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Abstract

The tense political environment of the late 1990s, in which the Zimbabwean government was confronted with a more vocal civil society and a new political party, set the stage for the introduction of a new private newspaper, The Daily News. This paper posed for the first time a serious challenge to the long-standing monopoly of the government-controlled daily newspaper, The Herald. This article compares and analyses how these two daily newspapers have represented the widespread land occupations in Zimbabwe, which gained momentum in early 2000. It argues that media representations of the land question in the run-up to the June 2000 parliamentary elections came to parallel the polarised political environment, thereby missing chances for a serious and more subtle debate on the land issue in the Zimbabwean media.
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Introduction

With the widespread occupation of commercial farms in February 2000, Zimbabwe’s long-standing problem of its inequitable land distribution brought about by colonialism regained the attention of local and international media. Whereas the farm occupations were part of a much wider economic and political crisis in the country, the media – and the foreign media in particular – often focused its attention on the land issue without relating these to other developments in the country. The Zimbabwean government became increasingly concerned about how the land occupations were covered in the media and attributed great importance to media representations of the land question. This is demonstrated by the government’s paranoid attempts to control the operations of both local and international media through the introduction of stringent legislation.

The government also showed confidence in the persuasive power of the media. After the 2000 parliamentary elections, it increasingly began to use the state-funded media in order to win the hearts and minds of Zimbabweans for its ‘fast-track land reform’ exercise. A music album named ‘Hondo ye Minda’ [the struggle for land] was launched and a variety of jingles and video clips were introduced such as ‘Chave Chimurenga’ [it is now war] and ‘Rambai Makashinga’ [continue to persevere]. These would appear on state radio and television several times per hour.1

Acknowledging the crucial nature of representations of the land question in the Zimbabwean public sphere, this article analyses how meanings of land were contested in two daily newspapers, the privately-owned The Daily News and the state-funded The Herald, in the period from February 2000 leading up to the parliamentary elections in June 2000. It deals with the nature of their reporting, their selection of headlines, and their attribution of agency towards certain actors.

News is always a selection of events that are taking place in the real world at a particular moment in time. News is therefore not simply that what happens but that which can be presented as newsworthy. Whereas some events will be highlighted, others will be ignored. As Foucault (1978:27) has pointed out, silence is very much part of any discourse:

Silence itself – the things one declines to say, or is forbidden to name, the discretion that is required between different speakers – is less the absolute limit of discourse, the other side from which it is separated by a strict boundary, than an element that functions alongside the things said, with them and in relation to them within overall strategies.
Applying this to news production, Van Dijk (1991:114) argues that the analysis of the ‘unsaid’ is sometimes more revealing than the study of what is actually expressed in text. The focus of the analysis will be on how newspapers have both included and excluded information in their reporting on the need for land reform, the relation between farmers and farm workers and the causes of farm occupations.

**Zimbabwe’s post-independence print media climate**

In the first decade after independence, Zimbabwe’s newspaper environment was dominated by the range of newspapers printed by the government-controlled Zimbabwe Newspapers (1980) Ltd. This company published two daily newspapers *The Herald* (Harare) and *The Chronicle* (Bulawayo), and four weeklies: *The Sunday Mail* (Harare), *The Sunday News* (Bulawayo), *Manica Post* and *Kwayedza*.4

However, with the decreasing popularity of state-sponsored print media in the 1990s, several weekly private newspapers such as *The Zimbabwe Independent* (1996), *The Standard* (1997) and *The Zimbabwe Mirror* (1997) managed to penetrate the country’s media market. These newspapers became increasingly critical of the achievements of the government and played an important role in exposing corruption, government mismanagement and the deepening economic and social crisis in Zimbabwe. Obviously, this also made them a primary target for the government, who began to label private newspapers as ‘enemies of the state’, or as ‘opposition’ or ‘white’ mouthpieces. In order to silence the private press, the government used a range of measures including death threats to and assaults on reporters, charging editors and reporters with criminal defamation, and repeatedly suing newspapers for civil defamation, claiming large amounts of damages (Saunders, 1999).

