbabwe but their statements were not approved by the African governments. For instance, the president of Zambia compared Zimbabwe with a sinking Titanic. Soon after pronouncing this statement, he sent one of his ministers to Zimbabwe to apologize for his judgements. In the region, countries really do see Zimbabwe as a sinking Titanic, however, they do not feel obliged to confront Zimbabwe with their opinion about the situation because Mugabe is still the president of Zimbabwe. The African countries believe that if they want to cause changes in the country they should take the position of Mugabe into account (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007).

The financial institutes like the World Bank and the IMF stopped giving financial aid in 1999. They blamed the Zimbabwean government and Mugabe that they did not use the money in an efficient way and that they believed the government to be corrupt. Mugabe also did not keep his promise to economize on the government's budget. Jobs within the government were given away to friends of the ZANU-PF elites and through the state income several favours were being granted. The World Bank and the IMF were hoping that Mugabe would steer a new course because of the cut backs. Nevertheless, a year later it became clear that large amounts of money from the

funds for war veterans was given away to high ministers of Mugabe's government, while the ordinary old-veterans were living in poverty. The old-veterans began to revolt and Mugabe decided to comply with their request (Bossema, 1999, p. 25).

After independence, the UK supported the new government of Zimbabwe by means of financial support meant for resettlement projects. Mugabe, however, decided to give away the biggest part of the land to his colleagues and friends instead of the poor African population (Chitiyo, 2000, p. 25). Moreover, when Mugabe stated that he saw whites as the enemies of the state. He made the situation worse and he also attracted the attention of the British government ("Land crisis in Zimbabwe", 2000, para. 1-18). The British government was not against the land reform programme, but they were of the opinion that it should happen in an open and public way and that the only reason should be to fight against poverty. They do think that the government of Zimbabwe has failed to reach this goal and that it has taken few initiatives to try to reach it. For this reason the UK decided to put an end to financing Zimbabwean projects with regard to the redistribution of land (Mdlongwa, 1998, "donors withhold funding" section, para. 3-6).

The UN only reacted on the land crisis and, later, on the slum demolition campaign in Zimbabwe. The Secretary General of that time, Kofi Annan, had several talks with Mugabe. He believed that the only way to deal with the redistribution of land is by good cooperation and mutual agreement by all parties. According to Kofi Annan, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) should help to resolve the problem ("Anan postpones U.N. visit to Zimbabwe in wake of farm seizure", 2000, para. 2-11). However, there has been some discord within the UN whether to react on the slum demolition campaign in Zimbabwe or not. Especially, Russia and China did not want to meddle in the crisis in the country ("Zimbabwe Report Discussed at UN", 2005, "the UN security council" section, para. 1).

## **2.8 The current situation in Zimbabwe**

According to Fenneke Hulshoff of the "Nederlands Instituut voor Zuidelijk Afrika" (NIZA), the situation in Zimbabwe mid-2007 was still very tense, especially in the suburbs, the so-called high density areas. This was mainly due to the fact that the economic situation was still getting worse. These days, one can talk of a hyperinflation in Zimbabwe. The IMF predicts that the inflations will increase to 6,430 percent at the end of 2008. For this reason, the Zimbabwean government stopped publishing inflation figures, in order to draw away the attention of their economic situation. What is more, in 2007, the unemployment rate has increased to 80 percent (Markus, 2007).

It is clear that the people are suffering, they cannot even buy bread in the supermarkets. And if there are some products in the shops the prices change rapidly, in the after noon the merchandises will already be more expensive than in the morning. Malnutrition used to be something only the poor ones had to deal with, now everyone is poor. The authorities of Zimbabwe claim there is freedom of speech in the country but if a person expresses his or her opinion he or she can be abducted, tortured, murdered or arrested and it all happens unpunished. The government tries to accuse the victims of terrorism by using draconian laws. In fact, all 30 million citizens of Zimbabwe are prisoners in their own country (Ooij & Reiff, 2007).

A country which once was a big exporter of food now depends on developing aid. Mugabe wins his elections by means of violence and intimidation. In fact, members of the opposition are put in a dark light and sometimes even

held as prisoners. Apart from this, the economy is still declining while the inflation is rising. Besides, Zimbabwe has got the lowest life expectancy in the world. Health care, education and food production has completely collapsed. As a result, many inhabitants have fled to other countries because it is almost impossible to survive in the country ("Zimbabwe: an update", n.d., pp. 1-9).

### **2.8.1 The presidential elections of March 2008**

The presidential elections of the 29<sup>th</sup> of March 2008 have turned into a disaster. Right after the first results of the elections were released, the MDC claimed they had won the elections. However, at this point, two third of all the votes were not yet counted (Eg, 2008, para. 1-3). The tension in the country started to grow when the announcement of the official results was being delayed. The Electoral Commission explained that the outcomes of the presidential election were delayed due to the fact that there were four different elections at the same time.

At the end of March, the official results were still not released and the predictions of different parties, concerning the outcome, differed heavily. In the beginning of April, ZANU-PF gave another explanation for the delay of the official results. They stated that there were some problems with the calculation of the votes. A few days later, Mugabe claimed he was up for a run-off. The MDC was highly against a run-off, because they thought Mugabe would win the run-off by the use of intimidation and violence. Therefore, the opposition party decided to go to Court, claiming that the results should immediately been released. However, the Court did not have jurisdiction in this case, thus they could not comply with MDC's request.

Meanwhile, several Electoral Officials, journalists and opposition members have been arrested or seriously beaten. ZANU-PF justified these actions by claiming that the MDC had manipulated the elections by working with Electoral Officials. Mid-April the MDC called on the population of Zimbabwe to demonstrate against ZANU-PF, so that they would release the official results. This demonstration did, however, not have much impact and the ones who were demonstrating were arrested by the police. In the same period, the Electoral Commission decided that it was time for a re-count of the votes. The outcome of this re-count was again being delayed and the MDC claimed that the whole re-count was highly flawed. The Commission promised that the results of the re-count would be pronounced at the end of April.

At the first of May the results were eventually being released, however, another problem arose. The MDC came up with totally different figures than the Electoral Commission. According to the MDC, Tsvangirai had won the elections with 50, 3 percent of the votes while the commission stated that Tsvangirai had won only 47, 8 percent of the votes against the 43, 2 percent of Mugabe ("Zimbabwean presidential election, 2008", 2008, para. 9-28). None of the candidates won the majority of the votes which means that a run-off is necessary to determine who will be the next president. On the fifth of May, the MDC stated that they will decide whether to participate in the run-off or not by the time the Electoral Commission will pronounce the date for the presidential run-off. (Sibanda, 2008, para. 1-2).

### **3. The International Organizations involved**

---

*There has been some discord within the International Community about how to react on the long-lasting economic and political crisis in Zimbabwe. In general, almost all Western countries have been criticizing Mugabe's regime. These countries, who are strongly against Mugabe's way of governing, have implemented a couple of measures to influence the Zimbabwean government to change their policies. On the contrary, many African countries expressed their support to the Zimbabwean government. This can be explained by the fact that many African leaders still see Mugabe as an elder statesman and the leader of the battle against colonisation. Nevertheless, this positive view of Robert Mugabe, shared by many Africans, is starting to change. Some African leaders conclude that the situation in Zimbabwe is damaging the African interests and that political and economic reforms in Zimbabwe are necessary. Yet, in 2007, there were still some African countries that were supporting Mugabe with regards to Zimbabwe's successful request to lead the UN Commission on sustainable development ("Zimbabwe to chair major UN body", 2007, para.3). One says that these African countries are supporting Zimbabwe because they want to show their solidarity.*

*It is clear, that the relation between Zimbabwe and the International Community, especially the West, remains tense. Most International Organizations have narrowed or even discontinued their activities in the country. Moreover, the EU, the US and some members of The Commonwealth have applied sanctions against Zimbabwe. Currently, Zimbabwe only receives International financial support that aims at providing humanitarian aid, the fight against HIV/ Aids and the protection of human rights. Since Zimbabwe's relation with the West is weakening, the country tries to amplify its political and economic relationship with non-traditional partners, such as China and India (Baxter & Lenneiyee, 2007, "Development partners and government" section, para. 1).*

*The following organizations and institutions all played a significant role in Zimbabwe before and after 1980: The World Bank and The International Monetary Fund (IMF), The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and The World Food Programme (WFP), The Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) and The African Union (AU), The European Union (EU), The Commonwealth and Amnesty International (AI).*

#### **3.1 Before the presidency of Robert Mugabe**

##### *3.1.1 The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund*

The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) are two of the world's most important International Financing institutes. Many African countries, Zimbabwe included, are very dependent on the loans of the World Bank and the IMF (Shah, 2007, para. 1-2). However, the relation between these two organizations and Zimbabwe has not always been very fruitful. During Ian Smith's regime as well as during Mugabe's regime there have been a considerable number of conflicts between the country and, especially, the World Bank. However, there is no information available about the role that the IMF fulfilled in Zimbabwe before 1980.

In the period before Ian Smith introduced the UDI, the World Bank carried out five projects in Rhodesia. In 1952, 1956 and in 1964, the World Bank conducted three projects focussed on the promotion of electricity. These projects supported the extension of the distribution of electricity services in Rhodesia. Their main goal was to improve the capacity of these services. Furthermore, in 1960, the organization carried out a project aimed at rural development. The World Bank supported this project with no less than 5.6 million dollars. The project had three

goals namely, to put an end to soil degradation, to create an agricultural community and to upgrade the well-being of the farmers. The fifth project of the World Bank, which was carried out in 1958, aimed at the infrastructure of Rhodesia, especially the public transportation of products. ("All Projects", n.d., "Zimbabwe" section, p. 100).

After Smith launched the UDI in 1965, the UN decided to implement sanctions against Rhodesia because they were of the opinion that the UDI was illegal ("History of Rhodesia", 2008, "Declaration of Independence" section, para. 2). This put an end to the relation between the World Bank and Rhodesia because soon after the UDI was introduced the World Bank discontinued all its activities in Rhodesia. It was not until 1980 that Zimbabwe became an official member of the World Bank. After this period the organization continued its activities and started to play an important role in Zimbabwe ("All Projects", n.d., "Zimbabwe" section, p. 100).

### *3.1.2 The Food and Agriculture Organization & the World Food Programme*

Rhodesia used to be an agrarian country. According to Artsen zonder Grenzen (2006), "the country was even called the granary of Africa" (para. 1). It is clear that Rhodesia was not in need for any food aid in that time. However, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) did have some activities in Rhodesia; most of these activities were focused on gathering statistical information. In 1979, the FAO focused on the draw up of a geographic (soil) map of Rhodesia, so that they could classify the different soil types. In the beginning of the same year, the FAO investigated the use of land in Rhodesia which resulted in a land classification report ("GeoNetwork", n.d. para. 2 & 9). What is more, in the 60s the FAO studied forestry education and training in Rhodesia (Lafond, 1970, "Source Material" section, para. 1).

In the period before 1980, the FAO possessed a broad statistical database of all kinds of information concerning Rhodesia, for instance the population density, new economic developments regarding the production of food and agricultural goods, the different kinds of food the population consumed and the most important food imports as well as exports ("FAO nutrition country profile", 2001, pp. 5-25). However, the FAO did not carry out any projects in Rhodesia ("Field Programme Activities", 2003, para 1-4).

The World Food Programme (WFP) only operates in countries where the population is excluded from food because of a natural or human disaster. When Ian Smith was still in charge, the country had one of the biggest food industries in Africa. This explains the fact why the WFP did not have any projects in Rhodesia before 1980 ("World Food Programme", 2008, "Goals and Strategies" section, para 1). However, this does not mean that there were no people suffering from malnutrition in Rhodesia. In 1979, the Red Cross conducted a research on malnutrition in Rhodesia and discovered that 13 percent to 29 percent of the Africans were undernourished. When a white official in Rhodesia was asked to give some information about malnutrition in his country, he stated that there were just no figures to prove the high percentages of malnutrition in Rhodesia (Danaher, 1981, p. 33).

### *3.1.3 The Southern African Development Community & the African Union*

Zimbabwe was one of the founders of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) which was officially established in the 80s. The organization can be seen as a reaction towards colonisation and the white mastery in many countries of Southern Africa ("SADCC", 2007, para. 1). Because the SADC was not yet an International Organization before 1980, the role of the separate members of the SADC in Rhodesia will be described.

When Ian Smith declared the UDI in 1965, no country recognized the Rhodesian government. Most African countries supported the sanctions that were implemented by the UN (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007). Only South Africa kept on cooperating with Ian Smith. South Africa was still marked by the apartheid regime and therefore the South African government supported the white minority in Rhodesia. The country tried to ease the consequences of the economic sanctions towards Rhodesia, maintained by the UK and the UN. Furthermore, South Africa provided police assistance to Rhodesia until 1974.

