FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICS AND PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

TOPIC

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE REASONS FOR THE SOURING OF RELATIONS BETWEEN ZIMBABWE AND BRITAIN (FROM 2000 TO 2008) .

BY

CLIFF CHIKARA

R121513G

This dissertation is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the Bachelor of social scienc Honours degree in politics and public management at Midlands State University

Gweru, Zimbabwe

November 2015

SUPERVISION CHECKING LIST
NB. THIS FORM MUST BE ATTACHED TO THE FINAL COPY OF YOUR DISSERTATION
NAME OF STUDENT.....REG no.....
STEP 1 LIASE WITH SUPERVISOR FOR TOPIC
SUPERVISOR.....SIGNATURE.....DATE..../..../....
Topic.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
STEP 2 SUBMIT TOPIC TO DISSERTATION COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON
SIGNATURE.....DATE.....
COMMITTEE COMMENTS.....
.....
.....
Date of Approval.....
STEP 3 SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL
SUPERVISOR
SIGNED.....DATE.....
STEP 4 DATA COLLECTION
Approved to proceed to data collection.....signed .....date
STEP 5 PRESENTATION OF DATA FROM THE FIELD (RECORDINGS, QUESTIONNAIRES, INTERVIEWS.....)
SUPERVISOR.....SIGNED.....DATE..... .....
STEP 6 SUBMISSION OF THE DISSERTATION
SUPERVISOR
.....SIGNED.....DATE.....
STEP 7 SUBMISSION FOR VIVA-VOCE
CHAIRPERSON.....DATE.....

MIDLANDS STATE UNIVERSITY

APPROVAL FORM

This is a confirmation that the undersigned had read and recommended the Department of Politics and Public Management at Midlands State University to accept the project by Cliff Chikara (R121513G)

……..	…….
SUPERVISOR	DATE
……..	…….
CHAIRPERSON	DATE
…….	…….
LIBRARIAN	DATE

STUDENT: ……

SIGNATURE ……

DATE SIGNED……

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My acknowledgements I direct to my family members who kept pushing me on when this journey seemed impossible .My supervisor Sir Mude , I thank you for your patience and belief in my potential ,all Politics and Public Management lecturers may God bless you for your steadfast support may your good work overflow to others yet to finish .Most importantly my deepest acknowledgements I dedicate to the almighty God for bringing me this far .Lastly my classmates , workmates ,KamandaMetilda , I thank you for your support as well as my church members for standing up with me in this struggle .

ABSTRACT

The relations between Zimbabwe and Britain can be traced back to the pre-independence era where the current conflict is rooted from given the fact that the protracted war of liberation had its primary cause glued to land .Land resource has been at the heart of conflict between Zimbabwe and Britain dating back from the colonial era when land was seized from the Zimbabwean community by the British settlers , in the same vain legislative frameworks were set up such as the Land Apportionment Act and Animal Husbandry Act to change the land allocation set up that was culturally and communally determined .When Zimbabwe attained independence there was some eagerness to get back the land and when the agreements made at the Lancaster House Conference in 1979 faltered the result was fatal as relations turned out sour and as a consequence both parties (Zimbabwe and Britain) played the demonization and confrontational game . Zimbabwe was accused of policy inconsistence as well as breaching the willing buyer willing seller provisions of the Lancaster House constitution that only allowed the acquisition of land on compensation basis , while Britain was heavily criticised for failing to honour her obligations which she promised at Lancaster House . Divergent interests between these two state actors have spoiled thecordial relations that once existed between them and this study has however noted out other factors that resultantly led to the souring of relations between Zimbabwe and Britain in the specified period (2000-2008) .Amongst the factors that led toconfrontation between these two states include the fast track land reform program , foreign policy shift by Britain concerning Zimbabwe's land redistribution exercise and costs , economic sanctions .Also the research has identified various recommendations that can help warm the cold relations that exist between Zimbabwe and Britain ,amongst them is the need for both parties to reengage for meaningful and peaceful talks which ought to be guided by an interim committee that will stand as a mediator between these two hostile camps, the need to remove sanctions and the need to uphold human rights and good governance

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS

ZANU-PF.....Zimbabwe African National Union Patriotic Front

FTLRP.....Fast Track Land Reform Programme

MDC.....Movement For Democratic Change

ZIDERA.....Zimbabwe Economic Recovery Act

ZIMPREST.....Zimbabwe Programme For Economic Transformation

SAPS.....Structural Adjustment Program

ESAP.....Economic Structural Adjustment Programme

IMF.....International Monetary Fund

CHAPTER 1

1.1 Introduction

The main thrust of this chapter is to introduce the study and the actual direction of the research including objectives of the study as well as issues surrounding the confrontation that has affected the bilateral relations between Zimbabwe and Britain of which primary amongst them has been noted to be the land resource that can be traced back to the pre – independence period .It also reveals the various apparatus that are going to be used for gathering data to explain this phenomena .

1.2 BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

The epicentre of the causal factors that have for long drawn Zimbabwe and Britain to the crossroads is glued mainly to the Land Reform Programme which was the primary cause for the protracted liberation war that led to Zimbabwe's independence .The land issue has been argued to have began with the colonial government in the period in which the country Zimbabwe was still called Rhodesia were legislative frameworks were initiated to protect the bureaucratic structure of the minority white settlers and their interests .This was realised by pieces of legislation such as the Land Apportionment Act in 1930 that divided land on racial lines which saw the creation of Gwai and Shanghani Zimbabwe has for long adopted a protectionist approach towards safeguarding her territory particularly land which according to Chingono (2010) issituated in the manifesto of ZANU-PF where President Mugabe explains land to represent the economic sector while the economic sector likewise was equivalent to the land resource . On the other hand Britain saw herself as the cheerleader and facilitator of the Land Reform Programme at her own pace which contrasted with Zimbabwe's expectations for a time bound land allocation process .Chigora (2006) supports this argument as he argued that antagonism between these countries came up as a result of the conflict of values essentially the quest for divergent national interests in an era where respect of territorial integrity has been reduced to a mere theoretical principle worsened by the reality that imperialism is far from ending given its prevalence in the 20 first century . As presented by Chigora (2006) this lack of harmonyin as far as values and principles to pursue

consequently led to a quarrel between Zimbabwe and Britain .It however ought to be noted that the relations between Zimbabwe and Britain took a mixed dimension as they blew hot and cold in some instances .

In the initial stages the relations between the two were close from the Lancaster House Agreement of 1979 which witnessed Zimbabwe gain independence followed by a democratic electoral process that took place in 1980 which resultantly led to the coming to power of ZANU –PF . Chingono (2010) has it that relations between these two states continued on a positive platform as Britain recognised and supported the Zimbabwean government which saw the reconciliatory measures that prevented economic and political sabotage as some whites were left in the cabinet , industries and other parts of the economy . Britain invested intensively in sectors like training for the newly united Zimbabwean national army as well as in public projects , according to Abiodun (2012) the land conflict was addressed at Lancaster which purported to establisheven-handed redistribution of the land resource to the landless indigenous people without damaging the white farmers essential contribution to Zimbabwe's economy which was agreed on a willing buyer willing seller .As long as land was bought on a willing buyer willing seller the British government was willing to finance half the cost as a measure of compensating the white farmers for their vital developments on the land or farms they owned .

Through this agreement the British John Major and Margret Thatcher regimes agreedto establish a budget for the land allotment exercise in Zimbabwe which resulted in Zimbabwe receiving forty million pounds to start up the process . However it ought to be noted that the Lancaster House Agreement was a time ticking bomb which was to cause predicaments and menace to future diplomatic relations between the two actors as they seemed treacherous and biased. At its inception (Lancaster House Agreement) think tanks like Abiodun (2012) noted that the Zimbabwean regime was restrained by the provisions enshrined in the Lancaster House constitution that gave special protections to minority white commercial farmers for the first ten years of independence .

Masaka (2012) further support this view by presenting that it prevented the Zimbabwean government from indulging in a noble land exercise to release the pressure of overpopulation that was caused by the land division disparities and both parties failed to foresee that the agreement (willing buyer willing seller) lacked precision in solving the problem hence the

problem was never solved as it gave room for the white commercial farmers who were in possession of the best tracts of arable land to refuse to put their farms on the market as they were protected by the ambiguous phrase " willing seller " in the Lancaster constitution . Britain failed to realised that her judgements were short-sighted and misplaced because she miscalculated that the provisions of the willing buyer willing seller were going to delay the land reform programto her advantage and that the government of Zimbabwe would become dependent on her to implement a meaningful land reform program given the fact that she lacked the funds to compensate the white farmers .Nhara (2002) noted that the British government foreign policy towards Zimbabwe was based on intelligence services and spying which hoped as well as assuming that president Mugabe abandon the land redistribution policy and be dependent to the donorsystemespecially given the economic hardships that were bedevilling Zimbabwe .The failures by the British government to respect its obligations fuelled altercation and a negative response from the Zimbabwean elites . The rejection by the then newly elected labour party into political office in 1997 to continue with the obligation to fund the Land Reform Programme arguing that it was a policy initiated by the previous regime and that it was not to be bound by such an agreement , was never a shrewd idea which unsurprisingly worsened diplomatic relationship with Zimbabwe .Chigora (2006) the era when the labour party assumed office in Britain witnessed the setting up in motion of adeteriorating bilateral relationship between Zimbabwe and Britain and as such a foreign policy shift on Zimbabwe by Britain further spoiled the already spoiled relationship .

