



BRITAIN ZIMBABWE SOCIETY

in association with

**Zimbabwe Association
International Liaison Office, Zimbabwe Human Rights NGO Forum
The REDRESS Trust
Canon Collins Educational Trust for Southern Africa
Article 19 • Action for Southern Africa • End the Silence
Centre of African Studies, University of London
Royal Africa Society**

Present a Report on

THE OPEN FORUM 2005 ON ZIMBABWE, SOUTH AFRICA and the REGION

**4thTH June 2005, 2pm – 5.30pm,
Brunei Gallery, School of Oriental & African Studies (SOAS)
University of London**

Executive summary

This Report describes the proceedings of an event aimed at facilitating open, inclusive debate amongst the Zimbabwean diaspora in the UK and others concerned about the continuing crisis in Zimbabwe, its regional and international implications, the role of civil society in the struggle for democratic governance, human rights, justice and peace, and the possible strategies for change.

The **Open Forum 2005 on Zimbabwe, South Africa and the Region** was organised in London on 4 June 2005 by the Britain Zimbabwe Society in association with a number of associated organisations. It was conceived as an inclusive, non-partisan, non-governmental forum and focused on two specific themes:

- (1) the institutional instruments available to civil society to use in defending human rights and promoting change;
- (2) how to develop a genuinely anti-imperialist framework for understanding the situation in Zimbabwe, in the face of the anti-imperialist posture adopted by the ruling party in Zimbabwe to win international and particularly African support for its policies.

The Forum was attended by some 270 persons. Stimulated by strong presentations from all the speakers on two panels, and by the dramatic events unfolding in Zimbabwe (the 'drive out the rubbish' government blitz - officially called 'restore order' - on urban settlements and informal sector traders had reached its third week) participants conducted a lively debate with sharp disagreements on some points. The constructive discussion ranged more widely than the two principal themes, and reflected a clear consensus that the crisis in Zimbabwe had entered a new phase, requiring long- as well as short-term responses, and careful re-assessment of the direction of events in Southern Africa.

This report is compiled from the detailed notes of a team of three rapporteurs. It summarises the main presentations, and the ensuing discussion. At the end will be found the following appendices : (I) Biographical notes on the speakers. (II) Messages received by the Forum. (III) Organisational details of the Forum, including contact details of the organisations associated with it, funding, membership of the planning group, and the reporting team.

Contents

Concept	3
Aims of the Open Forum 2005	3
Themes	4
Programme	5
On the day	6
Panel One	6
Discussion on Panel One	12
Panel Two	14
Discussion on Panel Two	18
Appendix I - Biographical notes on speakers	20
Appendix II - Messages received by the Open Forum	22
Appendix III - Organisation of the Open Forum	23

Concept

The Open Forum 2005 was conceived as an inclusive, non-partisan, non-governmental forum to examine, analyse and debate the crisis in Zimbabwe, and its relationship with South Africa and the wider African region. It aimed to focus in particular on two themes : (1) the role of civil society in Africa in defending human rights, and the institutional instruments available to it to use in promoting change; (2) to consider how the ruling party in Zimbabwe has adopted an anti-imperialist posture to secure some international support for its domestic policies, and how to develop a genuinely anti-imperialist framework for understanding the situation in Zimbabwe.

The Open Forum 2005 was organised by the Britain Zimbabwe Society in association with the Zimbabwe Association, the International Liaison Office of the Zimbabwe Human Rights NGO Forum, the REDRESS Trust, the Canon Collins Educational Trust for Southern Africa (CCETSA), together with Article 19, ACTSA (Action for Southern Africa), End the Silence, the Centre of African Studies, London University, and the Royal Africa Society (RAS). The Forum was a follow-up to a well-attended event which the Britain Zimbabwe Society organised in London on 28th February 2004 in association with a number of other organisations (*ref: Report on the Open Forum on Zimbabwe and South Africa, 28th February 2004, BZS*).

Aims of the Open Forum 2005

1. To bring together the Zimbabwean and South African diasporas in the UK, with participants from other African countries and the British constituency of interest in Southern Africa
2. To inform and educate about current developments in the region appertaining to Zimbabwe's relations with South Africa and other African countries and the response of civil society to the Zimbabwean crisis
3. To stimulate and support an open, inclusive and constructive debate on the promotion of democratic governance, human rights, justice and peace in Zimbabwe
4. To support the ongoing advocacy efforts by civil society organisations in Zimbabwe, South Africa and the region in defence of these goals in Zimbabwe
5. To promote and facilitate networking and relationship building between individuals and civil society organisations in Zimbabwe, South Africa and the region, and with the wider international constituency of support

Theme 1 - Human rights instruments as tools for civil society

The number of organs and instruments emanating from the African Union (AU) that offer to deliver human rights to Zimbabweans has grown considerably in recent years. But their real implications for ordinary people remain limited and remote. What are their possibilities? How can they be used most effectively? As legislation within Zimbabwe increasingly inhibits civil organisation, do the instruments of the AU offer avenues for resisting or challenging state power? How do rights even offer simple protection or basic remedies to ordinary people? Is it realistic to even consider that they might be more ambitious instruments of transformation?

Theme 2 - An anti-imperialist framework for understanding Zimbabwe

One of ZANU PF's key strategies has been to present its draconian and anti-democratic actions as anti-imperialist measures in a continuing process of liberation for Zimbabwe.

This strategy is designed to do four key things:

1. to polarize politics (“you are either for us or for the colonial oppressors”)
2. to make it impossible for an alternative indigenous opposition to emerge
3. to disqualify any external support, particularly from Britain, the former colonizer
4. to label any externally voiced critique of the ZANU analysis as neo-imperialist

In order to unlock solidarity and support from civil society organisations outside of Zimbabwe (particularly in Britain), a clear alternative analysis is needed. A rejection of President Mugabe’s anti-imperialist rhetoric needs to be reconcilable with support for initiatives such as the Make Poverty History campaign. The grain of truth in the rhetoric has to be distinguished from the hyperbole that surrounds it, by situating Zimbabwe within its historical, political, and economic contexts.

The aim of both sessions together was to reach a clearer understanding of the Zimbabwe government's relationships within the region and internationally, and to contribute to developing strategy for civil society organisations in South Africa, the region and Britain. The Forum was publicised as widely and inclusively as possible, with invitations issued to a range of Zimbabwean, South African and African organisations based in the UK, and to UK organisations with an interest in Zimbabwe and the region.