During the Liberation War in Rhodesia the other neighbouring countries, Tanzania, Zambia and Mozambique, allowed the opposition parties ZANU and ZAPU to operate from out of their territory ("landen en staten", n.d., "Geschiedenis" section, para. 1-5). In 1971, Botswana, Tanzania, Zambia and Angola decided to form a coalition to fight for the liberation of Rhodesia, also known as the Frontline States. These states were already independent and were afraid that the white ruling minority in Rhodesia would form a threat to them. This coalition was a very important development in that time.

The Frontline States acted as an intermediate to help the black African opposition members to attain a shared feeling of unity. In the past there was a lot of disagreement within the different Liberation Movements in many African countries. This often turned out to be a big problem. That is why the Frontline States tried to avoid these problems by creating a black African unity with similar goals. The conference in Lusaka reinforced the relation between the black leaders. Besides the fact that the Frontline States wanted to create a black unity, their most important goal was to amend the Rhodesian constitution that was implemented in 1969 by Ian Smith to oppress the black population. The coalition also wanted to implement a democratic voting system in which both black and white people were allowed to vote (Bossart, 1993, para. 9-15).

Most of the members of the Patriotic Front were in favour of the use of violence, thus the guerrilla attacks remained the most important instrument against the white minority. For this reason, the Frontline States supported the Patriotic Front, made up of the ZANU and ZAPU. Ian Smith's regime suffered under the continuous pressure from the Patriotic Front, the Frontline States and the International sanctions. These three points together established a situation in which negotiations could occur. Besides this, South Africa also stopped supporting Rhodesia because of the long duration of the conflict and their economic situation. The most important mediators in that time were Conda, president of Zambia, and Niyera of Tanzania, they both worked with Ian Smith and they tried to keep the Frontline States as one united team. Eventually, Ian Smith gave in to the pressure and the Lancaster House Agreement came into being, which ended the white mastery. In short, it is clear that the Frontline States and Mozambique played a very important role during the Liberation War in Rhodesia (Bossart, 1993, para. 15-21). Ian Smith himself declares in his book "The Great Betrayal", that it was the pressure from out of Pretoria, South Africa, that put an end to Smith's regime. Smith stated that South Africa turned its back against Rhodesia during the 70s (Vlasblom, 1997, para. 6-7).

The SADC members, Swaziland, Malawi and Lesotho did not play any role in Rhodesia. In addition, the African Union (AU) was established in 2002, which means that the organization as a whole did not fulfil any task in Zimbabwe before the presidency of Mugabe ("African Union", 2008, para. 1).

### 3.1.4 *The European Union*

The European Union (EU) was officially established in 1993 ("European Union", 2008, para. 1). However, many European countries, individually, fulfilled a certain role in Rhodesia. The UK, former colonist of the Zimbabwe, played a particular role in Rhodesia, as described in the former chapters.

But the Netherlands also had a special relationship with Rhodesia. In 1955, the Netherlands and, in that time, the federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland signed an agreement on migration. This agreement had to facilitate the migration of Dutch citizens to the Federation ("Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland and Netherlands", 1957, pp. 1-4). According to Pascal Richards, in that period, there were a lot of Dutch who immigrated to Rhodesia (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007).

Before 1965, the UK believed that the system in Rhodesia was a great success and an example for other African countries. However, this positive view of Rhodesia changed after Ian Smith introduced the UDI. As a result, some European Countries turned their back against Rhodesia. The UK immediately imposed International sanctions against the country in which they froze the Rhodesian credits. Soon after the UK implemented these sanctions, the UN urged their member states to not recognize the new regime in Rhodesia. The UN also obliged its members to implement economic sanctions against Rhodesia, especially aimed at the export of oil, weapons and parts of motors and airplanes. In addition, it was prohibited to offer Rhodesia any kind of aid. In 1968, all these sanctions were extended to binding sanctions (Bartlett, 1985, "Rhodesia" section, para. 1-4). Furthermore, in 1972, Rhodesia was even excluded from the Olympics in Germany ("1972: Rhodesia out of Olympics", 1972, para. 1). According to Ian Smith, the sanctions implemented by the International Community did not really concern the Rhodesian government; they knew how to bypass these sanctions. In many ways the sanctions were even stimulating, because in this period Rhodesia realised the biggest economic growth in the world (Vlasblom, 1997, para. 15).

Not all countries obeyed to the call of the UN to issue the International sanctions. Most of the European countries maintained a good political and economic relationship with Rhodesia. Moreover, for a long time, the Dutch enterprises wanted to stay in business with the enterprises in Rhodesia (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007). France even stated that the UDI of Ian Smith was only a British problem; therefore the country did not want to sign the resolution of the UN against Rhodesia. In contrast to France, Bulgaria was in favour of stricter sanctions against Ian Smith's regime ("Sanctions against Rhodesia", 1966, para. 4).

### 3.1.5 *The Commonwealth*

In the 50s and 60s many African countries became a member of the Commonwealth, including Rhodesia. However, this was only for a short period of time, because Rhodesia was excluded from membership of the Commonwealth soon after Ian Smith introduced the UDI ("The story of Africa", n.d., "negotiation" section, para. 1).

In 1966, the UDI was first discussed during a summit of the Commonwealth, where they decided to implement sanctions against Rhodesia. The Commonwealth was strongly involved in deciding what kind of sanctions the UK and the UN would implement against Rhodesia. However, before they decided what kind of sanctions they wanted to apply, the organization established a committee to examine the consequences of International sanctions against Rhodesia. After the committee examined these consequences the Commonwealth decided that the sanctions should aim at the economy of Rhodesia. On the contrary, the organization tried to support the

Rhodesian Africans by starting an education programme (McKinnon, 2003, "Zimbabwe: From Minority Rule to Independence" section, para. 2).

In 1979, the Commonwealth played a very important role in putting an end to the crisis in Rhodesia. The organization implemented a three-phase program to put an end to the minority rule. This program eventually led to the Lancaster House Agreement and after democratic elections, observed by the Commonwealth, Rhodesia gained its independence (McKinnon, 2003, "Zimbabwe: From Minority Rule to Independence" section, para. 3-4).

### *3.1.6 Amnesty International*

Amnesty International (AI) has been very active in Zimbabwe before and after the presidency of Robert Mugabe. AI began to play an active role in Rhodesia in the 70s.

In the 70s, the organization was focused on the situation regarding human rights in Southern Africa. This is mainly due to the fact that the apartheid regime, in South Africa, became one of their biggest concerns. In 1977, AI attended an International conference in Maputo, Mozambique, in support of the people of Rhodesia and Namibia. During this conference, the representatives of AI tried to focus the attention on the violations of human rights, especially the treatment of prisoners, in these two countries (Joyce, 1978, pp. 1568-1569). In 1976, the organization decided to testify, in front of the Commission of Human Rights, on the situation in Rhodesia. The working group of this Commission decided to compile a report which, among others, included information on the violation of human rights in Rhodesia obtained by AI. Later on, AI used this report to raise public awareness through its National Sections (Joyce, 1978, pp. 1568-1569).

In this period, AI was mostly concerned with the following issues in Rhodesia. The government made use of preventive imprisonment; which means that people were locked up without a trial and without knowing for how long. Furthermore, the physical condition of the released (political) prisoners was often appalling. In addition, the government made use of the death penalty for a lot of different offences. Besides, political prisoners were frequently tortured. Moreover, the government did not want to carry out an investigation on the violation of human rights by the Rhodesian Security Forces and AI was worried about the forced settlement of many rural Africans to the Tribal Trust Lands (African Studies Association, 1976, p. 34).

## ***During the presidency of Robert Mugabe***

### *3.2.1 The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund*

When Zimbabwe gained its independence, the International sanctions that were implemented in 1965 were abolished, which was very profitable for the Zimbabwean economy (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007). As explained in the former chapter, after Mugabe became president he had many plans regarding the education and health care systems. These plans were focussed on reducing the inequalities between the white and the black population through economic and social reforms. Especially the social reforms resulted in high costs. At the same time, the economy started to decline and Mugabe had to deal with a serious lack of money (World Bank, 2004, "Summary" section, para. 2). At this point, the importance of the role of the World bank and the IMF started to grow.

In 1980, the World Bank reacted in an appropriate way on the government's strategy with regard to the Zimbabwean economy, which means that the organization supported Zimbabwe in managing their economy for instance, the World Bank assisted the country by indicating the errors in Zimbabwe's poor economic management structures (World Bank, 2004, "Summary" section, para. 2). However, the Bank forgot to pay attention to one of the most crucial points in Zimbabwe's history namely, the land reform program. Despite financing this land reform program, most projects aimed at the infrastructure of Zimbabwe (World Bank, 2004, "Summary" section, para. 2). Moreover, critics argue that, in that time, the conditionality policy of the World Bank laid too much pressure on the developing countries, including Zimbabwe. These conditionalities mainly consisted of harmful economic policy requirements that were attached to the World Bank's development aid programmes (Eurodad, 2007, para. 1).

In the 1990s, the bank tried to support Zimbabwe by means of analytical and advisory activities, such as formulating reform programs and raising awareness on structural adjustment (World Bank, 2004, p. 15). However, the bank was not able to carry out these activities in the best way. For example, on some important issues they did not undertake the analytical work needed, which again refers to the land reform program (World Bank, 2004, p. 15). Yet, as mentioned before the bank did not deal with the crucial issue concerning land reform. The reason for this is that they were simply unable to finance the land purchase. However, critics state that the World Bank could have tried to support land reform by means of analytical and advisory activities on alternative approaches (World Bank, 2004, "Summary" section, para. 1-10).

Between 1991 and 1996, the World Bank granted two SACs to Zimbabwe. These SACs, which included the ESAP, resulted in a couple of reforms in Zimbabwe but the country was never able to completely stabilize its economy. This can be explained by the fact that Mugabe was not willing to make essential adjustments, such as reorganizing the civil service and restructuring the government's companies (World Bank, 2004, p. 29). Another important reason is that the financial liberalization and the "tax diminution" implemented by the government led to high costs which resulted in a debt trap (World Bank, 2004, p.7-9). The author Patrick Bond even states that Zimbabwe was forced by the IMF and the World Bank to implement the ESAP and that this program eventually led to the political and economic crisis in Zimbabwe (Vermeulen, 2006, para. 12).

In short, the role of the World Bank from 1980 till 2001 has been disappointing. Also the institutional development impact has been very small. On the one hand, the World Bank did support the liberalization of trade, the reformation of agricultural marketing activities, the deregulation of domestic investments and the establishment of a fund to protect the population against the social impact of the reforms. On the other hand, the World Bank did not support the stabilization of the economy, the change in expenditures and the decrease of poverty and inequalities. A research report of the World Bank in 2004 stated that they can do little to improve the economic and social agenda in Zimbabwe.

Between 2000 and 2004, the World Bank was mainly focussed on providing general policy advice. When it was recognized that this approach did not improve the situation in Zimbabwe the World Bank draw up the Interim Strategy Note in 2005. The main goal of this note was to facilitate the conversations between stakeholders and the closure of knowledge gaps. This strategy note was mostly financed by the Trust Fund that is meant for developing countries that are in a state of crisis (World Bank, 2004, p. 27-29).

Since 1999, the World Bank and the IMF do not provide any more loans to Zimbabwe, mainly because the government does not pay its debts and because white farmers are being chased away from their land without compensation. Even if Zimbabwe would pay back all of its debts it is not likely that the country will soon receive another loan from the IMF. This is mainly due to the situation concerning human rights (Vermeulen, 2006, para. 7).

The IMF states that the extreme inflation will not come to an end until the government is changing their behaviour regarding their expenditures. The government of Zimbabwe ignored the advice of the IMF to devalue the official exchange rate. Instead of this, the governor of the Reserve Bank tried to alleviate the inflation through devaluing the Zimbabwean dollar by removing three zeros. According to some analysts the devaluation did not invert the lack of foreign exchange rates. At the moment, Zimbabwe owes the IMF 119 million dollars. In 2005 and 2006, Zimbabwe did pay a part of its debt to the IMF to avoid enforced abandonment from the IMF. This is because the IMF threatened to exclude Zimbabwe from the funds for debt payment arrears. It is unsure how Zimbabwe obtained the money to pay off its debts to the IMF (Ploch, 2007, pp. 25-26). It is clear that Zimbabwe attaches much value to the membership of the IMF, despite the fact that the IMF already closed its office in Zimbabwe in 2004 ("Background note: Zimbabwe", 2008, "Foreign Relations" section, para. 2). A member of the MDC thinks Mugabe tries to stay a member of the IMF because it is a matter of prestige (Vermeulen, 2006, para. 10). In the same way, Zimbabwe owes the World Bank an obligation of 409 million dollars (Ploch, 2007, p. 26).

At the moment, the role of the World Bank in Zimbabwe is to provide technical assistance, to improve the macro-economic policy, to provide food, to support the social sector and to fight against HIV-AIDS. Overall, the World Bank financed 33 projects in Zimbabwe between 1980 and 2000 ("The World Bank: Zimbabwe", n.d., para. 2).