As if it was not enough Britain's attitude never tilted to a fair scale on Zimbabwe but rather continued on the same note , for instance in 1997 November 5 when the then British Secretary of State for International Development Clare Short wrote a letter to Zimbabwe's Minister of Agriculture KumbiraiKangai arguingthat the government she was serving was from diverse backgrounds without any colonial interests in Zimbabwe and as such she did not believe that Britain was expected to bear responsibility for the costs of the land reform program .Chigora (2006) argued that Britain failed to be frank and just as well as being open to the crisis which she had engineered , another piece of evidence which reveal the trail behind the sour relations among the actors concerned were the responses by the then British Prime Minister Tony Blair in 1997 who terminated the deal when funds from the Margaret Thatcher administration where exhausted . according to Africa Viewpoint (2012) Kenneth Kaunda former Zambian president

responded by saying that he could not believe that a young lad in office was failing to respond to the crisis in Zimbabwe of which his kith and kin had set in motion . In this case it can be argued that Britain was not yet repent and open to the problem because letting the problem solve itself and being emotional were improper and would default in problem solving procedures . It was high time the grievances which had led to war receive according attention . Chigora notes rightly that by hilariousill-treatment , personalisation of problems and demeaning those that are involved does not help but only worsen the problem at hand. It is clear that Anglo-Zimbabwe relations require serious diplomatic engagement with a high degree of political maturity not to indulge in confrontation , verbal war and propaganda if relations between these two antagonists are to get any warmer than the present .

By the time Zimbabwe attained independence in 1980 4000 white farmers were in possession of approximately above 75 % of the huge tracts of the finest arable land from the whole population that amounted to 13 million people .All these statics were angering the hearts of many in Zimbabwe who were still not resettled but were overpopulated . The attitude displayed by Britain inevitably called for cold sentiments from the Zimbabwean government that was committed to addressing the shortfalls of the willing buyer willing seller which provisioned white farmers to be compensated . Britain's failure to fulfil her promise saw the Zimbabwean officials taking it their own way hence according to Abiodun (2012) in 1992 the Land Acquisition Act was enacted which gave the government the strength to acquire land for resettlement subject to compensation .This saw Zimbabwe employ the Fast Track Land Reform Programme to catalyse the process against the growing pressure internally that was in need of land .

This move was met with distaste by Britain with her allies included as she argued that Zimbabwe's Fast Track Land Reform Programme was a violation of the Lancaster House Agreement and a lack of respect for property rights ,hence Zimbabwe's domestic policy impacted heavily on external relations . The major turning point was the declaration by the Zimbabwe government to make legal the allotment of land through a constitutional amendment , after the efforts of the 1998 proved fruitless .Also the refusal by the newly elected labour party in Britain to honour the obligation assumed by the previous government exacerbated the situation as it led to the forceful removal of the white minority living on the farms .

Dore (2007) presented that in April 2000 the parliament approved a constitutional amendment on section 16 of the constitution making legal the allotment of land which was met with sharp criticism from the general population and the rising opposition party the MDCMapedza(2007) argue that in order to strike back at those that had gathered support in opposition to the proposed constitution particularly the white farmers , the government (immediately) supported the forceful taking back of land as an option to redressing the land issue as well as a retributive measure against those who were alleged to have backed the MDC opposition political party argued to be a political gimmick to divert attention away from the declining economic situation , this perception cannot totally be dismissed as political expedience has appeared in Zimbabwe in numerous alleged times .

Masaka (2012) brought to the fore the point that the land exercise was twisted into a political tool that ZANU-PF believed would enable them to be triumphant in the coming June 2000 parliamentary elections against an up-and-coming opposition political party the MDC which according to him was done to affect MDC's focal point of both political and financial support , Zanu-Pf strategically backed the offensiveon white owned farms . Masaka(2011) however recognizedthat although the land redistribution exercise wassmartly and heavily manipulated by the Zimbabwean government for a political advantage in the face of diminishing political and economic fortunes regaining the land resourceremained the trademark of independence .Zimbabwe's former Foreign Affairs Minister Stan Mudenge as revealed by Chigora (2006) remarked that Zimbabwe is driven by the love for mankind respect for territorial integrity , liberty , impartiality and equal opportunity for all .

Hence Zimbabwe had to take action to regain the land since according to Smith (2003) it would make no sense to claim independence when in actual fact land was still in the hands of the few who were adamant to let the process unfold fairly and constructively for developmental purposes.Had Britain not dropped her promise to fund the land issue in this instance one can argue that the government of Zimbabwe could have exercised some degree of patience for the process as they had agreed under the regimes of John Major and Margaret Thatcher and also the responses that were coming from the British side reflected an attitude that was against the progress of the program , it was inevitable the process was hastened .Muzondibaya (2009) is also of the perspective that such a deal (Lancaster House Agreement) unfortunately safeguarded interest of the white minority and monopoly of land

by a minority group and secluded private property thus restraining the extentof land redistribution thereby hindering the government of Zimbabwe from putting into operation a significant land reform program as alluded to by Masaka (2010) .

In response Britain in 2002 suspended Zimbabwe from the Common Wealth of Nations which also saw Zimbabwe retaliating by withdrawing from the organisation . It is indeed bonafide to argue that states act according to the notion of survival and national interests Adromidas (2009). Between the two protagonists national interests played a mega role as Zimbabwe's interests were to fulfil and safeguard the gains of revolution while Britain wanted to keep her interests protected as well as to ensure the upholding of the principles of 'good governance' .It should be born in carbine mind that were the interests of a state are endangeredthe state concerned will pull out of the organisation or regional arrangement as evidenced by Zimbabwe's pullout from the Common Wealth of Nations (as a result of the doctrine of state sovereignty and national interests .It can also be noted that as long as Britain was benefiting from this bilateral relationship she would raise no concerns .

Nevertheless of paramount importance to note is the fact that all parties failed to make consistent efforts to reach out to each other to resolve the issue as also cemented by Chigora(2006) who argue that the relations between Zimbabwe and Britain have largely arise from the failures of both sides to bepersistent to re-engage for the setting up in motion of the process of land redistribution in Zimbabwe while Zimbabwe's efforts at the Abuja conference that sought to conciliate her with Britain as well as the 1997 attempt to reengage with Britainshould not be forgotten .On the other hand the international community under the auspices of the United Nations failed to take up a consistent effort and responsibility for the failed negotiations between Zimbabwe and Britain which it should have assisted .Chingono (2010) present that the background of the problem pictures the lack of convergence on ideas , values and interests that exist between the actors as Zimbabweanleaders assumed they were the custodians of the values and interests of the nationof Zimbabwe and were henceforth supreme .According to Tendi (2010) itis important to note that the relations between Zimbabwe and Britain before the turn of the new millennium had a strong bearing on future relations between these two protagonists .

1.3STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The research is an enquiryinto the causal factors that strained the relations between Zimbabwe and Britain from the period 2000 to 2008 .

1.4JUSTIFICATION OF THE STUDY

The discourse endeavour to enhance and aggregate literature in the paradigm of state to state relations , it also aims to unravel and demystify the mystery behind the souring of relations between Zimbabwe and Britain as well as proffering remedies to warm the cold relations that exist between these two actors .

1.5 LITERATURE REVIEW

A trajectory of the causal factors for the souring of relations between Zimbabwe and Britain in much of the literature in existential unearthed that much of the confrontation peeped in towards the turn of the new millennium as a result of the failure of the Lancaster House Agreement which at its inception became a time ticking bomb , an oil soaked rug which was to be a menace to these antagonists ,while the inception of the Labour political party in Britain and its refusal to continue fulfilling half the costs of the land reform program which she had affirmed to at Lancaster as well as the nationalist spirit within the Zimbabwean populace amongst others inevitably saw the relations between these two states deteriorating and Chigora(2006) is of the view that when the labour party came into power relations between Zimbabwe and Britain began t o sour and this inevitably resulted in an upcoming series of diplomatic raw and disharmony between these two nations .

Anglo –Zimbabwe relations have presented themselves with challenges to the academic circles there seem to have become a born of contention as divergent views have been brought to the fore concerning relations between these two .These two states engaged in somewhat a zero sum game were winning mattered most . Think tanks like Chigora (2006) , perceive that bitterness between thesestates emanate from a divergence of interests as well as values . In April 2000 the parliament approved a constitutional adjustmentof section 16 of the constitution making legal the possession of land by the indigenous black people

According to Moore (2005) president Mugabe argued that land reform is the last colonial matter which heavily qualify and legitimise Zimbabwe's sovereignty and territorial integrity, this was exacerbated by Britain's alleged secret backing of white commercial farmers monopoly on the land unlike expectations on her to respect commitment she agreed to as contained in the Lancaster House Constitution to bank roll Zimbabwe's Land Reform program . Against this background it is clear that the land resource contained so much connotations to the nation of Zimbabwe as a whole and as such it was like a hungry child that had a plate of food right in front of him only being delayed by his mother who is preparing the cutlery , one would obviously expect the child to go ahead abruptly if the cutlery is delaying .It was the same with Zimbabwe's land redistribution process as war veterans who had gone to war and were so much hungry for land and realising that the whole of it was now right in front of them prepared from the kitchen called independence surely they felt delayed and consequently went ahead with the land acquisition process .Chinamasa (2011) argued that the party that has the discretion to decide who gets the land is not British and American or any other but is Zimbabwean .On the whole the argument explains why Zimbabwe inevitably and eventually decided to take the land reform her own way when the Labour party in Britain refused to bear any responsibility for the costs of the land reform in Zimbabwe in 1997 .