Government attacks on the private press increased in 1999 when the government was confronted with growing political and economic pressures. The structural adjustment programme which was implemented in the early 1990s had led to the abolition of food subsidies, a sharp increase in unemployment and a decline in the provision of social services such as education and health care. In this climate of rapidly rising poverty, the government was faced with growing economic demands from members of the Zimbabwe National Liberation War Veterans Association (ZNLWVA). This association was set up in 1992 by the War Veterans Act in order to improve the welfare of ex-combatants and their dependants. Despite promises to uplift their lives, war veterans became increasingly disillusioned and therefore began to put stronger pressure on the government. In 1997, the government finally succumbed to war veterans’
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demands when it announced to offer them pensions although these had not been included in the government budget.

The unbudgeted spending on war veteran pensions, coupled with a decision in 1998 to intervene in the Congo war, led to a decrease in donor funds and a rapid devaluation of the Zimbabwean dollar as a consequence of declining investor confidence. Civil society became increasingly vocal under these circumstances.

In order to address the rising political and economic problems in the country, the labour union movement united in the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions (ZCTU) resolved to support the formation of a new political party. This led to the birth of the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC) in September 1999.

In this environment, Associated Newspapers of Zimbabwe (Pvt) Ltd established – with both local and foreign investment – two daily newspapers *The Daily News* and Bulawayo-based *The Dispatch*, and a chain of local newspapers. *The Daily News* started publishing in March 1999 and for the first time posed a serious challenge to the long-standing monopoly of the government-controlled daily newspaper *The Herald*. The *Daily News* became particularly popular in the period leading up to the 2000 parliamentary elections when it managed to triple its average daily sales from 35,000 to 90,000. In the same period, the circulation of *The Herald* dropped from around 90,000 to little more than 60,000 a day according to its former editor. A survey conducted by the Zimbabwe Advertising Research Foundation (ZARF) showed, however, that *The Herald* still dominated the market in terms of average readership with 713,000 daily readers whereas *The Daily News* was on average read by 424,000 people.

Because of its rapidly rising popularity and critical reporting, the government increasingly came to target the newspaper. In two separate incidents, *The Daily News*’ offices (April 2000) and printing press (January 2001) were bombed and in both cases the government was the primary suspect. Furthermore, journalists, reporters and the editor of the newspaper were arrested and harassed on numerous occasions.

After the 2000 parliamentary elections, Jonathan Moyo was appointed as the Minister of Information and Publicity in the President’s Office which drastically came to change Zimbabwe’s media landscape. Around the time of the presidential elections in March 2002, the government introduced new legislation, which had important implications for both local and international media. The Public Order and Security Act (POSA) banned the publication or communication of statements offensive to the Zimbabwean state or to the President, or those which endanger public order, regardless of whether the information is true or false. In addition, the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act (AIPPA) called for registration and accreditation of all foreign correspondents, local journalists, media houses and news agencies with a Media and Information
Commission. *The Daily News* decided not to register as a media house but to challenge the constitutionality of AIPPA in the Supreme Court. In September 2003, the Court ruled that *The Daily News* would have to comply with AIPPA and the newspaper was advised to register with the Media and Information Commission. The commission denied registration and this forced *The Daily News* to stop publication of its paper.

**The need for land reform reported**

While reporting on the need for land reform in the context of the new developments in early 2000, the Zimbabwean press clearly took very different positions. Whereas *The Herald* emphasised the necessity to redistribute land, *The Daily News* focused on the negative aspects of the farm occupations.

First of all, this could be concluded from the numerous articles which *The Daily News* published on criticism of farm occupations. Various groups such as the international community, opposition parties, human rights organisations, labour unions, business community, farm worker representatives were quoted as expressing their disapproval of farm occupations although they supported the principle of land reform as long as it would be conducted in a transparent manner.

By contrast, *The Herald* carried articles in which other, mainly political, actors declared their support for land reform such as foreign governments, churches, labour unions, and most importantly ruling and opposition parties from neighbouring countries. However, while supporting land reform if it would be conducted in a transparent and orderly manner, some actors were reported to be concerned about the farm occupations.

Whereas the content of these types of articles in both papers did not always differ significantly, headlines were clearly distinct. *The Daily News* headlines would state that certain actors condemned land ‘invasions’, whereas headlines in *The Herald* would point out that certain actors supported land reform. In this case, headlines served to make clear ideological statements about the attitude of the newspaper towards the events unfolding.