Mugabe is not very positive about the IMF. He calls the organization "a political monster" that has never acted in the interest of Zimbabwe. He also believes that the UK and the US are using the IMF as an instrument (Vermeulen, 2006, para. 2). In a recent speech of Mugabe, he states that the International Organizations, especially the IMF and the World Bank, cannot extend their financial facilities to Zimbabwe because they do not have the approval of the US and the UK ("Mugabe on landownership and sanctions", 2008).

### *3.2.2 The Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Food Programme*

Zimbabwe was once known as the richest country of Southern Africa. However, in the year 2000 the country ended up in a downward spiral when the government of President Mugabe seized the land of the white farmers. This occurrence can be seen as one of the main factors of the economic and political crisis in Zimbabwe (Artsen zonder grenzen, 2008, para. 1). Many people are suffering from malnutrition because of droughts and the economic crisis. At the moment, food is even used as a political instrument, which means that the food is divided among the ZANU-PF members. Opponents of Mugabe do not receive anything ("Politieke situatie", n.d., "sterven van honger" section, para 1).

The FAO provides a lot of information and geographical maps about Zimbabwe which they obtained through many years of research. The organization focuses on a certain number of areas, namely sustainable development, the economic situation, the agricultural sector, the forestry sector, the fishery sector and technical assistance. These are the six fields of expertise of the FAO. The FAO provides this information to inform other International institutions or Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) about the situation,

in the field of food and agriculture, in Zimbabwe. Besides providing information the FAO also carried out 30 projects and programmes between 2003 and 2008. Since 2003, the FAO offers all kinds of assistance to Zimbabwe, which differs from supporting certain agricultural sectors to supporting education in order to build capacity and to improve certain policies ("Zimbabwe: general information", n.d., para. 1-7). The FAO sometimes works together with the SADC, they jointly started a project to control the Foot and Mouth Disease and Contagious Bovine Pleuropneumonia (FAO Emergency Operations and Rehabilitation Division, 2004, "Controlling Transboundary Animal Diseases" section, para. 1).

Despite the fact that Zimbabwe is in a state of crisis, the WFO is still able to provide food to the vulnerable people of Zimbabwe. The irony of Zimbabwe is that it may seem an ordinary country while it is in fact the opposite. The government knows how to hide the problems (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007). In 2003, Mugabe called on the International donors to provide Zimbabwe with one third of the total demand for food to avoid a famine. However, because of a lack of finance the WFP was forced to halve the food rations ("The Republic of Zimbabwe at a Glance", n.d., para. 23).

In 2005, humanitarian actions of the UN, aimed at homeless persons, were being opposed by the Zimbabwean government. Furthermore, the solutions, proposed by the UN, for the temporary emergency measures for these people were repeatedly being rejected. Eventually, in March 2005 the UN received permission from the government to establish a couple of temporary relief camps (Amnesty International, 2007, "Dwarsbomen van humanitaire hulp" section, para. 2). In addition, in the same year Zimbabwe decided to sign an official agreement with the WFP so that the organization could provide food assistance for the period of one year (Ploch, 2007, p. 23).

At the moment, the WFP is supporting the population of Zimbabwe through different programs. These programs aim at, among others, displaced people, orphans, school feeding and child health. Besides providing food to vulnerable population groups the WFP also takes care of people with HIV or AIDS (World Food Programme, 2008, "WFP activities", para. 1-9). A big part of the budget of the WFP for Zimbabwe is being donated by the US (Ploch, 2007, p. 23). However, experts claim, that the food is used by the government to reward their members and to penalize opponents (Pan, 2003, "What International aid is Zimbabwe receiving" section, para. 1). The WFP strongly disagrees with these statements. The organization states that, by means of strict controls, they ensure that the distribution of food is not being disturbed by political intervention. The goal of the WFP was to reach 2.6 million Zimbabweans at the end of March (Rusere, 2008, para. 1-3). Pascal Richards believes that the WFP can control the distribution of food to the communities but only if they are there at the time. He thinks that if the members of the WFP leave the country, the distribution of food will be politicized. The biggest problem is that the government provides food as well, however, this food is strongly politicized.

In most cases, it is possible for an International Organization to work in Zimbabwe, however, they can not only focus on the humanitarian aspects, they also have to get involved in political aspects. For instance, the organizations that want to provide humanitarian aid, first have to talk with regional authorities to ask if they can work in that area. Afterwards, they have to talk with the local authorities, the chiefs, to negotiate in which way they will deliver the food. Thus, an International Organization has to negotiate with different institutional levels. Nevertheless, most International Organizations have to deal with some barriers in order to provide humanitarian aid, for instance, some of these organizations have been intimidated or arrested. However, as long as the

International Organizations do not interfere or criticize the political aspects of Mugabe's regime they are able to work in the country (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007).

### 3.2.3 *The Southern African Development Community and the African Union*

The history of the Southern African countries explains their current reaction and the roles they fulfil in Zimbabwe. Most of these African countries strived together during the Liberation War in Zimbabwe against colonisation and oppression by the white minority, which created a special band between the countries. Moreover, the members of the SADC are also economically attached to each other. The SADC was established after Zimbabwe gained its independence. Within this community Mugabe is seen as the man who liberated Zimbabwe (Markus, 2007).

Most African countries have been quiet about the situation in Zimbabwe for a long time. The members of the SADC did not judge Mugabe's regime because of solidarity. The SADC did what was expected of the African leaders. Robert Mugabe is their colleague, not a regime on its last legs which was stated by the Western governments. Solidarity is very important in this part of the world, where most African leaders only think about their own political career. All African leaders had their trouble with opposition parties or trade unions who wanted more power. In case they would criticize Mugabe's regime it is very likely that the SADC and the AU will condemn their governments as well, if they would violate human rights. For instance, a trade union like the MDC in Zimbabwe that develops into an opposition party is just as threatening for Mbeki as it is for Mugabe. The differences in the opinions of the Western world and the African countries are striking. The western world is hoping that Mugabe's regime will soon come to an end while the members of the SADC do not seem to bother the violations in Zimbabwe. Their only advice is that the different parties in Zimbabwe should engage in a conversation (Vermeulen, 2007, "Solidariteit" section, para. 1-3).

In 2005, the leader of the SADC was invited to observe the elections in Zimbabwe. Afterwards, the SADC congratulated Mugabe with the fair and transparent elections. This statement received a lot of criticism by the International press because the actual election observers within the SADC were not invited during the elections. After a research, which was carried out by domestic observers, it became clear that the election process itself was not free or just at all (Ploch, 2007, pp. 8-9). Furthermore, in 2005, South Africa promised to help Zimbabwe with their financial problems on a few conditions, the government should negotiate with the opposition party and they should respect human rights. But Mugabe answered that they don not need any help from abroad (Vermeulen, 2006, para. 11).

The South African churchman and Nobel Prize Winner Desmond Tutu is very disappointed in the fact that the African leaders do not judge the violations of human rights in Zimbabwe. Especially, the attitude of South Africa towards Zimbabwe is often being judged by the International Community. Till 2007, the South African president Mbeki did not say anything about the violence in his neighbouring country. Mbeki states that South Africa should not interfere in Zimbabwe's affairs. He rather appeals for a silent diplomacy than for a public condemnation. In addition, South Africa has got considerable large economic interests in Zimbabwe, which can also be considered as a reason for the silent diplomacy (Markus, 2007). Analysts believe that the SADC would be the best mediator when it comes to resolving the crisis in Zimbabwe. Therefore, the SADC appointed Mbeki to act as a mediator during the conversations between the different parties in Zimbabwe. Mbeki's task should have been to draw the country out of the current crisis. Nevertheless, Mbeki is already negotiating, behind closed doors, with the

different parties in Zimbabwe for over seven years but the situation in Zimbabwe has not changed. Mbeki said he does not want Zimbabwe's regime to change, instead he is in favour of democratic elections (Ploch, 2007, p. 2).

Recently the attitude of the African leaders is starting to change. The president of the African Union John Kufuor said he finds the commotion in Zimbabwe very painful. Furthermore, the president of Tanzania tried to discuss the situation with Mugabe, but Mugabe was not willing to talk to him ("Zimbabweaanse oppositie verklaart Mugabe de oorlog", 2007, para. 10). In Botswana the government wanted to close the Zimbabwean embassy. Although this did not actually happen, the criticism from the African countries is increasing. This is mainly due to the fact that local NGOs in Zimbabwe are lobbying within the African Union and the African Commission of Human Rights. These local NGOs also established a coalition with similar NGOs in the neighbouring countries so that the NGOs in other African Countries will pressure their governments to do something about the situation in Zimbabwe (Markus, 2007).

Despite the fact that some African leaders pronounced their judgements regarding Mugabe's regime, the International Community was hoping that they would also increase pressure on the Zimbabwean president to make some reforms. Yet, the SADC members might have been tough on Mugabe behind closed doors but not in their public response. They believe the EU should repeal their sanctions against Zimbabwe and they asked the UK to finance Mugabe's land reform program. At the moment, the question is raised if the SADC is able to handle the crisis diplomatically (Ploch, 2007, pp. 1-2).

In the beginning of Mugabe's presidency the AU was very supportive. In 2002, the Union still declared that the elections in Zimbabwe were fair. However, in 2004, the position of the AU towards Zimbabwe started to change. The Union wrote a report full of criticism on Mugabe's regime and they circulated the report during a summit. The report discussed, among others, several cases of police abuse and press censure. In 2005, the Commission for Human Rights of the AU adopted a resolution in which they called upon the Zimbabwean government to respect the fundamental rights and the freedom of speech of the Zimbabwean people. The Union assumed that this reaction would put a lot of pressure on Zimbabwe because it was the first time that such a large African organization publicly criticized the situation in Zimbabwe. Nevertheless, the resolution did not do much good, because Mugabe did not care about the condemnation of the AU. After operation Murambatsvina the AU tried to send a special researcher into Zimbabwe to investigate the case, but Mugabe would not let the researcher in the country (Ploch, 2007, pp. 38-39).

#### 3.2.4 *The European Union*

The role of Europe in Zimbabwe has frequently been discussed because of Europe's colonial past in Africa. Mugabe was able to anticipate on this situation by using Europe's colonial past. He has stated: "Europe has got neo-colonial interests" and "it is Europe against Africa".

After Independence, the UK became very supportive towards Mugabe's regime and financed big parts of the land reform program. Many Zimbabweans moved to the UK in that time to have a proper education. Although, at the moment, the official relationship between Zimbabwe and the UK is tense, the private contacts between the countries remain close ("Background note: Zimbabwe", 2008, "foreign relations" section, para. 3). From 1996 till 2000, the EU also provided financial aid to Zimbabwe. The organization financed different projects concerning, among others, electricity (European Union, 1999, "Zimbabwe" section), education programs concerning

human rights and fair elections (European Union, 1998, "Zimbabwe" section), health care, decentralized cooperation (European Union, 1999, "Zimbabwe" section), technical assistance (European Union, 1998, "Zimbabwe" section) and a feasibility study concerning different kinds of metals (European Union, 1996, "Zimbabwe" section). Besides providing financial aid, the EU also signed an agreement with Zimbabwe regarding, among others, the protections of consumers (European Union, 1996, para. 1) and the prices for sugar (European Union, 1997, para. 1-3). Furthermore, in 1996 there has been a meeting between the SADC and the EU to discuss the political and economic cooperation between the two organizations (European Union, 1996, para. 1-2).

The UK was the first European country which reacted on the worsening situation in Zimbabwe, therefore, they stopped financing the Lancaster Agreement in 1997. As a consequence, in 2000, the Zimbabwean government decided to resettle thousands of black Zimbabweans to the land of white farmers in the national interest ("Mugabe on landownership and sanctions", 2008). In 2002, other European countries got concerned about the situation in Zimbabwe because of the fact that European observers were excluded from the elections in the country ("Robert Mugabe", 2008, "elections" section, para. 1-7). After this occurrence the EU decided that it was time for some precautions, which resulted in political pressure and International sanctions. The US decided to institute similar sanctions towards Zimbabwe. The EU does, however, not make use of economic sanctions; the sanctions are mostly aimed at Mugabe and his government. To be more precise, the sanctions include that 130 Zimbabweans are not allowed to come to Europe, the European bank accounts of these 130 Zimbabweans are frozen and the EU will no longer provide bilateral help or military instruments. The Zimbabwean economy is mostly harmed by the sanction concerning the bilateral help (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007). Denmark even decided to close their embassy in Zimbabwe ("Commonwealth has suspended Zimbabwe", 2002, para. 8). The EU will only change its position towards Zimbabwe if the Zimbabwean government will implement some major reforms ("EU to Expand Zimbabwe Sanctions List", n.d., 1-10). In addition, the UK promised that if Mugabe retires and if the current policies are changed they will finance parts of the land reform programme (Ploch, 2007, p. 32). As explained in the former Chapter, the Southern European countries have been less active in Zimbabwe than the Northern European countries (Denmark, UK, Netherlands, Scandinavia and Germany).