OPEN FORUM 2005 **on ZIMBABWE, SOUTH AFRICA & the REGION**

Saturday 4th June 2005, Brunei Gallery, SOAS, University of London

PROGRAMME

- 1.30pm Doors open
- 2.00pm Welcome & introduction to the afternoon - Margaret Ling, Britain Zimbabwe Society
- 2.00-3.30pm **Panel One: Human rights instruments as tools for civil society**
Chair - Gugulethu Moyo, International Bar Association
- First speaker - Gabriel Shumba, Zimbabwe Exiles Forum
- Second speaker - Ahmed Motala, Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation, South Africa
- Open discussion
- 3.30-4.00pm Refreshment break
- 4.00-5.30pm **Panel Two: An anti-imperialist framework for understanding Zimbabwe**
Chair - Shula Marks, Emeritus Professor, SOAS
- First speaker - Elinor Sisulu, Crisis Coalition of Zimbabwe
- Second speaker - Brian Raftopoulos, Institute of Development Studies, Zimbabwe
- Third speaker - Wilf Mbanga, The Zimbabwean
- Open discussion
- 5.30pm Closing remarks
- 6.00pm Forum ends

On the day

The Open Forum 2005 was organised in two sessions, based on the themes. Session I was chaired by Gugulethu Moyo, a Zimbabwean lawyer who is currently with the International Bar Association advising on media relations for Southern African issues. Session II was chaired by Shula Marks, a South African historian who is Emeritus Professor in the history of Southern Africa at the School of Oriental & African Studies. The speakers and participants were welcomed by Margaret Ling, convenor of the planning group, who drew attention to the messages to the event from those unable to attend.

The Forum was attended by some 270 persons. Stimulated by strong presentations from all the speakers on the panel, and by the dramatic events unfolding in Zimbabwe (the 'drive out the rubbish' government blitz - officially called 'restore order' - on urban settlements and informal sector traders had reached its third week) participants conducted a lively debate with sharp disagreements on some points. The constructive discussion ranged more widely than the two principal themes, and reflected a clear consensus that the crisis in Zimbabwe had entered a new phase, requiring long- as well as short-term responses, and careful re-assessment of the direction of events in Southern Africa.

PANEL ONE

SUPPORTING HUMAN RIGHTS IN AFRICA: THE KEY CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES AND HOW THEY RELATE TO ZIMBABWE

Opening the session, Gugulethu Moyo cited the recent statement by Miloon Kothari, UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Adequate Housing, condemning the mass evictions in Zimbabwe as a violation of human rights which had led to the arrest of 24,000 people thus far and left up to 300,000 homeless. She observed that whilst the UN spokesperson had called for a halt to the operation, no statement had yet emerged from any regional body or the African Union (AU) on the issue. The session would consider how the African inter-governmental system might protect Zimbabweans' human rights.

Gabriel Shumba, a Zimbabwean human rights lawyer and torture victim, now based in Pretoria, made the first presentation. He said that most people (except for government employees) are now agreed that the situation in Zimbabwe cries out for constructive intervention. At a time when the prisons are already overflowing, with 22,000 prisoners occupying the space for 16,000, the government has arrested over 22,000 more people, and evicted thousands of residents in mid-winter. It crushes dissent ruthlessly. How can the structures of the AU and human rights instruments be engaged with these problems?

Chapter 3 of the Zimbabwean Constitution sets out a Bill of Rights, which includes the right to vote. In August 2004, the Southern African Development Community (SADC)

adopted Guidelines on Free and Fair Elections, which could assist the monitoring of elections in the region. However, regional bodies harbour people who share the same undemocratic instincts as certain governments. They are flawed institutions; the SADC has been unresponsive to Zimbabwe's problems. The same is true of the African Union (AU), which he likened to a dictators' club, with some exceptions. Both the SADC and the AU had failed the people of Zimbabwe.

Chapter 3 also protects other rights, such as the right to dignity - which has been breached for the 22,000 people who have just had their homes and livelihoods destroyed. The right to be free of torture has been breached in respect of many people, including well-known figures. If your rights are violated you are supposed to seek your remedy in the domestic jurisdiction. In his own case, said Mr Shumba, this was impossible because he had been forced to flee the country. Moreover, the judiciary had changed. Some judges have been forced to resign, whilst judges friendly to the regime had been brought onto the Bench. He believed that the Chief Justice was benefiting from the land appropriations. This makes futile attempts to exercise or defend basic rights within the system.

The African system acknowledges that where the exercise of rights in a domestic jurisdiction is predictably futile, the complainant may go elsewhere, without exhausting domestic remedies. He had therefore approached the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights (ACHPR) directly in 2003. But the preliminary stage of argument about the admissibility of his case has not yet begun. The Zimbabwean government has not responded to the allegations in his case, and asked for a postponement until November 2005, when it is due to host the next session of the Commission. Mr Shumba said he could not visit Zimbabwe without risking his freedom or his life. He would be deprived of the opportunity to present his case in person and it could be dismissed in his absence. It was governments that appointed people to the Commission; its decisions were 'quasi-judicial' and not enforceable. It just gives recommendations to the African Union. He concluded that the African system as a legal system to enforce rights was a hopeless system. The value of the Commission was for publicity. As long as the present government remained in power in Zimbabwe, we could not expect justice, since the UN and other international mechanisms like the International Criminal Court were not of much practical help.

However, Canada has a Crimes against Humanity and War Crimes Act. Mr Shumba is preparing a dossier on crimes against humanity and is seeking permission to apply for warrants of arrest for Mugabe and others who have committed crimes against the people of Zimbabwe. However, since Mugabe as head of state is immune from prosecution the focus is on key lower-level players such as torturers in Harare Central Police Station.

Ahmed C. Motala, a South African human rights lawyer and Director of the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation, Johannesburg, gave the second presentation. He noted that the plight of Zimbabweans worsens each day especially with the current destruction of informal settlements and stalls of vendors. He cited the experience of a

cobbler who had been mending shoes on the streets of Harare for the past 20 years, who was told in no uncertain terms by two policemen to take his belongings and leave. When the policemen were asked for reasons they did not respond but warned the cobbler not to make any excuses. The cobbler considers himself lucky in that the owners of the property outside which he plied his trade have allowed him to work in their yard. But his customers have difficulty locating him and he is suffering a loss of even the meagre income he was earning. He can barely support his family. One story amongst the thousands in Zimbabwe of a struggle for survival.

The “restore order” campaign has led to the destruction of the livelihoods of thousands of Zimbabweans, most condemned to rely on foreign food aid. However many of those being forced to return to their rural communities have no assurances that they would be able to access such assistance. In fact, the Zimbabwean authorities seem to be determined to impoverish their own people, including some who are supporters of ZANU-PF and may have voted for them in the recent elections. While the impression that was created at the time of the elections was that there was no violence, the contrary is being proved. Many cases of torture and assault are now being revealed as people gain access to civil society organisations to tell their woeful tales.