In order to further strengthen its point, *The Daily News* carried a large number of articles - mainly quoting professionals from the business community, financial sector and farmers’ unions - on the negative effects of occupations on the economy. Articles reported that occupations would prevent farmers from planting wheat and vegetables, would result into reduced foreign currency earnings from tobacco which would further negatively impact on business in general and would lead to a weaker performance of the stock exchange. Furthermore, *The Daily News* was concerned about the plight of farm workers.
An opinion piece in the newspaper argued that farm workers would be displaced if land would be redistributed.\textsuperscript{12}

*The Herald* seemed to be less worried; it covered the issue but with significantly fewer articles.\textsuperscript{13} It did report that farm occupations were threatening farm workers’ jobs, damaging investor confidence and hurting agricultural production but the paper tended to focus solely on the disruption of agriculture and did not include the general effects on the economy. The newspaper also argued that land reform would have positive effects. The production potential of communal farmers could be fully utilised if they would be able to move to more fertile areas. To further illustrate the crucial importance of land reform, *The Herald* frequently published pictures which were supposed to prove the marginalised position of communal farmers.\textsuperscript{14}

Particularly in its editorials, the newspaper reported that land reform could improve food security.\textsuperscript{15} *The Herald* argued that commercial farmers had in recent years increasingly shifted their production from food crops such as maize to export crops such as horticulture and flowers, thereby negatively affecting food security. *The Herald* pointed out that a large part of food was now being produced by communal farmers. If land would be distributed to these farmers, the newspaper concluded, food production would increase because communal farmers tended to focus on food crops. Although it remains to be seen whether communal farmers will continue to be interested in growing food crops after resettlement, *The Herald* made numerous attempts to break down colonially rooted stereotypes of ‘unproductive peasants’. In order to reduce fears of lower agricultural production as a result of land reform, *The Herald* stressed the productivity of communal and resettlement farmers:

The acquisition of fertile land from the large-scale commercial farming sector for resettling peasant farmers will not result in a slump in agricultural production, as the farmers have proved their potential on small and marginal land. The bulk of the major crops, such as maize, cotton, groundnuts, burley tobacco and paprika, come from the communal and resettlement farmers.\textsuperscript{16}

“Persistent claims that Zimbabwe will not be able to feed itself if communal farmers are settled on commercial farms have no foundation at all. The farmers have convincingly answered their critics by consistently producing on their small and poor pieces of land the bulk of the country’s maize and cotton.”\textsuperscript{17}

The resettled farmers, who were given land during the first phase of the land reform programme, have contributed immensely to the country’s agricultural production, in spite a host of problems, such as absence of infrastructure,
escalating costs of inputs and high interest rates.\textsuperscript{18}

Photographs of communal and resettlement farmers “showing off with their bumper harvest” served to deliver further evidence for the productivity of small-scale commercial farmers.\textsuperscript{19}

\textit{The Daily News}, in contrast, did not have a lot of confidence in land reform. Although the paper was particularly concerned about the way in which it was being carried out by the government, it still failed to seriously consider and debate the option of land reform itself. Echoing the emphasis of the opposition party MDC on solving the economic crisis as first priority, \textit{The Daily News} attempted to downplay the importance of land reform to Zimbabweans:

There is a need to understand and appreciate that our attention is being diverted from the real issue and threat confronting Zimbabwe. We are being drawn into debates on the land issue and the rule of anarchy, when the most serious and pressing problem that we should be debating and concentrating on is the rapidly declining state of the economy, and how will the economy be restored to a more viable level.\textsuperscript{20}

The paper also published the results of a survey that concluded that land was not the most pressing issue among Zimbabweans.\textsuperscript{21} According to the survey, priorities were rather raising prices of commodities, unemployment, the fall of the Zimbabwean dollar, and poverty and corruption.

Often quoting politicians, \textit{The Herald} thus focused on the historical necessity to correct land imbalances in order to solve the issue once and for all. But the paper thereby failed to critically assess the chaotic ways in which land reform was being carried out. \textit{The Daily News}, on the other hand, seemed to be overly concerned with the negative effects of the land occupations and often cited economists expressing concern about the future of Zimbabwe. However, as a result, the paper did not engage in a more profound debate on land reform.