Nevertheless, the sanctions implemented by the EU are not always being observed. Mugabe has been travelling to Europe despite the travel ban, because he is still allowed to attend UN events within European and US borders. Especially France does not always obey the International sanctions towards Zimbabwe. For instance, in 2005, France invited Mugabe to pay a visit to the country. France stated that the isolation of Mugabe would not put an end to the crisis in Zimbabwe (Ploch, 2007, p. 33). In December 2007, Mugabe was even invited to the EU/Africa summit in Portugal. Provided that the EU had prohibited the coming of Mugabe to the summit, the other African leaders would not come either. The EU accepted the demand of the African leaders and decided to invite the Zimbabwean president as well. Only the British Prime Minister Brown and his Czech colleague Topolánek stayed at home as a form of protest. Chancellor Merkel did, however, address Mugabe on the violations of human rights in the country (Boogaard, 2007, para. 1-5 & Jongsma and Roerig, n.d., para 1-7).

Besides trying to influence the Zimbabwean government, the European Community Humanitarian aid Office (ECHO), a special department of the EU, provides financial aid to Zimbabwe. ECHO is mainly focused on the following themes: water supply and sanitation services, the distribution of food (with special attention to children) and supporting the displaced people. Since 2001, the EU spent more than 54 million euros on humanitarian aid for the population of Zimbabwe (European Commission, 2004, para 1-6). Corruption is very common in

Zimbabwe, that is why the EU does not provide the financial aid to the government. They rather support the population of Zimbabwe by providing financial means to NGOs or via a more multilateral way, for instance the WFP.

Many African countries are criticizing the EU because they feel that the EU is fixated on Zimbabwe while there is no attention for the situation in other African countries. In Nigeria, 200 people died during the elections, after this incidence no sanctions were implemented. The reason for this is that Zimbabwe is a rather small country, therefore, the EU thought it would be easier to pressure Zimbabwe than Nigeria (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007). Furthermore, the EU wants to remain a good relationship with Nigeria because they still have some interests in the country. While the International Institution has got no interests in Zimbabwe at all, hence they are not interested in a good relationship with Zimbabwe. More and more countries are condemning these double standards of the EU (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007).

### 3.2.5 *The Commonwealth*

In 1991, there has been a meeting of the members of the Commonwealth in Harare, Zimbabwe. The organization introduced some important principles during this meeting. The principles aimed at the endorsement of peace and development. However, these principles, named after Harare, are clearly not being respected by the Zimbabwean government. Therefore, the Commonwealth is very much concerned about the situation in Zimbabwe, especially the land question (McKinnon, 2003, p. 6). In 2001, an agreement was signed by the Commonwealth and Zimbabwe aimed at the land issue. However, the government of Zimbabwe never implemented the conditions of this agreement. After the Lancaster House Agreement, the Commonwealth expected that the International financial aid to Zimbabwe would be used for the land reform program. However, due to corruption the financial aid was never used for improving the situation concerning the land question (McKinnon, 2003, p. 6).

The Commonwealth played a significant role during the presidential elections of 2002. The organization was invited by the Zimbabwean government to observe the elections. A team of 61 members of the Commonwealth were present during the elections in Zimbabwe and they discovered that the election period did not turn out the way it should have. Members of the opposition were being intimidated, the media was monopolized by the leading party and the number of polling stations in the cities were being reduced, which resulted in a small number of people in urban areas who were able to vote. The Commonwealth concluded that the Zimbabwean people were not allowed to freely express their will. The organization advised Zimbabwe to leave the differences in the country aside and to look at the future (Commonwealth Observer Group, 2002, para. 1-16).

In the same year, the Commonwealth decided to suspend Zimbabwe's membership for the period of one year. Unexpectedly, Nigeria and South Africa were in favour of this decision. The decision was made after the report of the observer election group was published. However, the Commonwealth still believes that they should support Zimbabwe in the process towards national reconciliation ("Commonwealth has suspended Zimbabwe", 2002, para. 1-5).

In 2003, the Secretary General of the Commonwealth pronounced that the organization was still willing to support the population of Zimbabwe and that they were also prepared to work with the government to ensure that the country would return to the Commonwealth. The organization is trying to help Zimbabwe by finding a solution for the current crisis. They want to make sure that the land in Zimbabwe is farmed in a productive way. The

Commonwealth tries to reach this goal by granting the new farmers the technical and material assistance necessary.

Nevertheless, the government of Zimbabwe is not willing to cooperate with the Commonwealth. The organization strongly advises the Zimbabwean government to change the current legislation and to put an end to the violation of human rights especially of members of the opposition party (McKinnon, 2003, pp. 5-6). However, the advice of the Commonwealth was not followed, on the contrary, Mugabe decided to quit being a member of the Commonwealth. Mugabe came to this decision after the Commonwealth declared to suspend Zimbabwe for an indefinite period until there would have been made some significant reforms in the country. Mugabe did not accept this and stated that he rather quit being a member of the organization than obey to their wishes ("Commonwealth and Mugabe: Your reactions", 2003, para. 1-4).

Since 2003, the Commonwealth did not play any role in Zimbabwe. This year the UK stated that they hope that a new government in Zimbabwe will ensure that the country will rejoin the Commonwealth. However, current statements of Mugabe towards the Commonwealth are not very positive. He describes the organization as an "evil organization led by the UK" to oppress Zimbabwe ("Britain eyes Zimbabwe return to Commonwealth", 2008, para. 1-10).

### 3.2.6 *Amnesty International*

Since 2000, the situation with regard to human rights in Zimbabwe is drastically declining. The main reason for this, is that the government was defeated in a national referendum concerning the constitution. Since that day, the government rules with a heavy hand (Amnesty International Canada, 2008, para. 1).

It is clear that during the presidency of Robert Mugabe human rights are being violated at a wide scale which has got a lot to do with the growing poverty. He slightly restricted important human rights like the freedom of speech and the freedom and the right to freely associate. Important documents and movies about operation Murambatsvina had to be smuggled out of the country, because the Zimbabwean government tried to hide the operation for the International press (Amnesty International Canada, 2008, para. 1-5). According to two Zimbabwean students, most political opposition leaders spend more time on laying in the hospital than they spent time on their political campaigns. The two students came to the Netherlands to raise public awareness on the situation in Zimbabwe. When they go back, they will probably be thrown into prison. The students declare, "At the moment, there are continuous abductions, murders, arrests and it all happens unpunished. The government claims they respect freedom of speech but when a person expresses his or her opinion anything can happen. Even senior citizens are being beaten because they happen to be family of a member of the opposition" (Ooij & Reiff, 2007).

AI is trying to improve the situation concerning human rights in Zimbabwe in several ways. The main role of AI is to keep up with the developments concerning human rights in Zimbabwe and to raise public awareness throughout the world, through for instance interviews and petitions. They raised a number of awareness campaigns in which they asked the people to approach the Zimbabwean Embassy in their countries to express their opinion on the situation in Zimbabwe. The last couple of years AI released several reports about the situation in Zimbabwe, among others, about the opposition, the distribution of food and the situation of the victims of forced removal.

Delegations have visited Zimbabwe, trying to convince the government to respect the human rights (Amnesty International, n.d., pp. 1-10). In 2000, the organization also appealed to the International Community to meet its obligations and to put an end to immunity in Zimbabwe and to punish the ones who violate human rights. AI even tried to approach Robert Mugabe himself through a letter, asking the government to put an end to the violation of human rights (Amnesty International, 2000, para. 1-16).

In 2005, during a visit to Zimbabwe, AI gathered evidence of intimidation by the government and random arrests of members of the opposition. They also discovered that the distribution of food was been manipulated for political purpose and that freedom of speech, before the presidential elections of 2005, was practically forbidden. AI discovered that, because of the violations of human rights, not all Zimbabweans could take part of the election process unhindered. AI has, together with 300 local NGOs, tried to stimulate the UN to condemn the actions of the Zimbabwean government in public. They also asked the UN to lift all the unnecessary constrains on the provision of humanitarian aid (Amnesty International Canada, 2008, para. 4).

In February 2007, a delegation of AI visited Zimbabwe. They talked with human right activists from urban and rural areas. Despite many requests, no one from the government was willing to talk with AI. After this visit, AI released another report with recommendations for the improvement of the human right activists in Zimbabwe (Amnesty International, 2008, "Acties van Amnesty" section, para. 1-3).

## 4. Comparison of the role of the International Community before and after 1980

---

*The attitude of the International Community towards Zimbabwe and Zimbabwe's attitude towards the International Community is very much marked by the past. After independence Mugabe decided to maintain a foreign policy of "active non-alignment", which means that Zimbabwe followed the positions of a non-alignment movement like the Commonwealth ("Background note: Zimbabwe", 2008, "Foreign relations" section, para. 1). The colonial period, and, therefore, Mugabe's aversion to the West, are keywords for describing the recent relationship between the International Community and Zimbabwe. It can even be seen as a chain reaction, the International Community tries to influence Mugabe's regime by expressing their criticism and by implementing International sanctions. Mugabe interprets these sanctions as a attempt of the West to "re-colonize" Zimbabwe. As a consequence, Mugabe does no longer accept any help or advice of the International Community. Eventually the situation in Zimbabwe is getting out of hand and again the International Community is criticising Mugabe's regime, after which the whole vicious circle starts all over again.*

*In fact, the International Community should be split up into the "African" International Community, the "Western" International Community and the "Humanitarian" International Community. This division will be further explained in the conclusion of this thesis.*

### 4.1 The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund

The relation between these two International Organizations and Zimbabwe has had its ups and downs. During the regime of Smith as well as during the regime of Mugabe the World Bank has narrowed or even discontinued its activities for a certain period. Both the IMF and the World Bank are attached to the UN, which means that if the UN implements sanctions against a certain country it is possible that the IMF and the World Bank will also adapt their activities. Thus, because of the UN sanctions, the World Bank discontinued its activities in 1965 after carrying out five projects between 1952 and 1958. For over 15 years the World Bank did not play any role in Rhodesia.

After Zimbabwe gained its independence in 1980, the World Bank and the IMF were both very supportive towards Mugabe's regime. They tried to improve Zimbabwe's economic situation by providing loans, giving advice and, most importantly, by granting two SACs. Despite all affords, the World Bank and the IMF have not been able to convince Mugabe to change his policies and to implement reforms. Mugabe never paid attention to the advices of the financial institute, neither did he pay back his debts. In addition, in this period Mugabe also started to chase away the white farmers. That is when the organizations decided to stop providing loans to Zimbabwe. In 2005, the World Bank did one more try to improve the situation in Zimbabwe by implementing the Interim Strategy Note to facilitate the cooperation between stakeholders and to narrow the knowledge gaps. Yet again, this note did not change much about the political and economic crisis in Zimbabwe. At the moment the World Bank is mainly focussing on providing technical assistance, improving the macro-economic policy, providing food, supporting the social sector and fighting against HIV-AIDS. Unexpectedly, since 2005, Mugabe is trying to pay back its debts to the IMF, so that Zimbabwe will not be suspended as a member of the organization. This seems strange regarding the fact that Mugabe is regularly expressing his negative feelings towards the organization. However, it is very unlikely that Zimbabwe will soon receive another loan of the IMF or the World Bank.

The exact effect of the World Bank and the IMF's support, especially between 1980 and 2001, is frequently being discussed. Critics state that the World Bank and the IMF made a mistake by not focussing on the land reform program in Zimbabwe. Moreover, the activities that were carried out by the World Bank, were not carried out in the best way. Yet, the centre of debate is focused on the Structural Adjustment Credits (SACs) and in particular the ESAP. There are stories that this program eventually led to the political and economic crisis Zimbabwe has to deal with today.

In short, if one looks at the relationship between the two International Organizations and Zimbabwe it can be compared to a wavy line. Before 1965, the World Bank was supporting Rhodesia, after 1965, their activities were discontinued, after 1980, both the IMF and the World Bank were supporting the country in all kinds of ways and after 1999, the activities were narrowed down to giving advice and trying to support the Zimbabwean population. Therefore, there can be found some similarities. Both in the beginning of Smith's and Mugabe's regime there was a lot of support from the World Bank and the IMF. But, throughout the years, this support decreased because of the worsening situation in the country. However, if one looks at the number of activities the World Bank fulfilled before and after 1980, it is clear that the organization strongly increased its activities when Zimbabwe gained its independence. In addition, after 1965, the World Bank discontinued all of its activities in Rhodesia while at the moment, despite of the International sanctions, the World Bank is still trying to support the population of Zimbabwe and tries to convince Mugabe to implement a couple of reforms.