Secondly land was the primary issue that was causal to the Liberation struggle hence it would make no sense to claim independence when in actual fact land was still in the hands of a minority few who adamant to let equitable process unfold itself . According to Chingono (2010) it is noteworthy that no matter whatstructure the leadership takes states always act upon their interests and differences emanate from how national interests are explained . In relation to Chingono (2010) 's assertion , the difference of opinion of interests between Zimbabwe and Britain led to confrontation and acrimony. According to Masaka (2012) this explains why Zimbabwe perceived herself as safeguarding her history against obstacles from Britain while the later assumed herself as making new history .

When relations turned upside down both parties failed tomake consistent efforts to follow up on the land issue and resolve it peacefully but they rather took a confrontational approach to the matter . For instance Britain'spersuasion upon her allies resulted in ZIDERA (Zimbabwe Democratic Recovery Act) . In this case Britain was trying to effect a regime change agenda . Britain argued that only sanctions would help to enforce the

jusecogens such as human rights as well as good governance . Furthermore things got worse pertaining to the relationship between the two as Zimbabwe received another set of sanctions which were categorised as smart and targeted or restrictive . Krieger (2007) argued that the Zimbabwean government perceived the use of economic sanctions as an illegal tool to sabotage the internal political affair of the country which contravened and breached the doctrine of state sovereignty and non intervention into the internal affairs of other states . Thus Britain failed to observe law as it is (lax latter) and respecting for the political and territorial integrity of other states as enshrined in the United Nations Charter because she constantly meddled in the electoral process of Zimbabwe amongst them the 2000 and the 2008 elections that she used her media platform in the name of BBC to demonise and condemn the elections in Zimbabwe .It is a pity that Britain had an issue with Zimbabwe but she extended the land issue to elections and in the first place the questions that needs to be posed to the fore are , is Britain so much rationale in as far as free and fair elections and good governance are concerned if so how come she did not take a stance against Equatorial Guinea former leaderpresident TeodoroObiang in his electoral procedures and outcomes .

The West's truism of protecting human rights and scattering democratic principles is an imperialistic deception that is purported at manipulating civic beliefs and perceptions and justifying aggression against powerless and defenceless nations.Silverstein (2005) Zimbabwe looks like Sweden by comparison with Equatorial Guinea and yet Zimbabwe is demonised and is well thought-outas an enemy of the West. In May 2008 elections wererigged when Obiang's party won 99 per cent of the vote but surprisingly not a single Western media channel had the honesty and courage to report the fraudulent results and were accepted as democratic. Obiang came to power in 1979 after he toppled and executed his uncle in a military coup d'état. Francisco Macias Nguema was a monster who murdered as many as 50,000 Equatorial Guineans (10 % of the population) during his long rule. Obiang is not very different from his uncle.This piece of evidence clearly bring out questions in as far as the Zimbabwean situation is treated by Britain as she does not take stance for a noble cause but out of emotions whenever she is faced with situations like these . Concerning relations between Zimbabwe and Britain there is need to acknowledge the fact that Zimbabwe has been alienated , blacklisted and declared an enemy because she refused to bent to the demands and interests of the West mainly of adopting all the concepts of globalisation like part of the third world countries are doing amongst them South Africa , Botswana .

In international law , the United Nations Charter oblige every nation state to respect the territorial and political integrity of other states . It ought to be understood that sanctions were never a peaceful way of savaging this deteriorated and spoiled dialogue . Chigora (2006) , noted that sanctions on Zimbabwe consequently resulted in an increase in poverty levels while making ZANU-PF unpopular .It is important to take into cognisance the fact that the reason for the imposition of economic sanctions on Zimbabwe testify to the fact that Zimbabwe had refused to bend to the interests of the west and America that it is not surprising why Britain and her allies abruptly turned against Zimbabwe , sanctions were thought to be an effective way of forcing Zimbabwe to revert back to their game plan , as if it that is not enough Zimbabwe was tricked into accepting in her economic ambits the saps so as to diabolically , cunningly and deceitfully get reverted back to Britain given the effects that SAPS were going to inflict on Zimbabwe' economy as she banked on the hidden fact that Britain was banking on , the fact that Zimbabwean markets and economy was structured the British was so Britain perceived that Zimbabwe was going to go back to her to come and unlock the economic door that she knew of so much just like an electrician who is called to sort out an electric fault or even burg for loans .Zimbabwe shook the world by resembling the biblical David as she stood against al odds and as such she has been an epitome of the great .Others argued that Britain's lack respect to the political and territorial integrity of other states reflect that the predicament posed by colonialism if far from ending as she was violating the Monte Video Convention on the duties and rights of states ,as well as the United Nations Charter (on non interference in the internal affairs of other states). Zimbabwean elections in 2002 which were allegedly marred with violence and intimidation received acute criticism from the West (Britain being the forerunner) . Think tanks like Hopkins (2000) argue that the West support of the opposition party MDC in particular Britain worsened the economic and political predicament in Zimbabwe .

In 2008 again Zimbabwe received criticism and doubt from the British circle and her allies (EU) for the elections held which she argued that the electoral outcomes reflected a flawed electoral process Adromidas (2012) and as such Britain could not endorse them as they lacked 'credibility ' .This worsened the relations as both parties kept on with verbal exchanges even through press statements whenever possible as well as through the media .Zimbabwe argued that Britain and the West were not repent of colonial acts , in the economic circles Britain was alleged of sabotaging the economy of Zimbabwe by urging financial institution (IMF ,World Bank) to isolate herMuzondibaya

(2009) . Although some of the literature concerning the relations between Zimbabwe and Britain favour a biased approach arguing that Zimbabwe must bear much of the burden for the failure of dialogue between the two , the land reform .In actual sense all parties stand to be blamed for the problem as they failed to entered into a tit for tat , a continuing predicament diplomatic , economic , political interaction between these two actors (an Anglo- Zimbabwe cold war)

Firstly British actions stood to be condemned as she treacherously signed the Lancaster House Agreement , the refusal by the newly elected labour party in 1997 in Britain to honour its obligations spelt a justification for the approach taken by Zimbabwe towards the land Reform Program ,Zimbabwe tried to reach out through her Minister of Agriculture KumbiraiKangai when Clare Short replied in shocking words refused to accept the obligation to fund the land process as revealed by Abiodun (2012) .Nhara (2002) argued that British foreign policy on Zimbabwe was glued on intelligence services which presumed that Mugabe would plunge the land reform policy and be tied to the donors especially given economic hardships Zimbabwe was confronted with ' . on the other hand Zimbabwe should have adopted a non corrupt way when she was given the first batch of funds (40million pounds) though the fund were not enough as alleged by Raftopoulos (2003 : 35) .Others like Dore (2007 : 20) argue that she rushed the land reform program as her government was now faced with a rivalry political party the MDC .

Nevertheless another school of thought Ghali Hassan (2008:pg 60) present rather a different revelation to the whole matter ashe revealed after independence Mugabe's Government embarked on a program of land reform aimed at redistributing land to black Zimbabweans. Britain under Margaret Thatcher agreed to compensate ('its kith and kin') white farmers, but in 1997 the British government (under the war criminal Tony Blair) reneged on its promises to provide compensations. The main aim is to subvert Zimbabwe and incite Zimbabweans to get at each other's each other's throat . In addition Britain and the U.S. influenced the IMF to cut off aid to Zimbabwe and began a campaign of economic sanctions and anti-Mugabe propaganda. This deliberate destabilising campaign accompanied by funding the Western-oriented and manipulated opposition led by the opportunist Morgan Tsvangirai in a bid to remove the Government from power and assume power. With the aid British media controlled by the BBC propaganda Zimbabwe is unfairly depicted as a pariah state led by a dictator.Demonising each other and refusing to accept wrongs is never a panacea to the

dilemma at hand which has for long pitied Zimbabwe and Britain that all parties ought to accept and move on to the future .

Zimbabwe's former Foreign Affairs Minister Stan Mudenge as revealed by Chigora (2006) remarked that Zimbabwe is driven by the love for mankind respect for territorial integrity , liberty , impartiality and equal opportunity for all. Although Zimbabwe has for long received criticism for the fast track land reform program a deep analysis of the mystery of the fast track land reform program , one can argue that the government was justified for introducing the program .Firstly , the masses were awaiting the fair distribution of the fought for 'national cake ' (land) as over population was still menacing the government coupled by Britain's failure to keep its promises to bank roll the fast track land reform program , the program was a necessity though allegations of mismanagement were raised . In as far as this study is concerned there has been a realisation of a missing link in much of the shelved and already pencilled literature which has to do with introduction of the fast track land reform program .The reason why the fast track land reform program found its way into the whole policy was as a result of the war veterans as well as a part of the populace which indulged in this activity as a result the need to regain the land . The government tried to calm the situation by promising the land hungry people but it was to no avail and it has been argued that the reasons for that was the passion for farming as the people believed that it was a lucrative business particularly the rural based populace which had most it affected by the racially base land division exercise .This impacted negatively on the government as this reflected the whole confusion about land as well as the plan that the government had on the land redistribution exercise which left the government with no choice to back the already in motion violent land invasions .To put the whole blame on the government of Zimbabwe would be to miss the whole concept of academic-ism which entails the analysis of the facts on the ground with researchers having to be apolitical in the research discourse. Much of the literature has turned out to be political either from a Euro centric perception or from an Afro centric perception basing on what ought to be than the application of is on the ground .