\section*{Agency: farmers, farm workers and politics in the media}

Since the late 1990s, the National Constitutional Assembly (NCA), an umbrella organisation comprising various local NGOs, had been organising nation-wide meetings to debate a new constitution. As a result of these developments in civic society, the government decided to set up its own Constitutional Commission in early 1999. Later in the year, the commission presented its draft constitution which included clauses that would allow the government to compulsorily acquire land from large-scale commercial farmers without paying for the land itself but
for improvements made on the land only. In February 2000, the government held a referendum on the new draft constitution which was, to its own surprise, rejected by 55% of the voters.

The state-controlled *The Herald* blamed the rejection of the referendum on “the massive turnout of whites”.22 The state media explained the rejection of the constitution by whites as motivated by the clause that would allow the government to compulsory acquire land without compensation for the land. Obviously, whites could never really have had a significant impact on the final results since they only constitute a small percentage of Zimbabwe’s population. But with the establishment of the MDC, whites did come to play a more public role in political activities and some held positions in the party. This was quickly taken up by Zanu-PF and the state media who portrayed the MDC as a party ‘funded by white farmers’ and dominated by ‘Rhodesian interests’.

After independence, white commercial farmers took a low interest in participating in national political affairs. Rutherford (2001) argues that white commercial farms in Zimbabwe have been organised by the principle of ‘domestic government’. Both the colonial and the independent government were not extremely concerned with the plight of farm workers but saw them as the responsibility of the farmer. Farmers did not have problems with limited government intervention as it allowed them to fully control their farms and farm workers.

Whereas they did not have positions in government, farmers obviously had political power as a result of their strong economic position (Von Blanckenburg, 1994). In issues such as agricultural pricing policy, the government was forced to recognise their voices through their representative organisation, the Commercial Farmers’ Union (CFU).

As a consequence of their increasing presence in party politics and because of the scale of the farm occupations, farmers frequently became the target of violence. *The Daily News* paid significantly more attention to violence associated with farm occupations whereas *The Herald* generally described the farm occupations as peaceful. According to *The Daily News*, farmers were assaulted, harassed, held hostage, abducted, taken for ‘re-education’ sessions and intimidated.23 The paper described it as follows: “Police offered no comfort as they watched helpless, mainly middle-aged whites struggling to brace themselves in the face of angry mobs of men, women and children chanting war slogans and nationalistic songs”.24 In a number of occasions, *The Daily News* illustrated its reports with dramatic pictures of assaulted farmers and affected farm widows.25

Both newspapers covered the murder of five white farmers although agency was attributed to different actors.26 In its coverage of the killings, *The Daily News* portrayed the farmers as passive victims of violent war veterans. *The Herald*
reported them as provoking war veterans thus attributing a more active role to the white farmers. For example, in the case of the murder of David Stevens, *The Herald* emphasised the story of the police spokesperson:

> Chief Sup Bvudzijena said events leading to his death started around 6 am on Saturday when he [Stevens] armed himself with a gun and instructed his workers to arm themselves as well. They allegedly attacked and injured 14 of 35 war veterans, who have been occupying the farm since February using spears, hoes, sticks and stones, according to war veterans at the farm. (...) When word of the attack filtered through to other war veterans occupying neighbouring farms, they went to the farm to retaliate.27

*The Daily News* gave more prevalence to the story of the farmers’ union vice-president who denied that Stevens was armed and stated that the farmer and his farm workers had resisted the war veterans’ encroachment earlier that day.

Another example is the murder of the farmer Alan Dunn. In covering this incident, *The Herald* paid far more attention to the fact that white farmers assaulted two farm workers rather than to the causes of the actual death of Dunn. It thus ascribed agency to the farmers whereas farm workers were in this case portrayed as victims.

Generally, the government-sponsored media represented farm workers as being oppressed by their bosses. Parallel to conceptions central during the liberation war, simply working for whites was sufficient for one to be considered as a supporter of the opposition. Closer to the parliamentary elections, *The Herald* focused on how farmers were mobilising their workers to become MDC supporters. The paper expressed concern that farm workers were forced by their ‘paymasters’ to vote for the MDC.28 Farmers were reported to threaten their workers that they would become unemployed if they would vote for Zanu-PF since the government would then take their farms.