#### **4.2 The Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Food Programme**

Both organizations, especially the WFP, aim at defeating hunger in the World. The FAO is also operating as a knowledge institute and has got a broad database of information. Before 1980, Rhodesia was one of the richest countries of Africa and the most important exporter of agricultural products. This explains the fact that the WFP was not playing any role in Rhodesia. In this period, the FAO only aimed at gathering information regarding Rhodesia's agricultural and economic situation. The fact that the FAO continued its activities after 1965, while the UN implemented International sanctions against Rhodesia, is worth mentioning. This can be explained by the fact that the FAO is supposed to be a neutral forum for all nations ("Food and Agriculture Organization", 2008, para. 1). In addition, as mentioned before, the activities of the FAO were limited to gathering information, which means that the organization did not carry out any project in Rhodesia.

In 2000, the situation in Zimbabwe started to change as well as the role of the FAO. After Mugabe seized the land of the white farmers, the country ended up in an economic crisis and food became more and more a scarcity. The FAO is still providing a lot of information and geographical maps about Zimbabwe but the organization has extended its role. Between 2003 and 2004, the FAO carried out 33 projects in Zimbabwe. These projects aimed at supporting certain agricultural sectors, capacity building and improving certain policies. The FAO often works together with other International Organizations such as the WFP and the SADC.

Despite the fact that the Zimbabwean government is not always very cooperative, the WFP is still able to provide food to the population of Zimbabwe. However, it was only in 2005 that Mugabe decided to sign an agreement with the WFP, so that the organization could deliver food aid for the period of one year. Besides providing food the WFP also takes care of people with HIV and AIDS. Although, it is not easy to operate in the country the organizations do manage to provide food aid to the population. However, some critics claim that the food,

provided by these organizations, is used by the government as a political instrument. It is not 100 percent clear if the food aid of both organizations always end up with the people who need it the most.

While comparing the role of the FAO and the WFP between Rhodesia and Zimbabwe, it is clear that the activities of both organizations increased considerably. The WFP did not have any activities in Rhodesia but at the moment the organization is fulfilling an important task in Zimbabwe. The FAO was already, to a certain extent, active in Rhodesia but the organization extended its activities in Zimbabwe after the country ended up in an economic crisis. Despite the difficult circumstances both organizations are able to fulfil an important task in Zimbabwe.

#### **4.3 The Southern African Development Community and the African Union**

The relation between African countries and Zimbabwe is interesting because many African countries share the same colonial history. In other words, many African leaders can relate to Robert Mugabe. This explains the fact that the SADC and the AU were the last International Organizations that reacted on the worsening situation in Zimbabwe.

Tanzania, Zambia, Mozambique, Botswana and Angola played a very important role in Rhodesia during the Liberation War. Mozambique, Tanzania and Zambia allowed the armed forces of the ZAPU and ZANU to fight against the Rhodesian soldiers from out of their territory. In addition, Tanzania, Zambia, Botswana and Angola decided to form a coalition, the Frontline States, to fight for the liberation of Rhodesia. The Frontline States acted as mediators in order to create a shared feeling of unity between the opposition members in Rhodesia. The most important goal of these Frontline States was to convince the Rhodesian government to amend the constitution to the benefit of the black population. Furthermore, the coalition strived for a fair democratic voting system. Violence remained the most important instrument of the Patriotic Front. South Africa was the only country that supported the Rhodesian government. At a certain moment, the International sanctions, the Patriotic Front and the Frontline States put so much pressure on Smith that he decided to negotiate with the opposition parties during a conference at the Lancaster House in the UK. This meeting eventually led to the independence of Zimbabwe. However, Smith argues that it was the lack of support by South Africa that put an end to the white mastery in Rhodesia.

After Zimbabwe gained its independence, the SADC was established and later in 2002 the AU also came into being. Many African countries do not only have a special bond with each other because of their shared colonial history, they are also economically attached to one another. These two aspects explain their current attitude towards Mugabe's regime, an attitude that is completely different than the attitude of the West. For a long time, the African countries did not talk about Zimbabwe. The only comment that was given by some African countries was that the different parties in Zimbabwe should engage in a conversation. Even in 2005, the SADC declared that the elections were free and fair, while afterwards analysts stated that the elections were highly corrupted.

Especially, the role of South Africa has frequently been discussed, because the country is in favour of silent diplomacy. Many African countries share the believe of South Africa that silent diplomacy is the best way to deal with the problems in Zimbabwe. A good example of this silent diplomacy is the fact that the SADC is appointed by the International Community to act as a mediator in resolving the crisis in Rhodesia. However, after seven years of silent negotiation, without any news about any form of progress, nothing has changed in the country. At the moment, some African leaders are carefully expressing their criticism on Mugabe's regime, yet they are still not

putting much pressure on the Zimbabwean government to change policies. Instead they appeal to the EU to withdraw the International sanctions against Zimbabwe and they requested the UK to continue financing the land reform program. Still, there are some exceptions, in 2002 Nigeria and South Africa were in favour of suspension of Zimbabwe's membership of the Commonwealth.

Looking at the AU, the institution has been the first African organization that publicly expressed its criticism on Mugabe's regime. In addition, the AU is, compared to the SADC, a bit more active in trying to change the situation in Zimbabwe. In 2002, the organization was really supportive towards Mugabe's regime. Nonetheless, the attitude of the AU towards Zimbabwe started to change in 2004.

The role of the members of the SADC in Rhodesia and later on in Zimbabwe changed considerably over time. Some members of the SADC played a very important role in the Liberation War in Rhodesia. However, now it seems that Robert Mugabe is failing as a African statesman many African countries are being quiet and it seems they are ignoring the fact that Mugabe is the reason for the worsening situation in Zimbabwe. This reaction can be explained by their shared feeling of solidarity, the economic situation and the fact that some African Leaders are not much better than Mugabe. However the AU is a bit more critical towards the situation in Zimbabwe and the organization tries to influence the Zimbabwean government by publishing critical reports and by adopting resolutions.

#### **4.4 The European Union**

The role of the EU, and especially the UK, in Zimbabwe is a very sensitive matter. Nevertheless, one should not forget that not all European countries have fulfilled a similar role in Zimbabwe. The countries in the Northern part of Europe have played a much bigger role in Zimbabwe than the Southern part of Europe.

Mugabe himself is very negative about the West. He continuously claims that the West is after colonizing Zimbabwe again and that organizations such as the IMF, the World Bank and the Commonwealth are just instruments of the West to obtain their goal. Looking at the history it is not strange that Mugabe has got an aversion against the West. He spend many years fighting against the white mastery in Rhodesia, which made him, on one side, embittered against everything about the West. On the other side, he wants to show the West that he can perfectly adjust to the Western standards, which is also why he wants to stay a member of the IMF.

Before 1965, the Netherlands had a special relation with Rhodesia that is why many Dutch citizens migrated to the African country in that time. After Smith introduced his UDI the relation between Europe and Rhodesia started to change. First, the UK implemented economic sanctions against Rhodesia and after a while the UN also urged its members to issue similar sanctions against the country. However, Ian Smith argued that these sanctions did not bother Rhodesia that much. This can also be explained by the fact that not all European countries obeyed to the request of the UN.

As mentioned before, analysts claim that it was the increase of pressure from three different angles that put an end to the white mastery in Rhodesia. After Mugabe became president of Zimbabwe the UK was one of the biggest financers of the land reform program. In addition, between 1996 and 2000, the EU also financed a lot of projects in Zimbabwe. The UK was the first to react on the worsening situation in Zimbabwe, which meant that the country stopped financing the Lancaster House Agreement. After the elections of 2002, other EU countries also

started to react on the political and economic crisis in Zimbabwe. The EU decided to issue sanctions against Zimbabwe and to pressure the Zimbabwean government to change their policies. The EU will only change its position towards Zimbabwe if the government will implement some major reforms. However, it seems that not all European countries are obeying the EU sanctions against Zimbabwe. Mugabe is still travelling to Europe and, in 2007, he was even invited to an EU summit.

Despite the fact that the EU is no longer financing projects in Zimbabwe, through ECHO the organization does try to provide humanitarian aid to the population. The EU tries to reach the people by providing financial means to several International NGOs and the WFP.

The course of the relation between the EU and Zimbabwe is similar to the relation between the World Bank and Zimbabwe. Both organizations had a good relationship with Rhodesia before 1965. After Smith introduced the UDI they both discontinued their activities because of International sanctions. After Zimbabwe gained its independence both were, in the beginning, very supportive towards Mugabe's regime and after the situation in Zimbabwe started to change both organizations narrowed down their activities in Zimbabwe.

However, the situation concerning the EU and Zimbabwe is a bit more complex. First, if one compares the relation between Europe and Rhodesia and the EU and Zimbabwe there can be found some similarities regarding the sanctions. Although, the content of the sanctions differ, the sanctions against Rhodesia were aimed at the economy of the country while the sanctions against Zimbabwe are called "smart sanctions" because they aim at the government, in both cases the sanctions were not always being obeyed. In short, at the moment there can be made a division in the relationship between the EU and Zimbabwe. On the one side, the formal relationship between Zimbabwe and the EU is marked by the International sanctions, but on the other side, these sanctions are not always being maintained, both by the EU as a whole as well as by individual European countries. Therefore the question is raised if these sanctions are really effective if they are being ignored every now and then. And if one looks at the informal contacts, between the EU and Zimbabwe, there can still be found a close relationship between Zimbabwe and the UK.

Another division can be made when comparing the involvement of different European countries in Rhodesia as well as in Zimbabwe. Overall, most Northern European countries have been more involved and more supportive towards both Rhodesia and Zimbabwe than the Southern European countries. In conclusion, the course of the relation between Europe and Rhodesia and the relation between the EU and Zimbabwe are in some ways comparable. However, these days the EU is not only implementing sanctions towards Zimbabwe, as was the case before 1980, the organization is also trying to support the Zimbabwean population. Furthermore, the EU is trying to pressure the government to implement reforms.

#### **4.5 The Commonwealth**

The Commonwealth is actually established by the UK, and most of the UK's former colonies are members of this organization as well. For this reason, Mugabe often states that he sees the Commonwealth as an evil organization which is used by the UK to oppress Zimbabwe. Although Mugabe is very negative about the organization at the moment, Zimbabwe has been a member of the Commonwealth for a long period of time.

Looking back at the period before 1980, Rhodesia became a member of the Commonwealth around the 50/60s. Yet, the UDI also had its effects on the relationship between the Commonwealth and Rhodesia. After a short membership, Rhodesia was being excluded from the organization. The Commonwealth was very much involved in deciding what kind of sanctions the International Community should implement against Rhodesia. The organization even established a committee to examine the effects of the sanctions.

The Commonwealth also played an important role during the last years of Smith's regime in Rhodesia. The organization implemented a three-phase program to put an end to the white mastery in Rhodesia which eventually led to the Lancaster house agreement. After 1980, Zimbabwe returned to the Commonwealth. As mentioned in the introduction of this chapter, Mugabe decided to maintain a foreign policy of "active non-alignment". Thus, Zimbabwe attached much value to the opinion, regarding foreign matters, of the Commonwealth. In 1991, there has been a meeting of the Commonwealth in Harare. This meeting brought about some important principles that were named after Harare. The principles were, however, never respected by the Zimbabwean government. A few years later in 2001, Zimbabwe and the Commonwealth signed an agreement on the land issue in Zimbabwe. Again, the Zimbabwean government ignored these agreements. After the Commonwealth discovered that the presidential elections of 2002 were not being fair and free they decided to suspend Zimbabwe's membership for the period of one year. During all these years, the Commonwealth tried to support Zimbabwe by giving advice and trying to create a situation of national reconciliation, however, Mugabe never paid attention to these advices.

Despite the fact that Zimbabwe was suspended from the Commonwealth, the organization remained supportive towards the country. The Commonwealth tried to find a solution for Zimbabwe's crisis and they tried to support the Zimbabwean population by providing technical and material assistance. After Zimbabwe was suspended from the Commonwealth for a second time in 2003, Mugabe decided to quit being a member of the organization.

The relation between the Commonwealth and both Rhodesia and Zimbabwe has had its ups and downs. Overall, it is safe to say that the Commonwealth played an important role in Rhodesia as well as in Zimbabwe. However, this role did change over time. The Commonwealth was involved in creating the conditions for the Lancaster House Agreement by deciding which kind of sanctions the International Community had to apply and by implementing a three-phase transition program, which eventually led to the independence of Zimbabwe. Since independence, the Commonwealth turned more into an advisory body. Although the Commonwealth and Zimbabwe signed some important agreements, the Commonwealth has not been able to convince Mugabe to implement the conditions of the agreements. Nonetheless, the Commonwealth kept on trying to improve the situation in Zimbabwe, by supporting the population and by trying to connect with the Zimbabwean government. Still, the involvement of the Commonwealth in Zimbabwe has narrowed down because Mugabe does no longer want to be a member of the organization.