Thus Britain must accept to take responsibility of the land issue in Zimbabwe , while Zimbabwe must revert to free and fair elections , adopt transparent policies towards the land issue ,as well as being ever pessimistic about the true nature about Britain .In overall basis , both parties ought to accept that confronting and demonising each other is not effective in problem solving efforts .Chigora (2006) established an interesting analysis as he

postulates that "... it has to be born in mind that conflicts are inherent in every society and disagreements always crop up when interests differ " .From the analysis that has been conducted in this research , the most important pointed noted is that ,no matter how values amongst societies diverge fault finding , demonization and confrontation does not remedy any problem but maturity , tolerance and commitment are pertinent to problem solving . Chigora (2006) noted also this by asserting that by hilariousmistreatment , misplacement of issues worsen the matter on the ground even Tendi (2010) acknowledged that demonization makes it difficult to realise some meaningful peace talks .

RESEACH QUESTIONS

1.What was the turning point in the relations between the two actors ?

2.Could Zimbabwe's internal policies be blamed for external instability ?

3.Why was there a sudden change of Zimbabwe's foreign policy ?

4. What impacts did the change of relations had on Zimbabwe's economy ?

5.What remedies can be suggested to warm the cold relations the exists between the two states ?

OBJECTIVES

. Toestablish the causal factors for the souring of relations between Zimbabwe and Britain
. To fill in thegap left by the existing literature pertaining to relations between two states
.To look at the sudden change of Zimbabwe's domestic policy .
.To proffer remedies to warm the relations between Zimbabwe and Britain .
.To look at the impacts of the deterioration of relations on Zimbabwe .
.To look at the measures taken by Zimbabwe to survive from the effects of her strained relationship with Britain .

1.6METHODOLOGY

Denotes the strategy or way in which the research shall be carried out ,including all apparatus that are going to be used to gather data ,concepts or theories that explain this phenomena involving Zimbabwe and Britain .

1. 7Research Design

The research shall adopt Qualitative and Quantitative methods .

1.8 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this discourse , the Game theory , Dependency theory shall be used to explain the relations between Zimbabwe and Britain .The Game theory explain that every actor in the international system act to obtain gains , thus there has to be a winner and a looser ,this means that every actor's gain would be relative to other actors loss it is a zero sum game .After losing the land issue Britain actor to settle scores against Zimbabwe as she imposed sanctions upon the later.

Also the Realist theory attempt to explain the relations between the two states .The generic explanation of the theory denotes that states act out of the notion of self interests and therefore Zimbabwe wanted to secure her gains of the revolution , while Britain wanted keep her control on the later to maintain her political and economic hegemony . The imposition of sanctions on Zimbabwe explain the notion of national interests .Zimbabwean elites were eager to protected had been fought for .According to this theory , national interests are the top priority in the dimensions of state to state relations .Therefore Zimbabwe aim to advance her national interests specifically land while Britain aim to maintain her hegemony on former colony .Issues of morality are not considered when states interact to advance their interests because rationality is considered an impediment to pursuing national interests thus not any state is worried about the welfare of another when it comes to the realists ,interests are very crucial in this discourse of realism .

The Dependency theory articulates that all developing and under developed economies are integrated into the Capitalist economy by the developed economies , it also reveal unequal lower distributions between the North and the South ,Rodney ( ) .In this case the relations

between the two states reveal a dependency syndrome since Zimbabwe is less developed than Britain .It is therefore expected if one is using the dependency theory in analysing the relations between Zimbabwe and Britain to see Britain delaying the land reform .The context behind the attitude displayed by Britain is that of attempting to control resource movement as well as keeping market networks in Zimbabwe , this probably explain why she was in control of the Common Wealth of Nations as the siphoning element can be noticed as the theory explains that the periphery depend on the North for technological resources ,equipment ,expertise while the North depend on the later for raw materials , cheap labour as well as markets for their finished products

1.9COLLECTION OF DATA

The research shall adopt Primary and Secondary sources for a sound study .Among them are interviews were farm owners , former farm owners shall be interviewed .The internet ,civil society ,political parties , nongovernmental organisations .Secondary data shall also be used , which consist of report , speeches , news papers , journals , written texts from the Zimbabwean side to the British side .,British politicians on the internet to establish an unbiased research in order to fully aggregate upon what has been left out by the existing literature .

1 .10ANALYSIS OF DATA

There shall be content analysis in order to ensure effective discourse contribution .Textual analysis will accompany the process of data analysis to establish authentic information .

1 .11 CONTRIBUTION OF DATA TO LITERATURE

The research aim to enhance peoples understanding of the discourse concerning Britain and Zimbabwe . Most importantly there is need to fill the gap left by the literature in existence. It is an effort to help researchers , politician , the public to understand the dynamism of state to state relations as well as providing remedies to the rivalry between Britain and Zimbabwe

1 .12CHAPTER SUMMARY

The chapter was about the structure of the study as well as how the study is going to be carried out ,it was an appeal for permission to conduct the research so as to solve the state of relations between Zimbabwe and Britain from the period 2000 to 2008 .

CHAPTER 2

2 .1.0 THE RELATIONS BETWEEN ZIMBABWE AND BRITAIN BEFORE 2000

2.1.1 INTRODUCTION

The relations between Zimbabwe and Britain have attracted a lot of attention from a lot of academia's .Concerning these relations there has been a lot of debate as there have been contesting scholarly views vying for supremacy in attempting to explain the causal factors concerning Anglo –Zimbabwe relations .Others are of the perception that Zimbabwe is to blame for the souring of relations between the two states while others point to Britain as the culprit ,as to the causal factors , others explain that the Fast Track Land Reform Program is at the epicentre of the causal factors that led to the souring of relations between Zimbabwe and Britain while the others view the failure of Britain to honour her obligation to bankroll land redistribution in Zimbabwe as other factor as well as the failure of the willing buyer willing seller enshrined in the Lancaster House Agreement .

Not to forget is the much criticised Zimbabwean government for failing to soldier on to the principles of good governance (electoral fraud , human rights abuses) . Anglo – Zimbabwe relations. There has been a debated on the actual period to consider when looking at the relations between Zimbabwe and Britain before the period 2000 .Others argue that the period when the Smith regime on 3 March signed the internal settlement agreement in Salisbury with Bishop Muzorewa , ReverendSithole and chief Jeremiah Chirau which provided for qualified majority rule ,elections with universal suffrage following elections in April 1979 in which the UANC political party won the elections , must be taken as the mirror to reflect on the relations between Zimbabwe3 and Britain in order to give a much comprehensive appraisal of the relations between Zimbabwe and Britain by Evans (2006) .

He went further to Argue that these were the turning moments that were defining the birth of Zimbabwe from the colonial oblivion henceforth to scrape out these facts would to limit the clarity of the historical background between Zimbabwe and

Britain . This study has taken the stance of Evans (2006) to continue with the core aim of revealing the relations between Zimbabwe and Britain before 2000 because the position taken by Evans helps to give a much bigger view of the relations between these two states which will be very vital in this study in trying to establish the true nature of relations between Zimbabwe and Britain . On December 21 , after 3months of intensive negotiationsnegotiators agreed on the Lancaster House Constitution for peace and the land question in Zimbabwe as well as elections , a changeoverphaseunderneath Britain'sregulation, constitution , Alexander (2006) .

In the changeoverperiod , about nine political parties contested for elections between the February 27-29 pre-independence era the elections which were under British surveillance and included were many observers , the elections revealed that ZANU-PF came out victoriouswhich saw Britain conceding independence to Zimbabwe on April 18 , 1980 . Evans (2006) .In this period Zimbabwe's Prime Minister remarked that there was need for reconciliation and unity as well as nation building and socio-economic change .White Zimbabweans banked their money on these statements and perceived they were secure .In order to realize the notion of national reconciliation the cabinet comprised ZANU –PF , PF- ZAPU and independent MP'sand senators an effort that brought a success in the first two decades after attaining independence as the two former political and military opponents were now working together , Mlambo ( ) which enjoyed cordial relations in this era hence relations between Zimbabwe and Britain were close as confrontations were not yet cultivated between these two states .