Zimbabwe’s farm workers, normally treated with contempt by their “baases”, suddenly have new importance thrust on them as potential voters for the Movement for Democratic Change as the farmers desperately try to keep up the status quo on land in place. Vote for Zanu-PF and you are out, they are threatened by the farmers, who hope to keep their stranglehold on vast tracts of fertile, idle land with a possible change in government.29

The state media portrayed farm workers as victims of white farmers’ capitalist
exploitation. *The Herald* described how farmers were abusing farm workers by offering them low wages and providing them with poor accommodation. These arguments were supported by pictures showing a farm compound, hardworking farm workers and employees waiting for their salaries.30

Representations in the private press differed. *The Daily News* was concerned farm workers would be displaced if land would be redistributed:

There are 500 000 farm workers who stand to lose not only the source of their incomes and ability to support their families, but where they will live when the farmland is redistributed. The average family unit is larger than four, and if we use this as the average, that is a population of 2 million people who will be destabilised and disadvantaged economically, as a direct result of the farm invasions. The average farm employs and houses more workers than the area of the farm that will be resettled with people when the farm is redistributed. Who will pay the workers on the farms where the farmer has been forced to leave the farm? That is already a problem.31

Whereas *The Herald* blamed farmers for coercing farm workers to vote MDC, *The Daily News* instead reported that Zanu-PF was forcing farm workers to attend rallies.32 The paper associated these meetings with all-night rallies (‘pungwes’) as they were held during the liberation war in order to mobilise support for the guerrilla fighters:

(...) pro-government militias, propagandists and hired thugs have intensified their assaults of political opponents and doubters at all night rallies and liberation war-style kangaroo courts set up at invaded commercial farms, growth points and in remote villages. The new wave has cowed thousands into submission and forced some to flee to towns and cities for safety and security.33

*The Daily News* portrayed farm workers as victims of violence perpetrated by war veterans.34 War veterans and Zanu-PF supporters were reported to beat up, threaten and intimidate farm workers, sometimes because they were refusing to join them in their farm occupations. Houses of farm workers were burnt down and property was taken. Many farm workers were reported to have fled into towns. *The Daily News* often illustrated its reports with pictures of assaulted farm workers.35

Although the newspaper did acknowledge the problems facing farm workers, they were generally not given the chance to present their own views on the
situation. In all cases but one, farm workers were represented by spokespersons from farm workers unions or by the farmers. This further strengthened their positions as dependent victims and the newspaper hereby failed to recognise farm workers as autonomous individuals.

Whereas *The Herald* did not acknowledge the possibility of farm workers to vote for a political party of their choice or to escape from an exploitative situation, *The Daily News* failed to recognise their ability to speak for themselves. Furthermore, the private newspaper did not critically assess the often-marginalised position of farm workers on commercial farms before the farm occupations. By expressing their concern over farm workers’ position after the land occupations, they did not question the difficulties farm workers had experienced before such as often racist and paternalistic attitudes of farmers towards their farm workers. *The Herald*, on the other hand, solely seemed to focus on the structural situation of farm workers before the occupations. They did not express their concern over large-scale displacements of farm workers as a result of more recent developments.

**Explanations of farm occupations (un)covered**

Farm occupations have been part of Zimbabwe’s pre- and post-independence history (Alexander, 1994; Moyo, 2000, 2001; Chitiyo, 2000; Marongwe, 2001). Various land tenure categories have been occupied: white-owned, state-owned and communal land. Immediately after independence, occupation of abandoned commercial farms and vacant state land often resulted in formal resettlement of communities. From the mid-1980s onwards, landless peasants also began to occupy and use land that belonged to politicians and the black elite. Reiterating colonial discourses, these people were labelled as ‘squatters’ by the government. In this period, the government often quickly responded to occupations, forcibly removing people from the areas they were occupying with assistance of the police and army.

In 1997 and 1998, more high profile occupations began to occur, mostly on farms which had been identified for compulsory acquisition shortly before. Farms were mostly occupied with the explicit aim of redistributing land from white farmers to landless villagers and war veterans. In some cases, people were evicted from the land and the government tried to convince them to wait for proper resettlement.

After the rejection of the referendum, a large number of commercial farms were occupied. With parliamentary elections in June 2000 and presidential elections in 2002 coming up, the government decided not to ban these occupations. Despite the far more widespread nature of land occupations in
early 2000, the government did not react with mass evictions but instead tacitly tolerated the events. Although it is difficult to say *to what extent* the occupations were instigated and organised, there is no doubt that the ruling party Zanu-PF, the Zimbabwe National Army, the police and the Central Intelligence Organisation did play a significant role in the occupations.