#### **4.6 Amnesty International**

AI has been the only organization that have had a steady relationship with Rhodesia and is, currently, still very much involved in Zimbabwe. The organization has not been influenced by the UDI in 1965. AI became even more active in Rhodesia after this year. This can be explained by the fact that in this period South Africa and its apartheid regime gained the attention of AI. From there out they discovered that human rights were also being violated in Namibia and Rhodesia. The main task of AI in that time was to raise public awareness by, among

others, attending International conferences. AI is also responsible for a special working group that gathered important information on the situation in Rhodesia regarding human rights. This data was used for a report on human rights in Rhodesia.

After independence the situation concerning human rights in Zimbabwe improved a bit. This was only for a short period of time because in 2000, human rights were heavily being abused. AI is trying to improve the situation regarding human rights by, again, raising public awareness through International campaigns, reports, interviews and petitions. Moreover, several delegations of AI have visited Zimbabwe in an attempt to convince the government to respect the human rights. Furthermore, AI is trying to lobby within the International Community so that they will meet their obligations, put an end to the immunity and to punish the ones who violate the human rights.

After the elections of 2005, AI even increased its activities regarding human rights in Zimbabwe. Another delegation of AI visited the country and gathered all kinds of evidence that proved that human rights were being abused, that the elections were not fair and that the distribution of food was being politicized. AI also tried to stimulate the UN to publicly condemn the violations of human rights by the Zimbabwean government. What is more, the organization appealed to the UN to facilitate the provision of humanitarian aid to the population of Zimbabwe. In 2007, AI visited Zimbabwe again and tried to arrange a meeting with some members of the government. However, no one was willing to talk to them.

Overall, AI has been very much involved in Zimbabwe before and after 1980. Their role did not change that much over time, raising public awareness is still their main priority. Though, right after the independence of Zimbabwe the organization has not been active in the country for a while. For 20 years, there was no need for AI to be concerned about the situation in Zimbabwe because Mugabe implemented a lot of new laws and programs to improve the conditions of the black population. Equal rights between the white and the black population was one of Mugabe's main goals. He knew he needed the support of the white farmers to maintain a good economic situation, thus he tried to do best for both. It was not until the end of the 90's and the beginning of 2000, that the white farmers were being chased away from their lands and that human rights were being violated. At that point, AI was getting concerned about the situation and started their campaigns.

## Conclusion

---

During the whole of Mugabe's presidency his obsession about "the whites" has played a crucial role. There is almost no International speech of Mugabe where he did not insult the West. In addition, Mugabe thinks the situation in Zimbabwe will improve if the country is less dependent on the West. During one of Mugabe's UN speeches directed at George W. Bush in September 2007 he clearly states "we want to be left alone" ("Mugabe UN speech 09/2007", 2007). Recent developments show that Zimbabwe is trying to strengthen partnerships with the East, in particular with China, India, Indonesia and Iran, because they bring investments into Zimbabwe. According to Mugabe the West never brings investments into developing countries, they only give little amounts of money through NGOs ("Robert Mugabe speaks to Al Jazeera - 25 Mar 08", 2008). Keeping this in mind, the following question could be posed, how will the International Community be able to change the situation in a country, in a diplomatic way, while the government of that country is so obviously not willing to work with them? This question shows how difficult it is for the International Community to bring about changes in Zimbabwe and to not let the statements of Mugabe change their attitude towards the country.

As mentioned before, the strange thing about Zimbabwe is that it sometimes seems there is nothing wrong while in fact the country has to deal with a lot of problems. Humanitarian organizations are able to work in the country as long as they keep out of the political and economic issues. There have been International NGOs who narrowed down their activities because their work was being hindered by the government after they publicly condemned Mugabe's regime (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007). Moreover, there are certain periods, for instance the presidential elections, when International NGOs are not able to work in the country because of the tense atmosphere. Although the International NGOs seem the only organizations who are able to work in the country, they will not be able to make significant changes. Only the state itself can change the current situation. Provided that Mugabe will be re-elected there is not much hope that the situation will soon improve. Almost every person in the current government has got dirty hands. The International Community must try to work with them if they want to change the situation. However, there is no guarantee that the current government wants things to change, overall, they are the ones with all the power, there is no reason for them to give that up (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007).

Coming back to the division within the International Community, as mentioned in the previous chapter. If one looks at the attitude of the International Community as a whole there is no clear cut answer to the question:

*"What aspects changed in the attitude of the International Community during the presidency of Mugabe?"*

In the former chapter, this question has already been answered when it comes to the International Organizations individually. However, to answer this question in general the International Community should be divided in three, namely: the African community, the Western community and the Humanitarian community. While making this division one can see that the SADC and the AU fall into the first category while the EU, the World Bank, the IMF and the Commonwealth fall into the second category. The organizations that are not so easy to divide between the former two categories can be placed in the humanitarian corner, namely the FAO, the WFP and AI. First, looking at the African community, their attitude changed from very concerned and involved regarding the situation in Rhodesia to almost neglecting the current crisis in Zimbabwe. Second, the attitude of western community towards Zimbabwe changed a couple of times. When Zimbabwe became independent the Western Community

was very supportive. However, when the situation in Zimbabwe turned into a crisis and it became clear that Mugabe was responsible for this crisis, the attitude of the Western community changed. They implemented sanctions against Mugabe and his government and their activities were narrowed down. The Commonwealth is actually a mixture of the Western and African community. The organization is established by the Brits and is therefore seen as a western organization. Yet, many African countries are members of the Commonwealth. However, in their reaction towards Mugabe's regime the organization heads more towards the Western community. Finally, the organizations in the Humanitarian community have changed their attitude towards Zimbabwe but in another way. When the situation in the country got worse they have extended their activities in Zimbabwe. These organizations have not been scared of by Mugabe's regime and they keep on trying to help the Zimbabwean population by providing, among others, food aid and through raising public awareness in the rest of the world.

In the past, the Western and the African community have not paid enough attention to the actual results of their financial aid. This is one of the reasons why Mugabe was able to create an authoritarian regime in such a short period of time. Therefore, it is very important that the International Community as a whole puts more emphasis on monitoring the projects in Zimbabwe, so that they can make sure that the money is really used for the areas they agreed on (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007). It is difficult to give clear recommendations considering the obscurities around the presidential elections of March 2008. In fact, the recommendation should be divided into recommendations in case Mugabe will be re-elected and recommendations in case another ZANU PF member or a MDC member will be chosen as president.

## Recommendations

---

### **The World Bank & the International Monetary Fund:**

It is clear that the cooperation between the World Bank/IMF and the current government in Zimbabwe has not been very successful. After Zimbabwe became independent the World Bank and the IMF were both very supportive towards Mugabe's regime. However, both organizations appear to have failed in certain areas. The ESAP has been one of the World Bank's biggest mistakes in Zimbabwe. It seems like the World Bank and the IMF did not inform the Zimbabwean government enough about the effect of the ESAP. In addition, after the ESAP was implemented I think the institutions did not give enough advice to the Zimbabwean government on how to proceed.

Therefore, I think the organizations should learn from the past, which means that they should put far more emphasis on evaluating and monitoring their development projects, to make sure that their money does not end up in the wrong hands. However, if Mugabe will remain president of Zimbabwe it is difficult to predict what will happen and especially how he will react on the International Community after all their accusations about the elections in March. In any case, if Mugabe remains president he will eventually need the loans of the World Bank and the IMF. These two organizations are the only ones who can provide millions or billions of dollars (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007). When Mugabe does appeal to the World Bank and the IMF, the organizations should stick to their conditions. One should keep in mind that the whole International Community would first like to see some changes in Zimbabwe. However, money and support is needed to bring about these changes (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007).

According to Pascal Richards, the World Bank and the IMF improved their conditionalities, thus it is less likely that Zimbabwe will be hindered by complicated economic policy requirements. Despite the fact that Mugabe is very negative about the World Bank and the IMF, he is trying hard to stay a member of these organizations. This shows that the membership of the IMF and the World Bank is important to Mugabe, therefore, I believe that in case Mugabe remains president, he will eventually adjust his policies in order to receive the loans and to stay a member of the IMF and the World Bank. Provided that both organizations decide to continue providing loans to Zimbabwe, the organizations should be aware of the actual changes on the ground, they should check if the quality of life of the population is really improving (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007). However, the question remains what the exact conditions of the World Bank and the IMF will be, and if Zimbabwe will be able to negotiate on these conditions.

In case, Mugabe retires, the World Bank and the IMF will probably put more effort into supporting Zimbabwe. The organizations should learn from their mistakes in the past and try to put more attention to the areas and themes they forgot about, especially the land reform program. Zimbabwe's new government should be assisted by the World Bank and the IMF in the best way to make sure that the country's economy will increase.

### **The Food and Agriculture Organization & the World Food Programme**

The FAO and the WFP are playing a very important role in Zimbabwe. After the situation in Zimbabwe was getting worse and more and more people suffered from malnutrition, the FAO and the WFP immediately became Zimbabwe's biggest supplier of food aid. Moreover, by means of capacity building they made sure that black farmers were able to cultivate their land. Although, the government has not always been very cooperative, the

organizations were able to operate in the country. However, there are some obscurities whether the food really ends up with the people or that the food is used as a political instrument.

Provided that Mugabe will remain president of Zimbabwe, I would recommend the FAO and the WFP to stay in the corner of the humanitarian aid. In case they would publicly criticize Mugabe, they will hardly be able to work in the country. However, they should try to, anonymously, inform International journalists about the situation in Zimbabwe. This way, they raise public awareness but they will still be able to support the people. Working in the rural areas is the most difficult, because there are still a lot of supporters of Mugabe. Provided that the WFP and the FAO would say anything negative about the government in these areas, they would be intimidated and their activities would be narrowed down (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007). Looking at the fact that food is used as a political instrument, it is important that the WFP and the FAO follow the whole distribution process of the food, so that the food will not be politicized. Special attention should be focused on the end stage, namely, the communities.

If Mugabe will not be re-elected, the new government will probably realise major changes in the country. Therefore, the role of the FAO and the WFP should expand. The FAO should focus on improving the agricultural sector by, among others, capacity building and providing agricultural equipments. Furthermore, the FAO should advice the government on writing and implementing new policies regarding agriculture. In addition, the black farmers should be trained to cultivate the, neglected, land. What is more, the WFP should continue with providing food aid to the population and they should support the FAO where they can. The WFP will probably be able to work more freely in the country, and focus more on the rural areas.

### **The Southern African Development Community & the African Union**

Most members of the SADC and the AU have been rather calm about the situation in Zimbabwe. As explained in the former chapters there are a number of reasons why most African countries reacted this way. The SADC, in particular South Africa, is in favour of silent diplomacy. Nevertheless, the silent negotiations between the SADC and Zimbabwe have not yet changed anything in the country itself. The AU is a bit more critical towards Mugabe's regime and the organization is not afraid to express its opinion in public. Currently, more and more African countries are criticizing Mugabe's regime because they feel that Zimbabwe is harming the African interests, yet they are not putting more pressure on the government to change their policies. In this sub-paragraph I will focus my recommendations on the SADC, because the SADC is closest involved in Zimbabwe and because all members of the SADC are also members of the AU.

Zimbabwe has got a shared history with the members of SADC, which is why Mugabe is most attached to this organization. Thus, if Mugabe stays president, the SADC could play a very important role in changing the situation in Zimbabwe. They are the only organization that have frequently been invited to observe the elections, that is why the International Community should make better use of this organization. Although, the silent negotiations between SADC and Zimbabwe have not yet changed much in the country, it did create an opening that could eventually lead to a change (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007). Therefore, I believe it is important that the SADC continues these negotiations and tries to put more pressure on Mugabe to change his policies. There is actually a positive side on the fact that the SADC has not been very harsh towards Mugabe in public, because if they would have criticized Mugabe he would probably have lost his trust in the organization. As a consequence, Mugabe could have decided to quit the negotiations. Mugabe is still the head of the government

and if someone wants to bring about changes and wants the government to support these changes it is not possible to neglect Mugabe. Although, South Africa has been criticized many times for choosing to maintain a strategy of silent diplomacy, the country is playing an important role in the mediations between ZANU PF and the opposition. South Africa is searching for bilateral solutions which will not disturb the stability in the region. The country has chosen for silent diplomacy because they do not want the rest of the world to think that South Africa decides what is happening in Zimbabwe and because they think a public condemnation will not change the situation. Moreover, South Africa is truly in favour of changes in Zimbabwe because at the moment, many Zimbabwean refugees are migrating to South Africa (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007).

In case, Mugabe will not be re-elected the SADC should support Zimbabwe in every possible way. Because the SADC is the most important organization based in the Southern African region they should play a very important role in getting Zimbabwe back on track. Although, the SADC does not have a lot of resources and can be described as a weak organization, the organization can still be of much use when it comes to giving political and economic advice ("SADC", 2008, "SADC in practice" section, para. 1-2).