Given the serious situation in Zimbabwe, how have African inter-governmental institutions such as the African Union responded? Could they be playing a more effective role in addressing the situation? What role could civil society organisations play in lobbying these institutions? The establishment of the African Union in July 2002 marked an important milestone. It signified, on paper at least, a new commitment by African states to tackle issues of importance to the continent. The Constitutive Act of the AU explicitly incorporates in its objectives the promotion of “democratic principles and institutions, popular participation and good governance” and the promotion and protection of “human and peoples' rights in accordance with the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights and other relevant human rights instruments”. Similarly, the AU undertook to function in accordance with certain principles including “respect for democratic principles, human rights, the rule of law and good governance”, “promotion of social justice to ensure balanced economic development” and “respect for the sanctity of human life”.

By accepting these principles, African states have agreed to limit their sovereignty, which was a cornerstone of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) Charter. In a further erosion of state sovereignty, the AU has undertaken to condemn and reject any unconstitutional change of government and the Assembly has the authority to impose sanctions against any member state for failure to comply with decisions and policies of the AU. In principle at least AU member states are now unable to argue that how they treat those within their borders is a domestic matter in which the AU and other states should not interfere.

The question that arises is to what extent is the AU willing to implement these laudable principles? The recent example of the coup in Togo after the timely demise of President

Eyadema is illustrative. The coup was immediately condemned in the strongest terms by Alpha Oumar Konare, President of the AU Commission. Key leaders in Africa also publicly condemned the coup. A half-baked solution has seen the return of Faure Eyadema to power through a rigged election, resulting in thousands of Togolese continuing to flee the country, mostly to Benin. The AU Peace and Security Council remains seized of the matter. Whilst the intervention of the AU has had serious shortcomings, the AU - unlike its predecessor, the OAU - is not just standing by and allowing events to unfold. Togo sets an important precedent in AU crisis management.

The current situation in Sudan is also of serious concern to the AU Peace and Security Council (PSC). Pursuant to international outcry on the killings in Darfur, in October 2004 the PSC decided to establish the AU Mission in Sudan (AMIS), which is a military observer mission initially comprising about 3 000 troops. AMIS has been criticised for lacking the authority to intervene to protect civilians and prevent human rights violations, but it has established an important precedent in regard to AU conflict management initiatives. AMIS was installed in Sudan against the wishes of the Sudanese authorities, with senior military officials publicly threatening to attack the AU soldiers. It demonstrates the resolve of the AU to engage in conflict management and resolution beyond the rhetoric of resolutions and declarations.

How does this relate to Zimbabwe? When the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights presented its annual report to the AU Assembly in July 2004, it provided an opportunity for the AU to consider the report of a fact-finding mission to Zimbabwe undertaken by two members of the Commission in 2002. However, there were howls of protests from the Zimbabwean delegation. They argued that the report should not be considered since they did not have an opportunity to consider and respond to the report. Although this was a blatant lie, there was no representative of the African Commission there to present the facts of the transmission of the report to the Zimbabwean authorities. In the Executive Council of the AU, the South African Foreign Minister, disappointingly but not unexpected, joined the chorus that adoption of the African Commission's report be postponed until the Zimbabweans had an opportunity to consider it. The Assembly decided to postpone adoption of the report. The African Commission's report was finally adopted at the AU Summit in Abuja in January 2005. The African Commission has been instructed by the Assembly to transmit any report of a fact-finding mission to the State concerned before forwarding it for adoption by the Assembly.

The fiasco of the African Commission's report on Zimbabwe indicates the lack of political maturity at the AU to hold member states accountable. Instead of defending and supporting the work of its own independent human rights institution, the AU Assembly chose to accede to the demands of Zimbabwe. Even when the Assembly adopted the report in January, it did not adequately hold Zimbabwe accountable. What it ought to have done is to publicly express concern at the human rights situation in Zimbabwe and request the Government to commit itself to implementing the recommendations of the African Commission. This would not only have allowed the Assembly to monitor implementation of the recommendations in future but would have also bolstered the

confidence and role of the African Commission.

Within the 55-member AU, the five states that contribute together 40% of the regular budget of the AU wield tremendous influence. These countries are: Algeria, Egypt, Libya, Nigeria and South Africa. There is no representation amongst these from Eastern or Central Africa and the balance is tipped in favour of North Africa. There are some other States in Africa such as Senegal, Kenya, Tunisia and Ghana that also to a lesser extent have influence with the AU. Any issue requires the more powerful states to drive the process for it to succeed. Unfortunately amongst the states mentioned there are none likely to take up the issue of the human rights situation in Zimbabwe as long as South Africa is opposed to the issue being discussed. Just as Nigeria plays the “big brother role” in West Africa, South Africa plays a similar role amongst SADC countries. The decentralisation of initiatives and a greater reliance by the AU on the regional economic communities to deal with issues within their region means that there is less likelihood that the AU will deal the issue of Zimbabwe. Unless the situation deteriorates to the extent that it cannot be ignored.

However, it is still important that efforts to lobby the AU and its different structures continue. The ambassadors in Addis Ababa are central to any decision-making process at the AU. It is necessary to engage them continuously on the situation in Zimbabwe by providing regular accurate information and whenever possible to engage them in meetings about the willingness of the AU to take measures to protect the human rights of Zimbabweans. Recognising that South Africa is an obstacle to efforts at the AU means that it becomes crucial to engage the other influential states. In this lobbying effort it is necessary to clearly articulate what is being sought from the AU and the request has to be realistic. It is unlikely that the Peace and Security Council will engage with the situation in Zimbabwe or that the AU will send a peacekeeping mission. It is also not sufficient to simply say that the AU should do something. Lobbying efforts often target the AU Summit. By then it is often too late to influence the decision-making process at the AU. Discussions pertaining to the agenda of the meeting of the Permanent Representatives Committee, the Executive Council and Assembly are taking months, in advance of such meetings, and often tentative decisions are made on some issues prior to the Assembly.

The Pan African Parliament (PAP) is still very new and struggling with a lack of resources. It is unlikely to take up serious issues any time soon. But it would be worthwhile considering whether information on Zimbabwe should be despatched to the parliamentary members to keep them informed of the situation. Whether in the near future it could be influenced to adopt a resolution on a country situation is left to be seen. As the PAP comprises representatives from national parliaments this is not likely. Unfortunately it becomes imperative to constantly remind African states of the obligations they have undertaken under the Constitutive Act. It would be important to encourage the AU to request Zimbabwe to implement the recommendations of the African Commission. If it does so, it would have gone some way to holding the Government accountable.

The AU has established the Economic Social and Cultural Council, which was launched in March 2005. ECOSOCC comprises civil society and professional organisations from throughout the continent and from the African diaspora. Although ECOSOCC has only an advisory role, it provides an opportunity for civil society organisations to bring issues before the AU and its political structures. However, it has to be recognised that not all the representatives on ECOSOCC may be genuinely independent and therefore may be susceptible to influence by their governments in respect of issues they take up. It is worthwhile exploring whether ECOSOCC could be pursued to take up the issue of Zimbabwe, for example undertaking a fact-finding visit funded by Zimbabwean civil society organisations.