Also pertinent to note is the fact that , the relations between Zimbabwe and Britain were worsened by constant interference by Britain into the internal affairs of Zimbabwe ,in most cases demonising the Zimbabwean government as perpetuating evil by abusing human rights as well as violating the notion of free and fair elections chief noted elections are the 2000 June elections which prior to their event the Fast Track Land Program . Most scholars generally agree that relations between Zimbabwe and Britain in the early post independence era cordial given Britain's support to the Zimbabwean government for the Land Reform Mlambo (2014) , in the first two decades of independence , Zimbabwe received monetarysupport from a range of governments together with Britain thatsupported the program with 44 million pounds in a land redistribution endowment and budget leverage on the Zimbabwe.The land distribution

endowmenthad depletedin 1988 which became out dated in 1996 , conditions were attached on the procedure in which the grant would be used ,Britain favoured a land allotment exercise based on government acquisition of land amongst sellers who were free to indulge in the process at will on a market value , a bias that led to the purchase of scattered , poor quality land for redistribution,Abiodun (2012) the land conflict was addressed at Lancaster which purported to grantanimpartialallotment of land to the landless without damaging the white farmers white contribution to the Zimbabwean economy .

At the Lancaster House Agreement the land issue was to done through a willing buyer willing seller based on compensation to the white farmers the agreement which Abiodun(2012) argued that had implications on the future relations between the two , he stated " the black government was bound by the sunset clauses in the Lancaster House Agreement that gave special protections to white Zimbabweans for the first ten years of independence " , Muzondibaya (2009) also argued that such a deal (Lancaster) unfortunately , " protected the existing authoritarianbureaucracy and protected private property ,thus limiting the scope of distribution thereby extending for a decade colonial consolidation of their wealth as well as the morally questionable resource distribution disequilibria . . In 1992 , the Land Acquisition Act was enacted to speed up the Land Reform process by r5emoving the willing buyer willing seller clause limiting the size of farms and introducing the land tax (although the tax was never introduced) .

The Act was empowered a fair compensation which could be paid ,land owners could challenge in court the price set by the acquiring authority opposition by land owners increased throughout 1992 – 1997 ,in 1994 Land Tenure Commission also recommended that the best way to achieve redistribution was through a land tax though no measures were taken in place to effect the initiative . In the first decade of independence , the government acquired 40% of the targeted 8 million hectares , redistribution settling more than 50,000 families on more than 3 million hectares ., by the end of the second decade of independence , the pace of land reform had declined , less than 1 million hectares was acquired for redistribution during 1990's and fewer than 20,000 families resettled .Budgetary allocations showed that land acquisition was not a government priority during these years . By 1999,

11million hectares of the richest land were still in the hands of about 4,500 commercial farmers , the great minority of them white , Manyanya and Bond (2010).

In 2000 the Parliament passed a constitutional amendment to section 16 of the constitution legalising the acquisition of land by the government .This policy shift by Zimbabwe received sharp criticism from Britain , the general populace ,(including white farmers and the opposition MDC) . Others scholars argue that the government was angered by the rejection of this constitution in the held referendum held hence inorder to hit back at those that had canvassed support against the proposed constitution , especially the white farmers , the government (immediately) backed invasions of commercial farms as an alternative approach to redressing the land issue , as retribution against those who were perceived to have supported MDC and to divert attention away from the declining economic situation Mapedze (2007) . Masaka further took over from where others left by asserting that the land resource was turned into a political tool that ZANU-PF believed would make them prevail the coming June 2000 parliamentary elections against an emerging political opposition the Movement for Democratic Change(MDC) .

Hewent on to say that this was done to disturb MDC's vortex of political and financial support , ZANU –PF strategically decided to allow land invasions of mainly white owned farmlands .In this debate Moore (2005) took a similar stance as he argued .... in this regard ,the president of Zimbabwe Mr Robert Mugabe remarked that land reform is the last colonial question that heavily qualify our sovereignty given Britain alleged underhand backing of white farmers stronghold on the land and her failure to respect her commitment as contained in the Lancaster House Constitution to bankroll Zimbabwe's land reform program which limited the government of Zimbabwe to implement a meaningful land reform program .

However on a contrary note Masaka (2010) assert that , even though such an exercise appeared noble as it sought to rationalise land resource disequilibria between white settlers and the indigenous people of Zimbabwe , it lacked international support and economic prudence because it destroyed one of the most productive farming sectors in Southern Africa .In relation to Masaka's perception one can support the position that land was used as a political gimmick by Z ANU-PF because of two main reasons .Firstly

Britain had failed to stick to her word of sponsoring the land reform program process as explained in the Lancaster House Agreement and as expressed by the then Britain's Foreign Minister Geoffrey Home to Zimbabwe's the then Foreign Affairs Minister Witness Mangwende in 1980 acknowledging that her majesty is now willing to be more flexible with regard to the release of funds to be used in the land acquisition and development Adromidas (2008).

Chigora (2006) argue that the period following the election of the Labour Party in Britain into power has seen the relations between Zimbabwe and its coloniser Britain deteriorating , thus Britain's policy shift had adverse effects to her external relations when in 1997 through her Secretary For International Development Clare Short responded to Zimbabwe's the then Minister of Agriculture KumbiraiKangai in a letter written

.... ,I should make it clear that we do not accept that Britain has a special responsibility to meet the costs of the land purchase in Zimbabwe . We are a new government from diverse backgrounds without links to former colonial interests. My origins are Irish and as you know , we were colonised not colonisers ,Abiodun (2012) .This position has been taken as the basis for an argument towards the souring of relations between Zimbabwe and Britain .

British response came under scrutiny also in 1997 when Tony Blair reneged and terminated the Margret Thatcher fund towards supporting Zimbabwe's Land Reform Program .Former Zambian president Kenneth Kaunda responded by saying that ' when Tony Blair took over in 1997 , I understand that some young lady in charge of colonial issues within that government dropped doing anything about it , Africa View Point (2012) . This angered Zimbabwe eliteswho expected Britain to keep her promise .Secondly , ZANU-PF was pressured into adopting the Fast Track Land Reform Program due to the emergence of Movement for Democratic Change (MDC) which offered a manifesto promising to give land to the people as it aimed the approaching June 2000 Magaisa approaching parliamentary elections Magaisa ( ) , hence ZANU-PF felt a threat and a sense of insecurity and as such it saw the political landscape at that time as an opportunity to kill two birds with one stone by introducing the Fast Track Land Reform Program to outwit both MDC and to rubbish any British interference .

Although Masaka(2010) partly agree with the above perceptions there is anothera angle from which he perceived things from as he took rather a different version as he posit that , even though the land reform was heavily manipulated the government for political expedience in the face of waning political and economic situation , regaining the land resource from colonial settler group has always been seen as the hallmark of independence .In 2002 Britain suspended Zimbabwe from the Common Wealth of Nations , Zimbabwe retaliated by withdrawing from the organisation proving that states perceive that they are better off an organisation if that particular organisation threatens its interests played a mega role. National interests between these two state actors , Chigora (2006) argue that cooperation between nations exist primarily when there a commonality of interests , of which the absence of the same presents some degree of enormity , a situation depicted by the current state of relations between these two states , he went further to say that antagonism between these two countries arises from the conflict of values essentially the pursuit of divergent national interests in the post colonial world where state autonomy is a myth coupled with the fact that the legacy of colonialism is very much alive .Zimbabwe also came under scrutiny by Britain in 1998 as she intervened in Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) in support of Joseph Laurent Kabila . There were two notions involved in her intervention in the DRC , firstly the notion of national interests was involved while the issue of humanitarian concern was also taken into consideration by the Zimbabwean elites , Chigora (2008) perceived the intervention in terms of 5the same ground as he revealed the speech by Mudenge in 2003 here he remarked that .

In its interaction with the rest of the world , Zimbabwe is not influenced by or take any order from other states or foreign interest .I t is our obligation to the people of Zimbabwe and not to the and not to foreign interests which inspires and influences our co duct of relations with members of the international community .It is in this national vision that shapes our vision with other countries .

Chigora (2008) is noted is his discourse that questions were asked as to the factors that motivated the intervention in the state o DRC , as the intervention came in a time when the country was experiencing economic hardships .This intervention was also touted buy many as part of worsening point 8in the history of Zimbabwe's economic history as

the intervention which involved the deployment 11,000 soldiers strained the treasury as such budgetary allocations were further affected by this intervention .At this point in t6ime Britain expressed concern and n distaste concerning Zimbabwe's intervention in the DRC .Thus her intervention was viewed as perpetuating tyranny as well as the abuse of human rights and the principles of good governance in the Democratic Republic of Congo while Zimbabwe was arguing that her interests in the DRC were humanitarian rather than imperialistic and canal .

Enermity between these two continued as Britain allegedly influenced her allies to isolate Zimbabwe partly USA which declared ZIDERA (Zimbabwe Democracy Recovery Act) in 2001 .Again in 2003 Britain suspended the financial aid to Zimbabwe , from this point these states started the demonization game but concerning this issue Chigora (2006) comes to the fore as he argue that . , by hysterical abuse , personalisation of issues and demonization of those involved compound the problem .

Britain accused Zimbabwe of violating property rights which were enshrined in the Lancaster House Agreement through the willing buyer willing seller as well as breaching this clause ,hence she described the Fast Track Land Reform Program as unjustified and violating human rights ,while Zimbabwe stood up to her objective of Land Redistribution explaining it as noble as Stan Mudenge argued that Zimbabwe is guided by an overriding belief in the love of mankind and , the sacredness of and inviolability of our national sovereignty and the need for freedom justice and equality for all , Alexander (2006) .Other scholars like Mamdani (2008) justified the rationale of the Land Reform Program as he argued that the land process was a final closure in the decolonisation project while Scoones (2006) also support the same perception as he proposed that there were signs that land reform was having beneficial effects especially on smallholder farmers .