### **The European Union**

The EU has received a lot of criticism concerning the role they play and have played in Zimbabwe. Mugabe himself is one of the biggest opponents of the EU. His whole relationship with the EU is marked by the colonial period. After many years of fighting in the Liberation War, Mugabe was one of the liberators of Zimbabwe. That is why, his whole attitude towards the EU is full of bitterness and supposedly anxiety over neo-colonialism. However, in the first few years after independence the EU has been very supportive towards Zimbabwe. Yet, still some African countries claim that the EU did not support the land reform in Zimbabwe the way they should have (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007). When the situation in Zimbabwe started to change, the EU tried to put pressure on the Zimbabwean government in different kinds of ways. This made the relation between the EU and Zimbabwe and the SADC, that is against the implementation of sanctions, very tense. Mugabe has not been very impressed by the attempts of the EU to influence the government, which means that there is room for improvement. However, the EU does score on the level of humanitarian aid through the ECHO.

In fact, it is hard to give recommendations on the role of the EU in Africa in general, because the EU has got a bad image in this continent. Not only because of their history but also because it seems that the EU has got its own agenda in Africa. The EU is more willing to work and support some African countries than others. This can be explained if one looks at the economic interests of the EU. For this reason, the best recommendations would be to change the image of the EU, however, this would be very hard, if not impossible, to realise.

There were a lot of comments on the effectiveness of the sanctions, especially the visa badge, issued against Zimbabwe. However, most Zimbabwean NGOs think it is a good way to put pressure on the government without worsening the situation of the population in Zimbabwe. Economic sanctions are not being supported by the Zimbabwean organizations and trade unions because the economic situation in Zimbabwe is already really bad. Overall, the EU has a limited influence on Zimbabwe (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007). Therefore, in case Mugabe stays president, I would recommend that the EU focuses more on the region instead of addressing Mugabe directly. Mugabe does not trust the West, hence he will not give in to the pressure of the EU, besides, it is also very much an issue of pride. Thus, if the EU would address the regions, namely the SADC, and support them in influencing Zimbabwe I believe this would have a greater effect than the role the EU has

played so far. Besides, the EU has not always been very consistent in maintaining the sanctions which makes their whole attitude towards Zimbabwe not very convincing. Therefore, if the EU decides to issue sanctions against a country, I believe they should also be very consistent in dealing with these sanctions or else the effect will diminish. In short, provided that Mugabe will be re-elected I think the EU should maintain the same sanctions, without exceptions, and try to influence the Zimbabwean government via the SADC through silent diplomacy. I believe silent diplomacy in this case is the best option because if Mugabe finds out the EU is cooperating with the SADC, he will probably no longer be willing to collaborate with the SADC either.

Provided that Mugabe will not be re-elected the EU should stick to their promise and start cooperating with Zimbabwe again. The organization must keep on listening to the wishes of the Zimbabwean civil society and not only trying to push their own agenda. They should pay a lot of attention to the freedom of speech and human rights, because these are the two points that are very important for the Zimbabweans (P. Richard, personal interview, November 21, 2007). The EU should also lift their sanctions against Zimbabwe and they should support Zimbabwe financially in trying to recover their economy.

### **The Commonwealth**

Currently Zimbabwe is not a member of the Commonwealth. Yet, in the period Zimbabwe was still a member of the organization, the Commonwealth tried to support Zimbabwe primarily by giving advice. Even while Zimbabwe was suspended from the Commonwealth the organization kept on supporting Zimbabwe in all kinds of ways. Since 2003, Mugabe is no longer willing to talk with the Commonwealth and therefore he decided to quit being a member of the organization. Ever since the Commonwealth is established by Britain, Mugabe has got the same negative attitude towards this organization as towards the EU. Therefore, my recommendations for the Commonwealth are a bit similar to my recommendations to the EU.

In case Mugabe stays president there is not much to do for the Commonwealth. Mugabe is still not willing to talk or cooperate with the organization, so there is no reason to think that his statement will change after the elections. The Organization could, however, start to support the SADC and give them advice on how to deal with the situation in Zimbabwe. Some members of the SADC are also members of the Commonwealth, thus they could fulfil the role of mediator between the two organizations. I believe that the Commonwealth should mainly focus their advice on the land crisis in Zimbabwe.

Provided that Mugabe retires, the Commonwealth should try to convince the new government to return to the organization. If the new government is willing to do so, the Commonwealth should support Zimbabwe the best they can. First, they could support the new government by giving them advice on, among others, the land crisis. Second, they should start providing technical and material assistance to the population but at a bigger scale than before 2003. Finally, the Commonwealth should support the government to implement the conditions of the agreements made between the Commonwealth members.

### **Amnesty International**

AI has been active in Rhodesia and Zimbabwe for a very long time. Yet, right after independence the situation in Zimbabwe concerning human rights was quite stable. Hence, in this period AI did not have any activities in the country. The content of the activities AI has fulfilled till now, did not change much. Only the extent of their activities changed a bit over time.

I could recommend AI to keep on raising public awareness, in case Mugabe will be re-elected. They should maintain the activities they are carrying out at the moment. AI could maybe increase its awareness campaigns with special attention to the current situation regarding the presidential elections. They should also continue writing reports on the situation in Zimbabwe and trying to influence the Zimbabwean government. Moreover, they could address local human rights organizations and try to support them in their fight for freedom of speech and human rights.

Provided that Mugabe will not be re-elected, it is hard to tell what will happen in the field of human rights. Naturally, everyone is hoping that the new government will improve the situation concerning human rights, however, it is unsure if this will actually happen. In any case, AI should stay active in the country by giving the new government advice on how to maintain human rights and how to implement them in new policies. Moreover, they should randomly visit the country to examine if human rights are really being respected.

In conclusion, I would like to give a general recommendation to the whole International Community. I believe my thesis shows that there is a lack of cooperation between the African Community and the Western Community. However, I do think both communities want to improve the situation in Zimbabwe and pull the country out of the economic crisis, yet they have a different approach when it comes to attaining this goal. I assume that if the Western Community starts listening to the African Community and if they start acting as one front when it comes to influencing Mugabe's regime, they will achieve more than they have achieved the last few years.

## Bibliography

---

- 1972: *Rhodesia out of Olympics*. (1972, August 22). Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the BBC News Online website: [http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/august/22/newsid\\_3549000/3549444.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/august/22/newsid_3549000/3549444.stm)
- African Studies Association. (1976). Amnesty International Briefing: Rhodesia/Zimbabwe. *Issue: A Journal of Opinion*, 6, 4, pp. 34-37. Retrieved 12 May, 2008, from the JSTOR website: <http://www.jstor.org/pss/1166559>
- African Union*. (2008, May 12). Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the Wikipedia website: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/African\\_union](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/African_union)
- Akker, P. & Teeffelen, K. (1998). *Te gast in Zimbabwe*. Nijmegen: informatie verre reizen V.O.F.
- All projects*. (n.d.). Retrieved from the World Bank website: <http://web.worldbank.org/external/default/main?menuPK=375771&pagePK=141143&piPK=399272&theSitePK=375736>
- Amnesty International. (n.d.). *Zoeken in de Amnesty website*. Retrieved May 11, 2008, from the Amnesty International website: <http://www.amnesty.nl/zoeken?s=1&q=zimbabwe&start=30&results=10>
- Amnesty International. (2000, October 12). *Amnesty International condemns Zimbabwe amnesty*. Retrieved May 11, 2008, from the Amnesty International website: [http://www.amnesty.nl/voor\\_de\\_pers\\_artikel/2911](http://www.amnesty.nl/voor_de_pers_artikel/2911)
- Amnesty International. (2007). *Jaarboek Zimbabwe 2007*. Retrieved May 11, 2008, from the Amnesty International website: [http://www.amnesty.nl/landen\\_jaarboek/19151](http://www.amnesty.nl/landen_jaarboek/19151)
- Amnesty International. (2008). *Vrouwelijke activisten Zimbabwe vaak onder druk*. Retrieved May 11, 2008, from the Amnesty International website: [http://www.amnesty.nl/bibliotheek\\_vervolg/artikel2\\_vrouwenzimbabwe](http://www.amnesty.nl/bibliotheek_vervolg/artikel2_vrouwenzimbabwe)
- Amnesty International Canada. (2008, March 28). *Human Rights in Zimbabwe: Overview*. Retrieved May 11, 2008, from the Amnesty International website: [http://www.amnesty.ca/themes/zimbabwe\\_overview.php](http://www.amnesty.ca/themes/zimbabwe_overview.php)
- Anan postpones U.N. visit to Zimbabwe in wake of farm seizure*. (2000, June 2). Retrieved May 11, 2008, from the CNN World website: <http://archives.cnn.com/2000/WORLD/africa/06/02/zimbabwe.land.occupation/>
- Artsen zonder Grenzen. (2008, April). *Projectland Zimbabwe: in gevecht met doodsvijand nummer één*. Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the Artsen zonder Grenzen website: <http://www.artsenzondergrenzen.nl/index.php?pid=225>
- Background note: Zimbabwe*. (2008, February). Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the U.S. Department of State website: <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/5479.htm>
- Bartlett, B. (1985, December 23). *What's wrong with trade sanctions*. Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the CATO Institute website: <http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa064.html>
- Baxter, M. & Lenneiy, N.M. (2007, September). *Country Brief*. Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the World Bank website: <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/COUNTRIES/AFRICAEXT/ZIMBABWEEXTN/0,,menuPK:375746~pagePK:141132~piPK:141107~theSitePK:375736,00.html>
- Boogaard, F. (2007, December 7). Mugabe overschaduw EU/Afrika-top. *Algemeen Dagblad*.
- Bossart, D. (1993, October 22). *Rhodesia to Zimbabwe: lessons for mediators*. Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the Colorado University website: [http://www.colorado.edu/conflict/full\\_text\\_search/AIICRCDOcs/93-31.htm](http://www.colorado.edu/conflict/full_text_search/AIICRCDOcs/93-31.htm)
- Bossema, W. (1999). *Zimbabwe, mensen, politiek, economie, cultuur, milieu*. Amsterdam: KIT Publishers.

- Britain eyes Zimbabwe return to Commonwealth.* (2008, April 3). Retrieved May 11, 2008, from the BBC News online website: <http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2008/04/03/2206483.htm>
- Chitiyo, T.K. (2000, May). Land violence and compensation. *Track two*, 9, 1, pp. 1- 25.
- Commonwealth and Mugabe: Your reactions.* (2003, December 15). Retrieved May 11, 2008, from the BBC News online website: [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/talking\\_point/3253240.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/talking_point/3253240.stm)
- Commonwealth has suspended Zimbabwe.* (2002, March 19). Retrieved May 8, 2008, from the Afrol News website: [http://www.afrol.com/News2002/zim030\\_commonw\\_suspend.htm](http://www.afrol.com/News2002/zim030_commonw_suspend.htm)
- Commonwealth Observer Group. (2002, March 14). *Preliminary Report of the Commonwealth Observer Group to the Zimbabwe Presidential Election, 9 - 10 March 2002.* Retrieved May 1, 2008, from the Afrol news website: [http://www.afrol.com/Countries/Zimbabwe/documents/commonw\\_election\\_group.htm](http://www.afrol.com/Countries/Zimbabwe/documents/commonw_election_group.htm)
- Danaher, K. (1981). The Political Economy of Hunger in Rhodesia and Zimbabwe. *Issue: A Journal of Opinion*, 11, 3/4, pp. 33-35. Retrieved 12 May, 2008, from the JSTOR website: <http://www.jstor.org/pss/1166594>
- Eg, R. (2008). Oppositie claimt macht. *Metro*.
- EU to Expand Zimbabwe Sanctions List.* (n.d.). Retrieved May 5, 2008, from the Born African website: [http://www.bornafrikan.com/home/eu\\_to\\_expand\\_zimbabwe\\_sanctions\\_list/](http://www.bornafrikan.com/home/eu_to_expand_zimbabwe_sanctions_list/)
- Eurodad. (2007, November 9). *Untying the knots - How the World Bank is failing to deliver real change on conditionality.* Retrieved May 15, 2008, from the Eurodad website: <http://www.eurodad.org/whatsnew/reports.aspx?id=1804>
- European Commission. (2004, October 13). *Echo in Zimbabwe.* Retrieved May 1, 2008, from the European Commission website: [http://ec.europa.eu/echo/field/zimbabwe/echo\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/field/zimbabwe/echo_en.htm)
- European Union. (1996, May). *Internationale Samenwerking.* Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the European Union website: <http://europa.eu/bulletin/nl/9605/p103175.htm>
- European Union. (1996, October). *Europese investeringsbank.* Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the European Union website: <http://europa.eu/bulletin/nl/9610/p110024.htm>
- European Union. (1996, October). *Landen van Afrika, het Caribische gebied en de Stille Oceaan (ACS), Zuid-Afrika en de landen en gebieden overzee (LGO).* Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the European Union website: <http://europa.eu/bulletin/nl/9610/p104099.htm>
- European Union. (1997, March). *Suiker.* Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the European Union website: <http://europa.eu/bulletin/nl/9703/p104100.htm>
- European Union. (1998, March). *Voedselzekerheid en voedselhulp.* Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the European Union website: <http://europa.eu/bulletin/nl/9803/p103046.htm>
- European Union. (1998, December). *Mensenrechten.* Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the European Union website: <http://europa.eu/bulletin/nl/9812/p101021.htm>
- European Union. (1999, April). *Financiële en technische samenwerking.* Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the European Union website: <http://europa.eu/bulletin/nl/9904/p104109.htm>
- European Union. (1999, November). *Europese Investeringsbank.* Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the European Union website: <http://europa.eu/bulletin/nl/9911/p111032.htm#anch0470>
- European Union.* (2008, May 11). Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the Wikipedia website: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European\\_Union](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_Union)
- Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland and Netherlands.* (1957, March 27). Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the United Nations website: [http://untreaty.un.org/unts/1\\_60000/7/36/00013758.pdf](http://untreaty.un.org/unts/1_60000/7/36/00013758.pdf)