The fact-finding visit of the African Commission in July 2002 and the subsequent report to the AU Assembly has already been referred to above. Civil society organisations should persuade the African Commission to undertake another fact-finding visit to Zimbabwe more than three years later to establish for itself the human rights situation and to assess whether the Zimbabwean authorities have implemented any of its recommendations. The composition of the African Commission will change in July with four Commissioners being replaced. The response of the Commission will depend on the calibre of the new Commissioners elected to the Commission. The term of the current chair of the Commission also ends in November 2005. If the next chair is an independent Commissioner, the request for another investigative mission would be considered with the seriousness it deserves. However, as with all lobbying efforts, much energy would have to be expended in providing accurate information well in advance of the next session of the Commission. It is important to send the information directly to each Commissioner's personal address to ensure that they read it.

Zimbabwe has offered to host the next session of the African Commission in November/December 2005. The African Commission has as yet not decided the venue of the next session. If it takes place in Harare, it would provide an excellent opportunity for civil society organisations to showcase the human rights violations occurring in that country. There are many who argue that the African Commission should not meet in a country where serious human rights violations occur. But such a meeting could also provide an opportunity to develop a strategy that would include a series of events to highlight the serious human rights situation. It could also encourage the Commission to agree to undertake another fact-finding mission if they are confronted with the facts.

There are several cases currently pending before the African Commission. The procedures at the Commission are slow, it could take up to three years from the date on which the complaint is filed before a decision is reached. It is important not to become disillusioned with the hurdles and delays and to continue filing cases. The number and severity of cases also gives the Commission an indication of the enormity of the human rights problem in Zimbabwe. Under Article 58 of the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights the Commission may bring to the attention of the Assembly a situation of serious or massive violations of human rights which it deduces from complaints filed before it. As regards cases before the Commission, what happens after the Commission

has handed down its decision is as important as the process of arguing the cases. Often NGOs do not sufficiently publicise the decisions within the country and outside or use the decision in their lobbying efforts. The decision could have persuasive value with African and other governments. Decisions of the Commission could also be used to influence recalcitrant governments such as South Africa to at least condemn the violations publicly within the framework of the AU.

Zimbabwe ratified the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child in January 1995. Under this treaty a Committee of Experts has been established to monitor compliance by state parties with their obligations including through the receipt of complaints. Although the Committee has been meeting regularly, it still lacks resources and does not have its own secretariat. The Committee has a similar mandate to that of the African Commission, including undertaking fact-finding visits. It would be worthwhile exploring whether the Committee, if provided with resources will be willing to undertake a fact-finding visit to Zimbabwe to examine the situation of the rights of children.

Ahmed Motala concluded that there needs to be an accumulation of lobbying and other efforts to bring pressure to bear on the Zimbabwean authorities and their allies, especially South Africa. It is important not to naively expect that there could be immediate response from African institutions on the basis of one publication or a letter. A human rights activist has to remain eternally optimistic. And with the combined efforts of communities in different parts of the world, we can work together to change the situation in Zimbabwe

DISCUSSION ON PANEL ONE

Discussion followed. **Collen Gwiyo**, acting mayor of Chitungwiza and Deputy Secretary General of the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions (ZCTU), responding to Gabriel Shumba, said it was important that litigation was proceeded with, but warned that it was necessary to be aware of the ability of the regime to lobby both regionally and continentally. We should act to counter the influence of the regime by networking through trade unions, students movements and so on. ZANU-PF had been effective in lobbying in the SADC and AU, spending dollars to make friends.

He shared the experience that Gabriel Shumba underwent; a number of his colleagues in the labour movement had suffered torture. But the ZCTU had enabled him to raise some issues in the AU. Recently the government 'chose' the labour representative in Zimbabwe's delegation to the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The ZCTU had been under serious attack in the past four months, but had stood firm, with support from the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) in South Africa and other external friends. Economic rights must be given importance - the need for food is now dire. Another speaker added that the bulk of the population is being denied the right to eat. The Grain Marketing Board is run by crooks and incompetents. Within months people will not be eating - food will be unavailable even for those with money. This needs to be taken up with the AU, otherwise they will be faced with the embarrassment of

another Ethiopian-scale disaster.

The main themes that emerged in the ensuing debate were (i) lobbying in defence of human rights; (ii) land; (iii) whence comes South Africa's stance on Zimbabwe? (iv) why focus on Zimbabwe?

(i) Torture is real in Zimbabwe. What was done to Gabriel Shumba was horrifying. Since the elections supporters of the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC) have been harassed and tortured. But torture and violence are also happening elsewhere in the continent, so the Amani Trust in Zimbabwe and other groups in Kenya and Tanzania are networking to link up groups acting against such human rights violations. There are good linkages between those working on these issues in South Africa and the UK, but elsewhere civil society organisations need to coordinate better. The Robben Island Guidelines re prison inspections and Article 5 of the African Charter provide a touchstone. ECOSOCC, being solely made up of civil society organisations, was a good forum for networking. An opportunity would arise with the visit of an ACHPR delegation to Zimbabwe in July, led by Sanji Monageng, secretary of the Botswana Law Society.

(ii) Two speakers praised Mugabe's land policy, seeing it in the context of the liberation struggle. Others pointed out that whilst land reform was necessary, the recent process was neither fair nor practical. Many of those settled on the land after it was taken by the present regime are now being driven off it again. We should not romanticise Mugabe. It was necessary to demystify the liberation struggle, and bear in mind that most Zimbabweans were born after independence. Glorification of liberation struggle heroes of the past overlooks the crimes they committed against their own peoples once in power, e.g. Kwame Nkrumah in Ghana. We must recognise African leaders as human and fallible, and not allow recognition of their past good deeds to cloud judgement of their current failures.

(iii) Ahmed Motala said that the allegiance of Mbeki's government to Mugabe was rooted in the latter's support for the African National Congress (ANC) in its struggle. Its policy of quiet diplomacy had produced little effect, and it needs to change its approach. Mbeki's position was not informed by facts on the ground. But South Africa cannot indulge in regime change. The AU's African Commission had found human rights abuses in Zimbabwe, and Mbeki should have respected that; it's not something invented by the US and UK.