Others argue that the Fast Track Land Reform Program in Zimbabwe had adverse effects on economic performance , according to Zimbabwe Human Rights Non Governmental Organisation Forum (2010) the forceful eviction of white farmers during the fast trackland reform process was arguably one of the primary drivers of Zimbabwe's sudden economic downfall , in the same regard economist Eric Bloch argue that

agriculture used to provideemployment for over 300,000 farm workers and a livelihood for nearly two million people but since the 2000 land reform programme , agriculture has plummeted , foreign exchange inflows n have petered out and there has been a breakdown of the rule of law . Eddy Cross also presented that in 2000 the total output of the agriculture industry in Zimbabwe was 4.3 million tonnes of agricultural products worth US $ 1 billion , a decline of 60 % in volume .

Zimbabwe was also slept with sanctions from the European Union , encompassing amongst the proponents of the sanction measures were Britain and her allies namely Australia , Canada , amongst others . Krieger (2007) argue that the Zimbabwean government perceived the use of economic sanctions as an illegal tool to destabilise the internal political affair of the country .The relations between Zimbabwe and Britain continued on a negative note as they again gathered momentum in 2002 elections held in Zimbabwe which received sharp criticism from Britain as flawed ,as Britain cited political intimidation , electoral fraud , abuse of human rights through torture of the opposition .

2.1.2 ZIMBABWE'S POSITION WITH OTHER ACTORS IN THE WORLD SYSYTEM AMID CONFLICTS WITH BRITAIN BEFORE 2000

During this period Zimbabwe had good relations with Russia ,Korea , China stemming from assistance she got from these states for the protracted liberation struggle which resultantly led to Zimbabwe's independency .Zimbabwe had her military personnel trained in China , Russia , Korea (the fifth brigade) as well as Yugoslavia .Military assistance from these states helped strengthened the relations between Zimbabwe and these state actors .This explains why Zimbabwe had chosen Communism from China as a political ideology but finally opted for a Socialist ideology , as such relations between these states and Zimbabwe continued on a positive note spilling to the 21st century , China's objection to the attempt by Britain to intervene in Zimbabwe for the abuse of ' human rights' . Military equipment also was obtained by Zimbabwe from these states .As a result the efforts by Britain to isolate Zimbabwe in the world system by Britain did not yield d the desired results on Zimbabwe (state failure) as her markets and economy

was designed the British way which all these above mentioned states had no capacity to engage into a complete overhaul .

It can be noted that her interaction with China has off late brought much changes to her economy as Chinese markets also depend on British and American sales .Zimbabwe also was isolated from Australia , New Zealand , Canada due to her strained relations with Britain because the later was regarded as the lion of Europe and as such when she would catch a cold the whole of Europe was to catch a sneeze , this implies that Britain exerted a lot of influence to Europe because of her economic capacity during this periodYohane (2008) .It is therefore not surprising to see the European Union wavered in not slapping Zimbabwe with economic sanctions because of British influence which is evident when the European Union treat any enemy of Britain as an enemy of the whole o this regional block rather than to treat the so called enemy differently without bias as happened to Zimbabwe as she was rejected by the majority of the EU members , amongst them Australia , Canada though the likes of Italy have maintained a different approach to Zimbabwe given the president's often visits to Rome .

2.1.3 IMPACTS OF THE CHANGE OF RELATIONS ON ZIMBABWE'S ECONOMY

The sudden souring of relations between Zimbabwe and Britain had adverse effects on the economic landscape of Zimbabwe .Market failure was visible as the Zimbabwean economy and market was designed the British way , as a result trade depreciated . Britain also devalued the dollar which they had created in Zimbabwe hence the dollar that used to compete with the British pound had a calamitous fall from the international stock exchange .Again exports dwindled if they were to be compared to the statics when the relations between these two antagonists were still enjoying a cordial relationship .Zimbabwe could access funds for economic development from Britain for instance in 2003 her 'adversary ' (Britain) closed down the loans that she meant for Zimbabwe .Macmillan (2005)

The pursuit of the Fast Track Land Reform Program by Zimbabwe received countervailing measures of economic sanctions from the European Union as influenced by Britain . This meant that Zimbabwe could not access loans from international financial institutions as she also had her image tarnished and blacklisted which led to her isolation in the world system to the vital access she required for machinery and loans .Bloch (2006) revealed that the years of economic sanctions and Western interference in Zimbabwe's internal affairs have degraded Zimbabwean economy and destroyed people's lives. The shortage of oil and electricity supply, and the inability of Zimbabwe to import raw materials and spare parts decimated Zimbabwean industrial and agricultural productions. In November 1998 the IMF imposed unpublicised sanctions against Zimbabwe, by warning off potential investors, freezing desperately needed loans to Zimbabwe and refusing to negotiate Zimbabwe's debt. A year later, in September 1999, the IMF suspended its support for economic adjustment and reform in Zimbabwe. And in October 1999, the International Development Association (IDS), a multilateral development bank, suspended all structural adjustment loans and credits to Zimbabwe; in May 2000 it suspended all other forms of new lending leaving Zimbabwe desperate for needed funds.

Zimbabwe also felt the heat of a diminishing tourist sector because of the fact that she was affected by smear campaign from Britain as she was described as a destination unfit for tourism she thus faced challenges in trying to gain confidence from the world that Zimbabwe was an ideal nation for tourism .Due to the state of relations between Zimbabwe and Britain , Zimbabwe could not access machinery and equipment for industrial progress which led to industrial retardation given the fact that most if not all of her machinery and infrastructure was pre-independence needing some refurbishments Smith(2006) .It ought to be noted that most of her machinery was British and with the state of relations between the two , Zimbabwe could not access the repairs from Britain . This probably explain why Zimbabwe adopted the Look East Policy given the fact that her relations with the Western countries was no longer yielding anything tangible for survival in this hostile environment .Others point the Fast Track Land Reform Program .

Zimbabwe realised that there was no hope given the confrontation with Britain as both parties were failing to mend their relations which is explained by the diplomatic raw and exchange of words ,Tendi(2014) , smear campaign this has been witnessed between these two states despite Zimbabwe's adaptation of the SAPS which others argue they were a debt trap and a cause for economic crunch for African states . Some of her firms and companies which were vital for revenue generation to the treasury were blacklisted under economic sanctions which were explain as either smart , targeted or restrictive as a result trade was affected as she could not trade or get assistance from certain international financial organisations like the IMF ,Wold Bank ,EU as well as some states these restrictive measure can be noted when they covered Zimbabwean diamonds as boldly diamonds because they were from a sanctioned country .This implied that Zimbabwe would select the state to trade with amongst them were South Africa , India , Russia , Mozambique ,China , have amongst other states have been supportive to Zimbabwe during these hard times .

Zimbabwe's economic failure can be explained by other scholars who argue that her food production dwindled to an extent of importing from neighbouring countries .Others argue that a country that was once the beacon of Africa depleted in food supply , this happened to such an extend of importing from Zambia others argue that Zimbabwe ended up relying on food aid programs Raftopoulos(2003) . In 2001 Zimbabwe was again slept with sanctions from America commonly known as ZIDERA which Zimbabwe interpreted as having been influenced by Britain .All Anglophone states were receiving help from Britain under the Common Wealth of Nations led by Britain , the tragedy which Zimbabwe suspended from the Common Wealth of Nations further pressured the Zimbabwean economy ,it seemed Britain was now out on a vengeance mission for the scores lost against the Fast Track Land Reform Program .She could not access loans that might have been given to her if had remained in the organisation .Zimbabwe responded by withdrawing from the organisation .This has been explained as driven by national interests and a conflict of values between the two states .

Again the betrayal by Britain to bankroll the land redistribution program can be attached to the economic crisis as it led to economic crisis coupled by the emergence of MDC political party as supported by Britain .Infrastructure such as

roads , industrial buildings , and machinery were deteriorating needing to be replaced .Most parastatals were affected , economic growth , Gross Domestic Product (GDP) have all been cited as having been caused by the souring of relations between Zimbabwe and Britain ,Abiodun(2014) .

Important to note however is the fact that although the change of relations between Zimbabwe and Britain had an impact on the economy's performance of Zimbabwe , factors such as corruption , policy in consistence , the DRC intervention , the war veterans pay out , mismanagement of funds cannot be sidelined for contributing t economic crisis in Zimbabwe .This is to prevent one from over exaggerating the impact of the change of relations between Zimbabwe and Britain to economic effects the impact of or either mismanagement , corruption , DRC intervention , war veterans payout .The war veterans pay out were not budgeted for as a result the program strained the treasury , corruption allegedly contributed especially in most parastatals . most literature seem to take the position that mismanagement of the economy was the main reason for economic failure .Others Miradith(2010)argue that when Zimbabwe was handed over the economy things well but the economy was abused .It therefore ought to be understood that the factors that led to economic challenges in Zimbabwe were multifaceted and dynamic that static and single fold .