However, it must be noted that occupations differed enormously from region to region. Moyo (2001) argues that apart from the high profile, centrally controlled occupations, there were various other more locally driven occupations in which a variety of actors participated. He identifies occupations in which members of the ZNWVLA took a leading role, those that were started by community members or traditional leaders and were later formalised by war veterans, those ran by communities with specific grievances against particular farmers and some directed by urban groups.

Zimbabwean newspapers gave widely diverging reasons for the causes of the farm occupations. *The Daily News* generally held the view that occupations were sponsored by the government. The following descriptions of the events seemed typical for the newspaper:

> The ruling party is using land as its main campaign tool for the parliamentary elections and the recent farm invasions by the former fighters have been viewed as government orchestrated.36

> War veterans, with government support, invaded white-owned commercial farms alleging that white farmers had influenced blacks, to reject the government-sponsored draft constitution in last month’s referendum.37

> Political analysts say the invasions are part of a strategy to intimidate voters and cut financial support from farmers to the MDC, which gives Mugabe’s ruling Zanu-PF party the strongest challenge to its 20-year hold on power.38

*The Daily News* carried articles in which farmers were quoted as saying that the war veterans were ferried in government vehicles to their farms; that war veterans introduced themselves as Zanu-PF members and they were issued with arms from the government armoury.39 The paper reported that in some instances farm occupations were even incited or encouraged by Zanu-PF officials.40

*The Daily News* stressed that occupations were not spontaneous but well organised. Invaders arrived on buses and trucks and were supplied with food.41 In another article, *The Daily News* reported that villagers were being force-marched onto the commercial areas to seize land by a war veterans’ leader.42 However, the paper did not portray these villagers as passive victims but reported that they
dismissed the exercise “as part of cheap politicking by Zanu-PF”. *The Daily News* represented villagers as active agents resisting Zanu-PF’s tactics to garner more votes.

By contrast, *The Herald* portrayed the farm occupations as spontaneous demonstrations caused by disappointment over the rejection of the draft constitution. It carried several articles with headlines suggesting that occupations were a protest against the ‘no’ vote and dismissed ideas that the occupations were part of Zanu-PF’s election campaign.43

Land-hungry war veterans poured onto at least 30 commercial farms countrywide last month in a massive show of displeasure over the rejection of draft Constitution and to exert pressure on the Government to speed up the resettlement programme.44

Stung by the rejection of the draft constitution in a referendum early this month, the war veterans have gone on a countrywide invasion of commercial farms.45

*The Herald* vigorously dismissed the view that the occupations were sponsored by the ruling party and quoted Zanu-PF officials and villagers stating that these should not be regarded as a Zanu-PF election campaign.46

The allegation that Zanu-PF is sponsoring the ongoing farm seizure is baseless. Freedom fighters (veterans of the liberation war) do not need to be taught by anyone the need for land. They went to war for land and unless they and the masses of Zimbabwe got back the land, we cannot seriously think we are independent.47

By representing the farm occupations as spontaneous demonstrations, *The Herald* sought to cover up the crucial role which the state undoubtedly played in supporting the occupations. *The Daily News*, on the other hand, mainly portrayed the events as dominated by party politics and therefore did not acknowledge that e.g. communal farmers and farm workers with a true desire for land often joined the occupations as they hoped to be able to secure access to land in this way. By downplaying the role of other actors in the occupations, *The Daily News* created the impression that the occupations were just being used by the ruling party to win votes in the forthcoming elections.
Conclusion

With clearly separate agendas, the two Zimbabwean daily newspapers, the government-controlled *The Herald* and the privately funded *The Daily News*, have drawn upon different means to represent the land question. By selecting to report on a particular issue and silencing another, through use of pictures, choice of certain headlines, and attribution of agency to certain actors, they have produced a construction of the events in Zimbabwe that served to satisfy their interests in an increasingly polarised political environment. In this tense climate, both papers became easily associated with diverging political opinions.