(iv) A speaker who said he was from the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) complained that there was no focus in the UK on his country, where millions of people had been massacred. Why did Bob Geldof not condemn genocide in the DRC? Elections were also flawed in the US and UK. He praised Mugabe for arresting the mercenaries who were en route to the DRC. **Tererai Karimakwende** of SW Radio Africa, whose transmissions are being jammed by the Zimbabwe government, pointed out that Mugabe had also pillaged in the Congo. Flaws in the electoral systems in the US and UK were no excuse for human rights violations in Africa. **Elinor Sisulu**, sympathising with the

speaker from DRC, said that President Mbeki, addressing the South African Communist Party (SACP) conference, had asked why there was so much concern about Zimbabwe when 3.5 million had died in the Congo, and more in Rwanda and Somalia. She had recently visited Huambo in Angola, where the situation is dire, and registered for the first time the scale of loss of life and suffering there; nothing comparable in Zimbabwe. She understood why there was so little sympathy for Zimbabwe in Africa. But this did not mean that Zimbabwe was alright. Negative comparisons do not help. The root of these problems everywhere is the impunity of African governments. Africans must accept responsibility for African issues and crises. Regarding land, she said an aunt of hers had been allocated land two years ago, and now it had been taken away from her by the same government. In the Johannesburg office of the Crisis Coalition they deal every day with victims of torture from Zimbabwe.

PANEL TWO

THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST RHETORIC OF THE MUGABE REGIME, AND HOW TO DEVELOP AN ALTERNATIVE ANTI-IMPERIALIST PROJECT FOR ZIMBABWE

Opening the session, Professor Shula Marks welcomed the lively debate that had begun in the previous session, saying that in view of the grim situation in Zimbabwe, it was not surprising that people held passionate views about it. She introduced **Brian Raftopoulos**, associate professor of Development Studies at the University of Zimbabwe and Chair of the Crisis in Zimbabwe Coalition from 2001-2003. He first analysed the anti-imperialist critique relating to Zimbabwe. There was a long history of anti-imperialism on the continent, largely focussing on the role of colonial and imperial states and economic exploitation, especially in the 1970s. There was little focus on political and civil rights.

Mugabe's version of anti-imperialism centred on the land issue, making human rights secondary and marginalizing the needs of the people. His 'patriotic history' was a selective version of Zimbabwe's liberation struggle, excluding many voices, but it had resonance in the diaspora. From 2000 onwards, it subordinated human rights issues, and used the West as a shield behind which to carry out human rights abuses. This became very important after 9/11. The Bush-Blair neo-liberal imperialism with its hypocrisy about human rights provided a new focus for Mugabe's anti-imperialism; it drew Africa and the Third World together in opposition. Mugabe has constructed his message against the US-UK project and this prevented his own region from becoming isolated by making his anti-imperial project an international issue. In this context, issues like torture are treated as non-legitimate, and NGOs raising them, often Western-financed, are seen as targets. Mugabe also introduced race as an issue, which adds more complexity to the debate. The people have responded through national debates. But Mugabe has pursued a very skilful domestic and international strategy, and civil society in Zimbabwe has been too weak to respond effectively.

In relation to South Africa, Mugabe set the parameters early on, both in the region and in

relation to the West. Mbeki wanted to engage in African issues, especially in promoting the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), so he did not want to be seen to be falling outside an African discourse. Hence his policy of quiet diplomacy in relation to Zimbabwe. Mbeki needs to please many audiences. After 9/11 it became impossible for Mbeki to be critical of Mugabe without being identified with the US-UK strategy. Meanwhile with the assimilation of the Pan Africanist Congress (PAC) into the ANC, the Africanist voice within the ANC has grown stronger. Mbeki sees himself as providing the inter-face between Africa and the West (especially via NEPAD), but at the same time he does want to be caught outside the perspective of the liberation struggle. South African capital has been moving increasingly into Zimbabwe and has a key role in electricity supply. The ANC thought that there was a reform agenda within ZANU-PF, but it backfired with the Tsholotsho affair. [In late 2004, a secret meeting of six ZANU-PF provincial chairmen with Information Minister Jonathan Moyo at Tsholotsho was seen by Mugabe as a plot to replace him by elevating former Security Minister Emerson Mnangagwa to the vice-presidency. The chairmen were suspended and prevented from standing in the March 2005 elections; Moyo was sacked. He stood as an independent in the elections and regained his seat.] The embarrassing capture of a South African spy has thwarted any outside attempt to monitor the succession process within ZANU-PF. Mugabe has been pulling Mbeki around for the last five years.

In South Africa the new role of COSATU and the SACP in relation to Zimbabwe is a major breakthrough, resulting from the activity of the civic organisations. Their position is as much about South African issues, notably trends within the ANC itself, as it is about Zimbabwe. COSATU, raising human rights above sovereignty, tried to bulldoze its way into Zimbabwe, which allowed Mugabe to make national sovereignty a legitimate cover for repression. Cross-border collaboration between civics is an important development in the region; it signifies that civil society is not prepared to allow the boundaries of sovereignty to limit the solidarity of people's rights. Regarding the recent elections, the SADC Protocol on elections, which attempts to provide a framework for the legitimacy of elections in the region, is unenforceable, and formalistic. Mugabe used its formalism to comply in a formal sense.

Now Mugabe is attacking the social base of the opposition - the informal sector and the surplus population. Since 2000 he has consistently pursued an anti-urban policy. ZANU-PF's message is that townspeople don't belong. Mugabe has denounced immigrants from Malawi as totemless people. Residents in urban areas are regarded as temporary- they are being flushed out and sent to rural areas to live under traditional authorities. This is a major, and sinister, piece of social engineering. Mugabe's anti-imperialism sees urbanism as a political enemy, as a source of challenge to his autocratic rule. The opposition is so weakened that it cannot mobilize around issues of urban conflict despite its own constituency being there, and it has lost the battle both in the region and on the continent for legitimacy.

Raftopoulos concluded that anti-imperialism is a genuine response to the international crisis. Progressives are faced by the most dangerous US government of the last 100 years,

which threatens any independent country that has a major resource. This posture gives Mugabe's anti-imperial rhetoric greater credibility. We need to engage urgently with an anti-imperialism that is critical of national authoritarianisms - one that is not essentialist, (i.e. resting on binary oppositions - black/white etc). Such an anti-imperialism must draw on democratic values, and have human rights at its centre. We were globalised early on, and must stand for a democratic globalisation. He warned that Zimbabwe is not a failed state. It is a strong state, with strong army and police, with support in the region and the continent. This state could last another ten years. We need a democratic anti-imperialism, we must build solidarities through struggles against imperialism and authoritarianism.