2.1.4 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter stand to identify theories that better explain the relations between Zimbabwe an Britain , in order to establish why these two state actors behaved the way they did , from the change of policies to the confrontation that exist between these two state actors .This will be crucial in the sense and manner that it helps in determining the true nature of relations between Zimbabwe and Britain as well as issues surrounding the souring of their relations . This study adopted Afrocentricism and the Inequality theory to demystify on the nature of relations between these states as well as establishing the reasons why these states acted the way they were doing . Afro centricism theory is a theory of social change that was proffered by Asante (1987-1988) ,although there has been a realisation that the origins of the theory may not conclusively be glued to Asante as it was proffered and mentioned by many proponents amongst them Du Boise . It is a theory that is aimed at

questioning all forms of degradation and the dehumanisation of black people by whites as a result racism manifested in colonialism and imperialism .It is to question Eurocentric perceptions about Africans and argue a case for the need for African issues to be seen from the African standpoint ,Masaka(2010) .The theory stand to defend the African rights and interests against the view that Africans are barbaric and do not know how to use their resources for their betterment .

This explains why the land questions led to confrontation between Zimbabwe and Britain , because Zimbabwe felt that her land resource could taken away from her again by Britain .She has thus made it her policy to defend her ' territory' ,condemning the economic sanctions which Britain influenced the European Union to impose on Zimbabwe , as a result Zimbabwe felt that her rights were being undermined by Britain's interference on the land redistribution process given the sun set clauses in the Lancaster House Constitution which limited the pace of land distribution by Zimbabwe .It cannot be denied that Britain maintained the same view on Zimbabwe since she is African does not know how to use her resources for her own good , hence other scholars argue that the sunset clauses in the Lancaster House Agreement were meant to maintain an authoritarian bureaucracy of the white settlers Muzondibaya (2009) , and was also perceived as a tool protect the economic interests of the minority white people in Zimbabwe ,hence economic sanctions were imposed on Zimbabwe after the sudden change of her domestic policy than as hoped by Britain, that she was going to wait for Britain to facilitate the programme as

Using this theory one can see that the fast track land reform is just a reversal of what imperialism had done to Zimbabwe but the problem was that the colonisers were not contempt with the decision as they wanted to facilitate the program at their own pace .According to Masaka , the forceful recovery of land that had irritably been taken away from the local people by the white settlers was not only an open indictment of the white settlers lack of respect of the indigenous peoples ability to sustainably use their own resources for their own good but also a retributive stance towards a group of people that had earlier disposed them of their land resource in a violent and insensitive manner .

Moses (1998) put across that the term Du bois , possibly as early as 1961 and definitely by 1962 ...it perceived self determination and the idea of being unashamedly Afro centric , but not indifferent to the impact of the outside world .According to Fielder( )Afrocentricism is the idea that Africa and persons of Africa must be seen as pro active subject within history rather than passive objective of Western history .It means re-establishing Africa and its descendants as centres of value without any way demeaning other people , and their historical contributions to world civilisation .Afrocentricism is a response to global Eurocentric (Orientalist) racist attitudes about African people and their historical contributions and revisits their history with an African cultural ideological focus .

It deals primarily with self determination and African agency and is a Pan African ideology in cultural philosophy and history .This explains why Zimbabwe has taken a stance in adopting Pan African ideology while at the same she has also gained influence and power in Africa by gaining positions at the SADC assuming the chairmanship and lastly at the African Union as part of her foreign policy to survive in the hostile environment that she has found herself in after here change of relations with Britain .Also the continuous rhetoric from Zimbabwe about being the master of her destiny through self determinationis better explained here by revelations from Moses (1998) .In overall terms , it is not surprising to realise the constant remarks from Zimbabwe's president about Britain's unrepentant colonial behaviour towards Zimbabwe in the post independence era .

The efforts by Zimbabwe to keep her cultural ideology and the confrontation between Zimbabwe and Britain denotes a clash of ideologies and perceptions from continents which these two state actors are located .To be specific the attitude of Zimbabwe and Britain explain the clash between Afro centric and Eurocentric views , the latter which has been often criticised for attempting to explain African people and their culture , development and history as barbaric and uncivilised whist at the same time failing also to explain the African context from an African stand point ,hence Zimbabwe has constantly attacked Britain for having colonial agendas' her territory as well as the diplomatic raw that exist between these two state actors .

In overall the relation between these two states the reveal the perceptions of both the Afro centric and Realist theoretical inclinations as Zimbabwe wanted to assert her African identity and values as well as her territorial and economic integrity while Britain thought otherwise as she wanted to facilitate her own interests through a few white farmers though it has off late been argued that the few whit e farmers were not remitting revenue to the British economy .While the British government abandonment of their policy on Zimbabwe expressed her anger for Zimbabwe's adamant attitude to follow British economic path chosen religiously by other Common Wealth nations formerly colonised by Britain

Others argue that the land reform in Zimbabwe had adverse effects on economic performance , according to Zimbabwe Human Rights Non Governmental Organisation Forum (2010) the forceful eviction of white farmers during the fast track land reform process was arguably one of the primary drivers of Zimbabwe's sudden economic downfall , in the same regard economist Eric Bloch argue that agriculture used to provide employment for over 300,000 farm workers and a livelihood for nearly two million people but since the 2000 land reform programme , agriculture has plummeted , foreign exchange inflows n have petered out and there has been a breakdown of the rule of law . Eddy Cross also presented that in 2000 the total output of the agriculture industry in Zimbabwe was 4.3 million tonnes of agricultural products worth US $ 1 billion , a decline of 60 % in volume and a decline of 70% in value .

Also the Realist theory attempt to explain the relations between the two states .The generic explanation of the theory denotes that states act out of the notion of self interests and therefore Zimbabwe wanted to secure her gains of the revolution , while Britain wanted keep her control on the later to maintain her political and economic hegemony . The imposition of sanctions on Zimbabwe explain the notion of national interests .Zimbabwean elites were eager to protected had been fought for .According to this theory , national interests are the top priority in the dimensions of state to state relations .Therefore Zimbabwe aim to advance her national interests specifically land while Britain aim to maintain her hegemony on former colony .Issues of morality are not considered when states interact to advance their interests because rationality is considered an impediment to pursuing national interests thus not any state is worried about the welfare of another when it

comes to the realists ,interests are very crucial in this discourse of realism .The Realist perspective reveal that in the international system there is no room the recognition of morality as national interests and survival will be at stake .In this case this case the relationship between Zimbabwe and Britain were the later was accused of meddling in the politics of the former is clearly explained by the Realist theory .

2 . 1. 5 CONCLUSION

The main thrust of this chapter was to bring out the state of relations between Zimbabwe and Britain before the turn of the new millennium .As was realised , the relations between Zimbabwe and Britain blew hot and cold in first phases before they soured .Relations between Zimbabwe and Britain and their conflicts have a colonial bearing since land which is at the heart of the current conflict has its roots in the pre independence era hence forth relations began on a negative note then normalised when Zimbabwe got independence only to get sour in 2000 when the land policy in Zimbabwe came under scrutiny . from her British counter parts .relations have soured yet British loans in Zimbabwe have taken a low profile in Zimbabwe's economic sector .

CHAPTER THREE

3.1.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter seeks to respond to the title of the research , thus the main objective of this chapter is to address the needs of the problem at hand . It should be born in mind that the reasons that led to the souring of the relations between Zimbabwe and Britain were multifarious and as such this study shall explore more of the causal factors for the diplomatic raw that exist between Zimbabwe and Britain .This shall be done with an agenda of establishing an un biased discourse pertaining the problem at hand .causal factors range from ,policy direction , national interests , , bad governance , breech of agreements , economic sanctions ,smear campaigning between these two states .At the end of this chapter , the mystery behind the straining of relations between Zimbabwe and Britain shall be clearly pointed out .This chapter shall therefore be divided into sub topics in order to clearly bring out the true nature of what caused confrontation between Zimbabwe and Britain .

3.1.1 REASONS FOR THE SUDDEN CHANGE OF ZIMBABWE'S DOMESTIC POLICY

The historical background interprets more to the present crisis between Zimbabwe and Britain .During the colonization of Zimbabwe from the period 1898 to 1979 thousands of Zimbabweans were violently sent to the racially defined land as native and in the process they lost their land , homes , livestock and families they were forcefully resettled in reservationswhere they were forced to labour as slaves in mines and plantations. The main point here is that the introduction of the violent farm invasions was reminiscent of the 1898 to 1979 when the BSAC company under Rhodes forced local people off their land which never got off from their hearts .Worse still the British settlers introduced laws that were meant to prohibited the local people from owning and cultivating the best arable land sincethe majority of the most productive tracts of land was reserved for minority white settlers . British savagery was designed to terrify the populace and wipe out black farmers. For decades , white settlers who made up less than 1 per cent of Zimbabwe's population of

12 million people but controlled 70 per cent of the country's arable land reaps the benefits of British-imposed terror of an apartheid system in Rhodesia, today's Zimbabwe.