- Field Programme Activities*. (2003). Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the Food and Agriculture Organization Technical Cooperation Department website:  
<https://extranet.fao.org/fpmis/FPMISReportServlet.jsp?div=&type=countryprofileopen&language=EN&countryId=ZW>
- Food and Agriculture Organization. (2001, September 17). *FAO nutrition country profile*. Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the Food and Agriculture Organization website:  
<ftp://ftp.fao.org/es/esn/nutrition/ncp/zimmap.pdf>
- Food and Agriculture Organization Emergency Operations and Rehabilitation Division. (2004, July). helping to build a world without hunger. *FAO regional newsletter*. Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the Sahims website: [http://www.sahims.net/doclibrary/2004/07\\_July/23/Regional/FAOnewsletterjuly-2004.pdf](http://www.sahims.net/doclibrary/2004/07_July/23/Regional/FAOnewsletterjuly-2004.pdf)
- Food and Agriculture Organization*. (2008, May 5). Retrieved May 1, 2008, from the Wikipedia website:  
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Food\\_and\\_Agriculture\\_Organization](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Food_and_Agriculture_Organization)
- Foldvary, F.E. (2000). *The Land Question in Zimbabwe*. Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the Progress website: <http://www.progress.org/fold139.htm>
- GeoNetwork*. (n.d.). Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the Food and Agriculture Organization website:  
<http://www.fao.org/geonetwork/srv/en/main.search?extended=off&remote=off&any=zimbabwe&themekey=&to=&from=&siteId=fao&hitsPerPage=100>
- History of Rhodesia*. (2008, May 9). Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the Wikipedia website:  
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History\\_of\\_Rhodesia](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Rhodesia)
- Inwoners Zimbabwe kiezen nieuwe president*. (2008). Retrieved May 11, 2008, from the Nu website:  
[http://www.nu.nl/news/1501382/25/Inwoners\\_Zimbabwe\\_kiezen\\_nieuwe\\_president.html](http://www.nu.nl/news/1501382/25/Inwoners_Zimbabwe_kiezen_nieuwe_president.html)
- Jongsma, M. & Roerig, J. (n.d.). EU Worstelt met Afrika. *Telegraaf*.
- Joyce, J.A. (1978). *Human Rights: International Documents*. Leiden: Brill Archive.
- Laakso, L. (2002, September 12). *The politics of International election observation: the case of Zimbabwe in 2000*. Retrieved May 11, 2008, from the Cambridge University website:  
<http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=120487>
- Lafond, A. (1970). Forestry education and training in Africa. *Unasylva*, 96. Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the Food and Agriculture Organization website: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/98085e/98085e04.htm>
- Land crisis in Zimbabwe*. (2000, April 21). Retrieved May 11, 2008, from the Online Newshour website:  
[http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/africa/jan-june00/zimbabwe\\_4-21a.html](http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/africa/jan-june00/zimbabwe_4-21a.html)
- Landen en staten*. (n.d.). Retrieved May 4, 2008, from the World Wide Base website:  
<http://www.worldwidebase.com/science/zimbabwe.shtml>
- Land reform in Zimbabwe*. (2008, May 4). Retrieved May 11, 2008, from the wikipedia website:  
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Land\\_reform\\_in\\_Zimbabwe](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Land_reform_in_Zimbabwe)
- Markus, M. (presenter). (2007, March 26). *Studiogesprek over de actuele situatie in Zimbabwe* [Television broadcast]. Hilversum: Goedemorgen Nederland (KRO).
- McKinnon, H.D. (2003, September 1). *The Commonwealth and Africa: A precious partnership*. Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the Commonwealth website:  
[http://www.thecommonwealth.org/shared\\_asp\\_files/gfsr.asp?NodeID=35223&attributename=file](http://www.thecommonwealth.org/shared_asp_files/gfsr.asp?NodeID=35223&attributename=file)
- Mdlongwa, F. (1998, December). Zimbabwe presses land distribution. *Africa recovery*, 12, 3, pp. 1-19.
- Movement for Democratic Change*. (2008, May 11). Retrieved May 11, 2008, from the Wikipedia website:  
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Movement\\_for\\_Democratic\\_Change](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Movement_for_Democratic_Change)

- Mugabe on land ownership, and sanctions.* (2008, February 20). The African Chanel. Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the Youtube website: <http://nl.youtube.com/watch?v=CjHen9BupDI>
- Mugabe UN speech 09/2007.* (2007, October 2). Mugabe is right. Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the Youtube website: [http://nl.youtube.com/watch?v=s61pL\\_mq8VU](http://nl.youtube.com/watch?v=s61pL_mq8VU)
- Ooij, D. & Reiff, J. (producers). (2007, April 17). *Studentenleiders op de vlucht voor geweld in Zimbabwe* [Television broadcast]. The Hague: Nova.
- Pan, E. (2003, December 19). *AFRICA: Mugabe's Zimbabwe.* Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the council on Foreign Relations website: <http://www.cfr.org/publication/7723/africa.html#13>
- Ploch, L. (2007, December 6). *CRS Report for Congress Zimbabwe.* (Order code: RL 32723). Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the Federation of American Scientists website: <http://www.fas.org/sqp/crs/row/RL32723.pdf>
- Politieke situatie.* (n.d.). Retrieved May 15, 2008, from the Vakbondsrechten website: [http://www.vakbondsrechten.nl/dossierzimbabwe/Politieke\\_situatie.asp](http://www.vakbondsrechten.nl/dossierzimbabwe/Politieke_situatie.asp)
- Robert Mugabe.* (2008, May 12). Retrieved May 11, 2008, from the Wikipedia website: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert\\_Mugabe](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_Mugabe)
- Robert Mugabe speaks to Al Jazeera - 25 Mar 08.* (2008, March 25). Aljazeera. Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the Youtube website: <http://nl.youtube.com/watch?v=yLldzFA9H-E>
- Rusere, P. (2008, March 20). *WFP Says Zimbabwe Food Distribution Won't Be Influenced By Politics.* Retrieved May 8, 2008, from the Voice of America News website: <http://voanews.com/english/Africa/2008-03-20-voa64.cfm>
- SADC. (2008, April 23). Retrieved May 11, 2008, from the Wikipedia website: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Southern\\_African\\_Development\\_Community](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Southern_African_Development_Community)
- SADCC. (2007, September 5). Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the Wikipedia website: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/SADCC>
- Sanctions against Rhodesia.* (1966, December 23). Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the Time magazine website: <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,840760,00.html?promoid=googlep>
- Shah, A. (2007, July 2). *Structural Adjustment—a Major Cause of Poverty.* Retrieved May 15, 2008, from the Global Issues website: <http://www.globalissues.org/TradeRelated/SAP.asp>
- Shillington, K. (1998). *Onafhankelijkheid in Afrika.* Harmelen: Corona.
- Sibanda, T. (2008, May 5). *Zimbabwe: MDC Waiting for Run-Off Date Before Deciding Next Move.* Retrieved May 14, 2008, from the all Africa website: <http://allafrica.com/stories/200805051886.html>
- The Republic of Zimbabwe at a Glance.* (n.d.). Retrieved May 11, 2008, from the deployment link website: <http://deploymentlink.osd.mil/deploy/info/africa/zimbabwe/index.shtml#top>
- The story of Africa.* (n.d.). Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the BBC News online website: [http://www.bbc.co.uk/worldservice/specials/1624\\_story\\_of\\_africa/page30.shtml](http://www.bbc.co.uk/worldservice/specials/1624_story_of_africa/page30.shtml)
- The World Bank. (2004, May 21). *Zimbabwe Country Assistance Evaluation.* (Report No. 29058). Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the World Bank website: [http://lnweb18.worldbank.org/oed/oeddoctlib.nsf/DocUNIDViewForJavaSearch/2046773A5412D5DB85256EB500786E67/\\$file/zimbabwe\\_cae.pdf](http://lnweb18.worldbank.org/oed/oeddoctlib.nsf/DocUNIDViewForJavaSearch/2046773A5412D5DB85256EB500786E67/$file/zimbabwe_cae.pdf)
- The World Bank: Zimbabwe.* (n.d.). Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the World Bank website: <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/COUNTRIES/AFRICAEXT/ZIMBABWEEXTN/0,,menuPK:375742~pagePK:141159~piPK:141110~theSitePK:375736,00.html>
- Vermeulen, B. (2006, February 20). *Zimbabwe drukt geld bij om IMF terug te betalen.* Johannesburg: NRC. Retrieved May 11, 2008, from the NRC Handelsblad website: <http://www.nrc.nl/economie/article225192.ece>

- Vermeulen, B. (2007, March 30). *Mugabe heeft geen angst voor 'eindspel'*. Retrieved May 8, 2008, from the Wereldomroep website: [http://www.wereldomroep.nl/actua/regio/afrika/act20070330\\_mugabe](http://www.wereldomroep.nl/actua/regio/afrika/act20070330_mugabe)
- Vlasblom, D. (1997, April 26). De geschiedenis volgens oud-premier Ian Smith. *NRC*. Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the NRC handelsblad website: [http://www.nrc.nl/buitenland/article828525.ece/De\\_geschiedenis\\_volgens\\_oud-premier\\_Ian\\_Smith](http://www.nrc.nl/buitenland/article828525.ece/De_geschiedenis_volgens_oud-premier_Ian_Smith)
- World Food Programme. (2008). *Where we work: Zimbabwe*. Retrieved May 11, 2008, from the World Food Programme website: [http://www.wfp.org/country\\_brief/indexcountry.asp?country=716](http://www.wfp.org/country_brief/indexcountry.asp?country=716)
- World Food Programme*. (2008, April 30). Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the Wikipedia website: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World\\_Food\\_Programme](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_Food_Programme)
- Zimbabweaanse oppositie verklaart Mugabe de oorlog*. (2007, March 16). Retrieved 7 May, 2008, from the Trouw website: [http://www.trouw.nl/laatstenieuws/laatstenieuws/article661252.ece/Zimbabweaanse\\_oppositie\\_verklaart\\_Mugabe\\_de\\_oorlog#readmore](http://www.trouw.nl/laatstenieuws/laatstenieuws/article661252.ece/Zimbabweaanse_oppositie_verklaart_Mugabe_de_oorlog#readmore)
- Zimbabwe*. (n.d.). Retrieved May 11, 2008, from the Human Rights Watch website: <http://www.hrw.org/reports/1989/WR89/Zimbabwe.htm>
- Zimbabwe: an update*. (n.d.). Retrieved May 11, 2008, from the Lowy institute website: [http://lowyinstitute.richmedia-server.com/sound/The\\_current\\_situation\\_in\\_Zimbabwe.ppt](http://lowyinstitute.richmedia-server.com/sound/The_current_situation_in_Zimbabwe.ppt)
- Zimbabwe: general information*. (n.d.). Retrieved May 11, 2008, from the Food and Agriculture Organization website: <http://www.fao.org/countryprofiles/index.asp?lang=en&subj=1&iso3=ZWE>
- Zimbabwe's operation Murambatsvina: the tipping point?* (2005). Retrieved May 11, 2008, from the International Crisis Group website: <http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=3618>
- Zimbabwean presidential election, 2008* (2008, May 2). Retrieved May 14, 2008, from the Wikipedia website: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zimbabwean\\_presidential\\_election,\\_2008](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zimbabwean_presidential_election,_2008)
- Zimbabwe Report Discussed at UN*. (2005, July 27). New York: Global Policy Forum. Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the Global Policy Forum website: <http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/issues/general/2005/0727zimbabwe.htm>
- Zimbabwe the battle for land*. (n.d.). Retrieved May 4, 2008, from the BBC News Online website: [http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/static/in\\_depth/africa/2000/zimbabwe\\_crisis/slideshow/default.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/static/in_depth/africa/2000/zimbabwe_crisis/slideshow/default.stm)
- Zimbabwe to chair major UN body*. (2007, May 12). Retrieved May 12, 2008, from the BBC News Online website: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/6645715.stm>