Elinor Sisulu, who had arrived from South Africa that morning, referred to the difficulties she had encountered with Immigration in gaining entry, and condemned Mugabe for the exodus of so many Zimbabweans, now found queuing for hours at Heathrow. She recalled that she had worked with Brian Raftopoulos in the Planning Department of the Zimbabwe Government. Back in the 1980s there had been a revolutionary fervour in Zimbabwe following independence. African leaders like Mengistu were idolised. But meeting Ethiopian refugees she learned that one in ten Ethiopians had been murdered by Mengistu. For her at least, Mengistu's credibility had fallen. People have been protective of their heroes like Mobutu Sese Seko and Idi Amin, and they find it difficult to recognise faults in them. Now some people say that Mugabe is being demonised and victimised by the West, but the reality is worse even than what is reported. The current moves against the informal sector are not being reported in the world; few pictures have come out of the evictions and removals. Perhaps one million have been rendered homeless. At a time when most Southern African countries except South Africa and Botswana are experiencing food crises, in Zimbabwe the food crisis - caused by drought and bad agricultural policy compounded by HIV/AIDS - is being exacerbated by deliberate action. This is a major crime that cannot be rationalised through anti-imperialist rhetoric.

The usual response to such crises is to seek a political alternative, as we have seen in Zambia and Kenya. In Zimbabwe it has produced the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC). But the experience of other countries shows that a change of political parties does not necessarily make a difference. All crises in Africa are marked by imperialist interference, and the culture of impunity. The latter will not really disappear if a different political party takes power. Civil society must deal with the problem of impunity. The strengthening of civil society will make the difference, and Zimbabwe does need a change of regime. All the principles and instruments must be used, despite Gabriel Shumba's doubts about their effectiveness. The election of Alpha Konare as Secretary-General of the AU is a good omen.

To Mbeki's question 'Why Zimbabwe? Why not Darfur, the Congo, Rwanda?' we must reply that these are the tragic consequences coming in the wake of dictatorships often supported by the West. It is dangerous to ignore this. The development of civil society organisations and civil society momentum is very important. There is weakness, even

absence of civil society across Africa. The situation in Zimbabwe, especially as regards the integrity of elections and human rights abuses, has implications for our region. Our work with civil society in South and Southern Africa must be done sensitively (e.g. in relation to the Malawi elections). Now elections are due in Angola; the Zimbabwe experience does not augur well for free and fair elections there. Elinor Sisulu said she had recently attended a CODESRIA (Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa) conference on elections in Africa. Zimbabwe was represented by the government and by the Zimbabwe Electoral Commission (ZEC). The latter has a stronger protocol for the conduct of elections than does the SADC.

There is cynicism about the new body, the AU, because many see it as the continuation of the OAU. The AU failed to stop the genocide in Rwanda. But it does have new instruments on offer and we must continue to work with them. South Africa is important not just because of its power, but because of its civil society, the strongest in the region. COSATU's intervention made a nonsense of Mugabe's anti-imperialist stance, since COSATU cannot be portrayed as a tool of Western imperialism. The media are very important for people in the diaspora. We need a constant media focus on Zimbabwe; the same is true for Darfur, where the Sudanese government has blocked off much coverage. This is necessary in order to generate more urgent responses. The media, especially cameras, are absent from all the great African tragedies, such as Darfur, Rwanda, Sierra Leone. Civil society must tackle this. Zimbabweans in the diaspora are important here. There are more than 1.5 million Zimbabweans in South Africa now, and they have buying power. The remittances sent home by Zimbabweans in the UK are very important. We must work out how to use these sources of power. The new weekly paper in the UK, *The Zimbabwean*, is an important diaspora project. We are looking at how to publish it in South Africa and get it into Zimbabwe. Every Zimbabwean in the diaspora should buy it. We also need a radio project that the regime cannot stop.

Wilf Mbanga, founder, publisher and editor of *The Zimbabwean*, said that Mugabe in his desire to cling to power and ZANU-PF with its propensity for corruption and mismanagement, try to give respectability to their actions by parroting anti-imperialism. The March elections were dubbed the 'anti-Blair' election. They blame all problems on external factors, such as the sanctions of the West. This is a figment of the imagination. There are no sanctions, only travel restrictions affecting about 100 people. We must claim back the anti-imperialist agenda for our own. Mugabe has made it impossible to criticise him for anything without being denounced as an agent of imperialism.

The West talks the language of human rights and the rule of law; when we talk about these things we seem to be mimicking them although we are anti-imperialist. We should not be cowed by the denunciations of the oppressors. Bully boys always operate from a premise of fear. We need solidarity and support from the West, but we must stand alone and be independent. Those of us who have left Zimbabwe are denounced as traitors - Mugabe cannot beat us up or deny us food. He disparages us, denies us the vote, but he needs our pounds or US dollars. He has created this situation, but the diaspora still

manages to send money home. We are not made welcome here. We do not belong here and it will never be our home. We must sort out the mess at home, and get our act together here in the UK, setting aside our selfish agendas and swallowing our pride. Until we do that we will never dislodge ZANU-PF, and we will remain strangers in a land where we do not belong. Meanwhile I offer you *The Zimbabwean* - it exists for you. Please use it.

DISCUSSION ON PANEL TWO

In the discussion that followed, **Khanyisela Moyo** asked why are the voices of human rights activists drowned out? Had it not all started with the *Gukurahundi* [the bloody repression carried out by the regime in Matabeleland in the early 1980s]? We should not forget that. She asked why we had lobbied first with the European Union rather than the African Union. **Sunanda Ray** asked whether it was possible to use the G8 meeting and Make Poverty History campaign for our benefit. If the focus were on trade it might divert attention from these issues and consolidate the position of the dictators. Another contributor observed that we should develop a critique of Economic Structural Adjustment Programmes (ESAP) and Mugabe's devotion to neo-liberalism; he only became an 'anti-imperialist' when it suited him. People need to get involved in the Zimbabwe Social Forum, which had been established two years ago. At the end of this year the Southern African Social Forum will take place in Zimbabwe, and provide an important opportunity to develop an anti-imperialist strategy. Another speaker suggested it was necessary to find local solutions; we must locate structures within the country, both within and outside of ZANU-PF to inject more ideological pressure.

Brian Raftopoulos said that the agenda of the G8 was so pre-set that it would be difficult to redirect it. Both he and **Elinor Sisulu** underlined the importance of remembering the *Gukurahundi*. The former said we might need our own Truth and Reconciliation Commission in the future. The latter described it as a burning issue, a festering sore that needs a serious process to deal with it, which might even go back as far as the 1850s and Ndebele raids on the Shona. She warned against the increasing narrowing of citizenship in Zimbabwe, a tendency that was chillingly mirroring what happened in Rwanda, when those perceived as victims became the killers.

A former campaigner with ZimRights and member of the MDC in Chitungwiza pledged that people would buy *The Zimbabwean* in big numbers, because they want it to succeed. He referred to the sacrifices people had made in the past in Zimbabwe, and urged people to unite instead of dividing each other. Another speaker disputed that there were no sanctions on Zimbabwe. In addition to travel restrictions, there were the IMF/World Bank exclusions. Referring to the land seizures, **Collen Gwiyo** said that one factor not discussed was the plight of the farm workers. Each farm taken by the government had about 500 workers, who lost their livelihood. It was not a race issue. It was an attempt to target those who stated a democratic opinion of opposition in 2000. Now we have a collapsing mining industry and urban sprawl, with health implications, exacerbating the

HIV/AIDS problem. If in order to have peace and security we have to have a bourgeois disposition, then so be it.