*The Herald* clearly attempted to provide a positive image of Zanu-PF’s main campaign issue: its radical land reform programme. Being a relatively young newspaper and run on a commercial basis, *The Daily News* took advantage of the void created by *The Herald* which merely tended to focus on the past achievements and future promises of the government. With the increasing recognition of civil society and the labour movement, there was clearly a market for a second daily newspaper that would address the failures of past government policies and would provide alternative views on issues. These considerations might have induced *The Daily News* to be more sympathetic towards the opposition party Movement for Democratic Change whose main priority was economic recovery and creation of employment in Zimbabwe. MDC’s neo-liberal and market-based land policy echoed donor calls for transparency, poverty reduction, the rule of law and macro-economic stabilisation.

In its representations of the land occupations and the land question in general, *The Herald* frequently drew upon anti-colonial discourses in which the past often played a dominant role. Colonialism had led to serious land imbalances which had insufficiently been redressed after independence. White commercial farmers continued to occupy the most fertile grounds in Zimbabwe and the time had now come to solve the land issue once and forever. Spontaneous demonstrations of land-hungry peasants on farms had proven that there was a real need for land amongst Zimbabweans. However, in drawing extensively upon the past, *The Herald* neglected to critically assess how the present land occupations would affect the land reform exercise. By ignoring or downplaying the more negative aspects of the occupations such as the violence, the newspaper failed to speculate on how the future of Zimbabwe would look like under ‘fast track land reform’.

*The Daily News*, on the other hand, was very much concerned with the present, thereby missing its chance to reflect upon the past. Focusing on the negative economic effects of what the paper described as ‘land invasions’, it failed to get into a serious debate on land reform. By discrediting the land occupations as party politics, the newspaper ignored that there certainly is a clear
desire for land amongst Zimbabweans. Instead of questioning the inequitable land distribution, the paper seemed to favour the status quo because of fears of disruptions to agricultural production in case of land reform.

Readers of the two papers were confronted with very different positions which clearly made dialogue or compromise more difficult. By supporting the side of commercial farmers and farm workers on the one hand, and war veterans and Zanu-PF supporters on the other hand, newspapers reinforced stereotypes of the ‘good’ and the ‘evil’. Portraying the agenda of certain stakeholders as credible and others as illegitimate, both newspapers ignored that ‘the other side’ might also have a valid point to make and failed to take up a more subtle position towards the land question. Concerning the further course of events in Zimbabwe, this polarisation of attitudes might lead to more divisions on the issue within society whereas a lively public dialogue could potentially contribute to a final solution.
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**Endnotes**

1 It should be noted that Zimbabwe’s electronic media climate is still primarily dominated by the state broadcaster, Zimbabwe Broadcasting Corporation (ZBC). Various attempts have been recently made by e.g. Capital Radio and Radio Dialogue to set up radio stations but these have been hampered by the government. However, two radio stations, Harare-based Voice of the People (since mid-2000) and London-based SW Radio Africa (since December 2001), have successfully circumvented government’s restrictions to enter the airwaves and are currently broadcasting several hours per day on the short wave.

2 This section mainly focusses on post-independence print media in Zimbabwe. For more information on the pre-independence period, see Saunders (1999), Frederikse (1982) and Windrich (1981).

3 At independence in 1980 the new government created the Zimbabwe Mass Media Trust (ZMMT) in order to take control of the Rhodesia Printing and Publishing Company (RPP) which was set up in 1926 by the South African Argus Media Group. RPP was renamed Zimbabwe Newspapers (1980) Limited. In 1986 ZMMT took 51 percent of the shares in Zimpapers. (Saunders, 1999; Ronning and Kupe, 2000).

4 *The Herald* dates back from the early days of colonialism and was launched in 1892 as *The Rhodesian Herald* by the South African Argus Printing and Publishing Company.

5 Some attempts to break the monopoly of *The Herald* were made by Modus Publications in the early 1990s with their launch of *The Daily Gazette*. However, due to financial difficulties the paper had to stop printing in 1994 (Saunders, 1999; Ronning and Kupe, 2000).


8 As part of a survey carried out for the Zimbabwe Advertising Research Foundation (ZARF), 5000 adults in communal, resettlement, commercial farming, mining and urban high- and low-density areas were interviewed on their reading behaviour between 3 February 2000 and 13 June 2000. The results were published in the Zimbabwe All Media
& Products Survey (Zamps) 2000, Volume Three.
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14 Captions The Herald: The shortage of land continues to haunt the landless majority
of blacks after British settlers took the fertile land and established successful farms
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Despite the attainment of political independence by most countries, the land question
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18 Land reform is crucial to Zimbabwe’s future. The Herald, 2000-03-31.