Sam Nkomo, CEO of the *Daily News*, saying that he spoke of what he knew on a daily basis, observed that Zimbabwe had been engulfed in darkness since 1990, and since 2000 had been plunged into deep darkness. There is no short term solution. People must be prepared to get their hands dirty. Theorising would not get us anywhere. We had underestimated ZANU-PF. They are strategists (e.g. they focussed on the land issue not for its own sake but in order to win an election); we need to focus on strategising. They gave the farms to their cronies, and now we have hunger. Endorsing what several panellists had said, he stressed that the struggle for Zimbabwe would be fought from inside. Meanwhile, he begged the British government not send anyone back home - our children need to be here to be empowered to liberate us. We need a Chief Representative for the diaspora in each region where it is found - somebody to coordinate all activities. It did not matter whether it was somebody from the MDC or somebody else, we need to be united and have a leader to coordinate

Washington Ali, MDC chair in the UK, noting that there were many civic groups and political parties, called for unity and asked what are we doing for ourselves, for our country. He suggested that we could emulate the role of those who won liberation who before 1980 were operating from outside the country. A white Zimbabwean said he was ashamed of his race. Racism had surfaced in the last elections in the UK; we need to stop racist campaigns, and stop the deportation of Zimbabweans. He urged academics not to cooperate with the Home Office by providing expert reports in immigration cases. **Puck de Raadt** of Bail for Immigration Detainees disagreed, saying that expert reports can help to stop removals, and cited Prof. Ranger's recent appearance before the Immigration Appeals Tribunal as having been positive. Prof Ranger informed the audience that the Zimbabwe Book Fair would take place in the first week of August on the theme of African Rights.

Replying to the debate, Wilf Mbanga said that World Bank loans were not sanctions, just loans of money that was not ours. Referring to the problem of the removal of Zimbabweans from the UK, Elinor Sisulu commended the work of Southern African Women's Migration Affairs (SAWEMA). She said that demystifying the liberation struggle did not mean not acknowledging its successes and achievements - it meant not being blind to its legacy. She added that we need to talk more about the food crisis and its relationship to anti-imperialism. We cannot be independent if we rely on food imports. It is ironic that Zimbabwe is more dependent now on hand-outs from imperialist powers. This is where Mugabe's 'anti-imperialism' had led; also, it should not be used to justify the rape and sexual abuse of women.

Appendix I - Biographical notes on speakers

Gabriel Shumba:

A Zimbabwean human rights lawyer, Gabriel Shumba is currently carrying out research on Universal Jurisdiction and accountability for gross human rights violations in Africa for an LLD thesis at the University of Pretoria. He is also supervisor of the LLM Human Rights and Democratisation in Africa Electoral Observation Clinical Group and Director of the Zimbabwe Exiles Forum. He was arrested, assaulted and tortured in defence of Human Rights in Zimbabwe, for which he is taking a case against the Zimbabwe government to the African Commission for Human and People's Rights.

Ahmed Motala:

Ahmed Motala is a South African human rights activist and lawyer. He is currently Executive Director of the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation in Johannesburg and most recently was director of the Human Rights Institute of South Africa. Ahmed has previously worked as Legal Adviser for Africa at Amnesty International and Human Rights Officer at Save the Children UK, both London-based organisations. Ahmed has been supporting the work of the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights and attending its meetings since 1990. He has undertaken advocacy at the political bodies of the African Union since 1995.

During the final years of apartheid Ahmed was involved in the investigation of police killings of opponents of the government. He also participated as a member of one of the legal teams in the first case before the South African Constitutional Court in 1995 in which the abolition of the death penalty was successfully argued.

Elinor Sisulu:

Educated in Zimbabwe, Senegal and the Netherlands, Elinor Sisulu combines training in history, English literature, development studies and feminist theory. She has published studies of women's work in Zimbabwe and as a freelance writer and editor since moving to South Africa in 1990. In 1994 she published an award winning children's book *The Day Gogo Went to Vote*. She is a member of the South African Children's Book Forum and has been instrumental in the establishment of a Children's Literature Network in South Africa. Her biography about her mother and father-in-law, entitled *Walter and Albertina Sisulu: In Our Lifetime* was published to critical acclaim in December 2002. The book was runner-up in the 2003 Alan Paton non-fiction award and won the 2003 Noma Award for publishing in Africa.

Since 2003 Elinor has been advising on projects on democracy and human rights in Zimbabwe. She is currently the coordinator of the Crisis Coalition of Zimbabwe's Johannesburg office, the major umbrella body of Zimbabwean non-governmental organisations.

Brian Raftopoulos:

Brian Raftopoulos is currently Associate Professor of Development Studies, IDS, University of Zimbabwe. He has published widely in the areas of labour history, urban history, historiography, politics and the economy of Zimbabwe, and is on the Advisory Board of the Journal of Southern African Studies. He has also been a leading civic activist since the 1990's, having been a member of the first executive of the NCA and Chair of the Crisis in Zimbabwe Coalition from 2001-2003.

Wilf Mbanga:

Wilf Mbanga was founder and Managing Director of Associated Newspapers of Zimbabwe, publishers of the Daily News newspaper. In 2003-4 he lived in the Netherlands as guest for a year of the Tilburg City of Refuge Programme (Stichting Vrijplaats Tilburg) during which time he co-authored with his wife a literary biography of Sir Seretse, President of Botswana 1966 – 1980, and Ruth Khama, whose cross-racial marriage in 1948 rocked the world and wrote a weekly column for The Brabants Dagblad. Now living in the UK he is founder, Editor and Publisher of The Zimbabwean – a weekly newspaper published in the UK with a simultaneous edition for Southern Africa (especially Zimbabwe) printed in Johannesburg

Chair of Panel One - Gugulethu Moyo:

Gugulethu Moyo works for the International Bar Association as Media Relations Advisor for Southern African Issues focusing on rule of law problems in the Southern Africa region. Gugulethu is a Zimbabwean lawyer holding academic legal qualifications from universities in Zimbabwe and the United Kingdom. Before joining the International Bar Association, she worked, for two years, as in-house legal advisor to Associated Newspapers of Zimbabwe (ANZ), publishers of The Daily News and The Daily News on Sunday. At ANZ she oversaw litigation on behalf of the company and Daily News' journalists challenging the Constitutional validity of aspects of Zimbabwe's media law. One of these cases formed the basis for a complaint against the Zimbabwean government, filed before the African Commission for Human and People's Rights by Zimbabwe Lawyers for Human Rights.

Chair of Panel Two - Shula Marks:

Shula Marks is an Emeritus Professor of the School of Oriental and African Studies, London and Distinguished Research Fellow of the School of Advanced Study in the University of London. A former Director of the Institute of Commonwealth Studies, London, she is a Fellow of the British Academy and holds honorary degrees from the Universities of Cape Town and Natal. She has lectured and written widely on Southern African history.

Appendix II - Messages received by the Open Forum

From Professor Barney Pityana, Vice-Chancellor, University of South Africa, human rights lawyer and anti-apartheid activist. Member of the African Commission on Human and People's Rights and co-compiler of its fact-finding report on Zimbabwe.

'Many thanks for your kind invitation to participate in this Open Forum on South Africa-Zimbabwe on 4 June 2005. ... I have tried very hard to see if I could be travelling to the UK at the time suggested. The truth is I cannot. My diary is very tight and I have to be travelling overseas around the times of the proposed dates. The result is that I regret to advise you that I am not available for this event.

Kindly be assured of my support for all your efforts and for supporting the struggle for justice and human rights in Zim. I have no doubt that your efforts are appreciated and valued by the people of Zim. Keep it up.'

From The Book Café, Harare

'Culture is a fluid means of popular and 'free' expression in Africa, even under repressive conditions; but don't expect it to conform, one way or another. Culture has a subversive edge. It has a special role to play in bringing together people of different views; reminding all of deeper truths. It transcends all boundaries; and is a primary means for communication across cultures and countries.

Book Café works in these areas and has successes and lessons to share. Don't forget a cultural component in your deliberations. Good wishes for a successful event from Book Café, Harare.'

From Jim Corrigan, immediate past President of the National Union of Journalists and speaker at Open Forum 2004

'Good luck with your forum and with your campaigns for human rights in Zimbabwe and across the region. Zimbabweans deserve and need our support at this very difficult time - the success of their struggle will boost democratic practice throughout Southern Africa.'

Appendix III - Organisation of the Open Forum

(a) Membership of the organising group

The practical arrangements for the Open Forum were handled by a working group of representatives of the sponsoring organisations, namely:

Margaret Ling, Britain Zimbabwe Society - convenor
Oliver Phillips, Britain Zimbabwe Society
Katrina Phillips, Zimbabwe Association/Britain Zimbabwe Society
Tor-Hugne Olsen, Int Liaison Office, Zimbabwe Human Rights NGO Forum
Julius Mutyambizi, Int Liaison Office, Zimbabwe Human Rights NGO Forum
Rob Monro, Amani Trust/ Zimbabwe Human Rights NGO Forum
Kevin Laue, The REDRESS Trust
Theodoros Chronopoulos, CCETSA
Sarah Nancollas, CCETSA
Tirzah Loewenstein, End the Silence
Lois Davies, End the Silence
Eldridge Culverwell, End the Silence
Euan Wilmshurst, Action for Southern Africa
John Barker, Article 19
Alan Brooks (individual)
Gugulethu Moyo (individual/chair of panel one)

Meetings of the working group were hosted by the International Liaison Office of the Zimbabwe Human Rights Forum.

(b) Contact details of associated organisations

Britain Zimbabwe Society

Frances Chinemana, Secretary, 16 Longland, Salisbury SP2 7ET

Tel: 01722 322293 Mob 07748 305601

E-mail: frances@chinemana.fslife.co.uk

Web: www.britain-zimbabwe.org.uk

Contact: Margaret Ling margaret.ling@geo2.poptel.org.uk Tel 0208 348 8463
Oliver Phillips oliverph@homechoice.co.uk

Zimbabwe Association

Development House, 56-64 Leonard Street, London EC2A 4JX

Tel: 020 7549 0355

E-mail: zimbabweassociation@yahoo.co.uk

Web: www.zimbabweassociation.org

Contacts: Katrina Phillips katrina.phillips@virgin.net
Sarah Harland ray.rasalosa@btinternet.com

International Liaison Office, Zimbabwe Human Rights NGO Forum

56-64 Leonard Street, London EC2A 4JX

Tel. 020 7065 0945 Fax: 020 7549 0356

E-mail: IntLO@hrforumzim.com

Web: www.hrforumzim.com

Contacts: Tor-Hugne Olsen, Julius Mutyambizi

Canon Collins Educational Trust for Southern Africa (CCETSA)

22 The Ivories, 6 Northampton Street, London N1 2HY

Tel: 020 7354 1462

Fax: 020 7359 4875

E-mail: ccetsa@canoncollins.org.uk

Web: www.canoncollins.org.uk

Contacts: Sarah Nancollas sarah@canoncollins.org.uk

Theodoros Chronopoulos theo@canoncollins.org.uk

The REDRESS Trust

3rd Floor, 87 Vauxhall Walk, London SE11 5HJ

Tel: 020 7793 1777

Fax: 020 7793 1719

E-mail: info@redress.org

Web: www.redress.org

Contact: Kevin Laue Kevin@redress.org

End the Silence

Formed to take direct action in response to crises, this group has urged the South African government to break its silence on escalating abuses in Zimbabwe.

Contact: Eldridge Culverwell eldridgeculverwell@hotmail.com Tel 078664 57695

Action for Southern Africa (ACTSA)

28 Penton Street, London N1 9SA

Tel: 020 7833 3133

E-mail : actsa@actsa.org

Web: www.actsa.org

Contact: Euan Wilmshurst euan.wilmshurst@actsa.org

Article 19

6-8 Amwell Street, London, EC1R 1UQ

Tel: 020 7278 9292

Fax: 020 7278 7660

E-mail: info@article19.org

Web: www.article19.org

Contact: John Barker johnb@article19.org

Centre of African Studies, London University

SOAS, Thornhaugh Street, Russell Square, London WC1H 0XG

Web: www.soas.ac.uk/centres/

Contact: cas@soas.ac.uk

Royal Africa Society (RAS)

SOAS, Thornhaugh Street, Russell Square, London WC1H 0XG

Tel: 020 7898 4390

E-mail: ras@soas.ac.uk

Web: www.royalafricansociety.org

Contact: Lindsay Allan

(c) Financial and material support

The Open Forum was made possible with the financial support and assistance in kind of the following organisations, whose assistance in this regard is gratefully acknowledged and deeply appreciated:

Canon Collins Educational Trust for Southern Africa

Centre of African Studies, London University

International Liaison Office of the Zimbabwe Human Rights NGO Forum

Royal Africa Society (RAS)

The REDRESS Trust

The Silbury Fund

ZimWatch, The Netherlands

(d) The reporting team

This Report of the Open Forum has been compiled from the detailed notes of the proceedings made by a team of rapporteurs comprising:

Alan Brooks - editor

Tarcisio Nyatsanza

Oliver Phillips

The organisers are most grateful to all of them.