19 Captions The Herald: Communal farmers have the potential to produce more if allocated
enough arable land. Here, a number of tractor trailers loaded with cotton bales wait for
their turn to deliver cotton at Sanyati Cotton Depot on Tuesday (2000-06-08). Despite
the devastating effect of Cyclone Eline, which hit Masvingo Province last February,
the Makamure family, from the recently introduced Marova Resettlement Scheme in
Gutu, expected a bumper harvest at least 50 tonnes of maize this season (2000-06-12).
Flashback… The Mapanzure family of Masvingo show off their sorghum crop which is
drought-resistant. Black farmers can produce much more if they are resettled on arable


21 ‘Land is not the most pressing issue among Zimbabweans’. The Daily News, 2000-03-


Captions *The Daily News*: Violence… Iain Kay, a Marondera farmer who was brutally assaulted by people suspected to be ex-combatants at his Chipesa Farm on Monday. Kay is said to have angered the ex-fighters when he failed to meet a deadline to reconstruct shacks belonging to the farm invaders that he had earlier destroyed (2000-04-05). Zimbabwean farmer Ian Hardy is given emergency treatment by medical staff at the Borradaile Hospital in Marondera, 70km east of Harare, yesterday (2000-04-17). Maria Stevens, of Swedish and Spanish descent, with her two-year-old twin boys Warren (centre) and Sebastian during an interview yesterday. Stevens’ husband Dave, a commercial farmer, was abducted and then murdered by war veterans, who shot him twice at point blank range on Saturday. Five other farmers from the same Virginia farming area were abducted and severely beaten when they went to find and rescue Stevens. Over 1,000 mainly white owned farms have been illegally invaded by war veterans and villagers (2000-04-18). Sherry Dunn is comforted by neighbours after her husband was admitted to the Intensive Care Unit at the Avenues Clinic in Harare on Sunday. Dunn died early on Monday from injuries sustained when he was brutally beaten-up by people, suspected to be war veterans, who visited his Beatrice farm on Sunday night (2000-05-10).


Abused! Farm workers are threatened: Vote Zanu-PF and you are out of here. *The Herald*, 2000-04-25.

Captions *The Herald*: Toiling for a pitiful wage… These farm workers, regarded as subhuman and treated accordingly, work on a tobacco crop at a farm outside Harare.
Willems: Selection and silence: contesting meaning of land

(2000-04-25). Neglected… An aerial view of typical farm compound. Farm workers’ living conditions have not improved. Now farmers are promising them better lives after voting for the MDC (2000-04-25). Former employees of Utopia Farm near Goromonzi have been camping on the farm since Tuesday last week to press management to pay them their salaries for the last 14 months. Here the women prepare their lunch yesterday (2000-06-15).


35 Captions The Daily News: Anarchy prevails… Farai Sandikonda sustained a broken arm and a deep cut to his head when he was attacked on Monday evening by about 27 alleged Zanu-PF supporters on Chidikamwedzi Farm in the Mvurwi district, 150km north of Harare. Sandikonda works as a game guard on the farm. He was stoned by his attackers as he tried to protect the farm manager’s house which was badly damaged in the attack (2000-04-06). Violence continues… A severely beaten and burned Farai Mutenengingwa, wife of a supervisor on Dean Farm 120kms south-east of Harare, is driven to hospital in the back of farmer Craig White’s truck yesterday. Mutenenginwa and several other workers were assaulted by farm invaders and labourers form different farms loyal to the ruling Zanu-PF party (2000-04-25).


The Daily News: War veterans threaten to fight over land (2000-02-21), CFU says invaders have taken over 40 commercial farms (2000-03-02).


War veterans vow not to leave farms. The Herald, 2000-03-04.

War veterans invade farms countrywide. The Herald, 2000-02-29.

The Herald: Land not being used as campaign tool: Svosve villagers (2000-05-18), Land can never be used as political gimmick: Lesabe, (2000-06-21).

Co-operation from all stakeholders needed in resolving the land issue, Dr Sylvester Maunganidze. The Herald, 2000-05-16.