All that preceded the independence era was an effort to reverse the unjust colonial set up in Zimbabwe , the inception the violent farmland seizures against the unwilling farmers to cooperate was as a result of history even though reconciliation and cease fire was touted of .When the FTLR was introduced the reaction was the same as it was rooted out fro the colonial legacy while the willing buyer willing seller mgave an opportunity to white farmers to sell only the poor and unproductive land which was countered with by the government .Dore(2007) notes that , ...in order to hit back at those that hat had canvassed support against the proposed constitution , especially the white farmers , the government (immediately) backed the invasion of commercial farms as a n alternative approach to redressing the issue as retribution against those who were perceived to have supported the opposition to divert attention away from declining economic situation .Masaka (2010) notes that the land resource was turned into a political tool that ZANU-PF believed would make them win the coming June 2000 parliamentary elections against an emerging opposition MDC , as the MDC in its manifesto promised people land, economic growth and employment This proved to be a menace to the ruling party ZANU-PF hence there was need to catalyze the land reform program in order to win the electorate to survive the approaching 2000 elections were condemned by Britain as flawed

Alexander (2011) argued that even though the land reform was heavily manipulated by the Zimbabwean government for political expedience in the face of waning political and economic fortunes , regaining the land resource from colonial settlers has always been the hallmark of independence henceforth the land reform exercise by Zimbabwe was justified as noble because it was justified because it for a national cause , since the land issue bear a colonial trail . the 1896 war of disposition , the chimurenga wars , it was necessary for the government to distribute land as promised and fought for by the masses , the much and protests by the likes of ChenjerasiHunzvi for land justified the fast track land reform by the government in the year 2000 , Thus one must not only condemn the land reform program but rather should also accept the fact that it was the land that had led to war between the colonial settlers and the indigenous people in Zimbabwe , this explains the reasons a section of the population Namely the war veterans rubbished the need to

compensate he white commercial farmers for their land because like Asante ( ) noted that the colonial settlers came to Africa and realized the reach minerals , land and other resources and falsely concluded that African s were backward to an extent that they did not know how to use their resources for their own betterment Moore (2005) , this was worsened by Britain's alleged underhand backing of white farmers strong hold on the land .

Muzondibaya (2009) such a deal (Lancaster) unfortunately protected the existing authoritarian bureaucratic and protected private property thus limiting the scope of distribution thereby prevented the government of Zimbabwe from conducting meaningful land redistribution .Stiff (2000) argue that Britain had promised in Lancaster House Conference that after 10 years it was to compensate farmers but it failed ,so ZANU-PF took the opportunity to kill two birds with one stone ,thus the Lancaster House Agreement was manipulated and as well as to outwit the opposition party MDC ,henceforth Mapedza(2007) argued that , in order to hit back at hose that had canvassed votes for the opposition , the government (immediately) backed the invasion of white owned farms .....to disturb MDC's vortex of political and financial support .

3.1.2IMPA CTS OFTHE CHANGE OF RELATIONS ON ZIMBABWE'S ECONOMY

The sudden change of relations between Zimbabwe and Britain had adverse effects on economic landscape of Zimbabwe .Market failure , rocket inflation , strikes , unemployment b were almost others economic factors that threatened Zimbabwe as the Zimbabwean economic and market system was organized in a British way .Given the sour relations been these two Bloch (2006) argued that years of economic sanctions and Western interference in Zimbabwe's internal affairs have degraded Zimbabwean economy and destroyed people's lives. The shortage of oil and electricity supply, and the inability of Zimbabwe to import raw materials and spare parts decimated Zimbabwean industrial and agricultural productions. In November 1998, the IMF imposed unpublicized sanctions against Zimbabwe, by warning off potential investors, freezing desperately needed loans to Zimbabwe and refusing to negotiate Zimbabwe's debt. A year later, in September

1999, the IMF suspended its support for economic adjustment and reform in Zimbabwe. And in October 1999, the International Development Association (IDS), a multilateral development bank, suspended all structural adjustment loans and credits to Zimbabwe; in May 2000 it suspended all other forms of new lending leaving Zimbabwe desperate for needed funds.

.

As a result of antagonism that existed between these two states trade depreciated between these two state ACTORS , Zimbabwean dollar was also devalued to punish the government , According to Sachikonye (2008) at independence in 1980 Zimbabwe's economic was touted as the beacon for Africa's future exude with promising signs of vibrancy .The adoption of an ESAP Program in 1991 led to increase in interest rates and inflation and bought brought in 1992 and 1995 compounded by the problems .Stock market fell and manufacturing contracted by 40% between 1992 and 1996 , many workers were laid off by 1997 ....spiralling food and fuel prices inspired urban strikes and political protests , labour movements by ZCTU and the militant wave in 1998 saw public sector workers at the fore front of this growing resistance , despite public problems the government sent 11,000 soldiers to DRC.

Back in late 1997 when Zimbabwe's current began , the immediate catalyst by all accounts was president Mugabe's decision to give each registered war veteran a payout of Z$ 50,000 pension plus Z$2,000 per month , Mlambo(2014) .This stand to explain that one must not over emphasis the effect of Britain on the Zimbabwean economy given the fact that ,Zimbabwe bear some of the blame for her own economic downfall .In this case the printing of money for the war veterans exacerbated the already struggling economy in Zimbabwe .It was the turning point on the economy history of Zimbabwe as these war veteran pay outs led to hyper inflation than before as result the economy struggled because money should be a scarce commodity .

International and local financiers pounded the Zimbabwean dollar for reasons that ranged from punishing Mugabe , to transferring g their dollar to currency , to making money from selling the Zimbabwean dollar through a common form of currency specialization of white owned agri-business while donors accused the government continued lack of transparency and failure to adhere to the principles agreed at the

conference .It was inevitably Britain played intelligently as Zimbabwean markets , economy ,industry and currency was designed the British way and as such British retaliation would affect the Zimbabwean economic performance , as a result the Zimbabwean dollar that was once at par with the British pound calamitously fell on the stock exchange .It is a pity how the British lacked maturity in handling sour relations with Zimbabwe as she went for retaliation .Others argue that Britain was anger by her loss in the battle for "supremacy" in Zimbabwe hence she retaliated by imposing economic sanctions on her former colony to effect behaviour change Sachikonye (2011) .

In the wake of growing confrontation between Britain and other donors and the Zimbabwean government over the financing of land transfers and the November 1997 government notice of compulsory acquisition of 1,471 farms (about 3,9 hectares) , an international donor conference on land reform and resettlement was held in September 1998 .This forum aimed to build consensus among various stakeholders in lands reform .Zimbabwean government accused the donors of not actually putting up the funds that they had pledged and the protecting of neo-colonial interests .Also as a result of her sour relations with Britain , Zimbabwe suffered some isolation in some parts of Europe because she could not get access for machinery to refurbish her aging industrial machinery an equipment out of the trade embargos on some of her firms such as NOCZIM ,Agri Bank. Worse still she could not access funds from Britain as she used to do when their relations were normal particularly in the early independence period when the president of Zimbabwe his excellence comrade Robert Gabriel Mugabe was seen as a British knight as such she could get loans .

3.1.3 POLICIES THAT LED TO THE SOURING OF RELATIONS BETWEEN ZIMBABWE AND BRITAIN

Land reform took centre stage in Zimbabwe's politics and economy and polarized land policy discourse nationally and internationally Moyo (2013) .Sachikonye (2003) argued that the fast track land reform program was an electoral for the black elite interests.As revealed b yMoyo (2003) the land reform ought to be subordinated to good governance and procedural questions .Raftopouls (2003) , alluded that the process was condemned for human transgression .The notion of human rights particularly

property rights was noted out as the major concept violated .The Fast Track Land Reform program caused conflict between Zimbabwe and Britain as Britain perceived that she had been tricked , henceforth British officials argued the Zimbabwean government breached the 1979 Lancaster House Agreement where land question was to be addressed in a willing buyer willing seller process .

It was also argued that the Fast Track Land Reform Program was introduced in 2000 in a bid to derail the Movement for Democratic Change (a political party in Zimbabwe) support base Masaka(2012) given the fact that the government proposed constitution of 2000 was rejected at the referendum that was held . Others argued that the white Commercial farmers were against the constitution and hence they influenced their farm workers to do the same .In order to punish those that had canvassed votes against the government for the benefit of MDC the government supported the forceful removal of white farmers from their farmlands in order to disturb MDC focal point of political and economic hold .This angered the British government as they argued that the process was a violation of the notion of human rights in the face of property rights .They based their argument on the fact that the white farmers who lost their land in the fast track land redistribution process were not compensated for the developments and the capital that some of them had used when they bought the land .The British regime expected Zimbabwe to drop the land reform program and rely on Britain and the donor system as they wanted to protect minority rights as provided for by the sunset clause in the Lancaster House Agreement of 1979 , Abiodun (2012) .

It was also the FTLRP that spilled over to the souring of relations between Zimbabwe and Britain in the Common Wealth of Nations hence the suspension of Zimbabwe from the Common Wealth of Nations .It has been alluded that the major reason why the FTLRP was introduced was to win the coming June 2000 Parliamentary elections coupled by the pressure coming out from the public as a result of the manifesto unfolded by MDC which promised land to the people while explained the policy as justified given the fact that the newly elected British Labour Party into power in 1997 rejected to carry in its ambit the land costs in Zimbabwe as was promised by the Margret Thatcher and the John Major regimes to bankroll the land reform program in Zimbabwe .

Another school of thought argued that the reason why Britain was angered was because she wanted to keep her political and economic hegemony over Zimbabwe hence when the program was introduced she felt a blow in this economic struggle .In overall terms , the FTLRP strained relations between Zimbabwe and Britain because the later felt hat Zimbabwe had treacherously abandoned the Agreement at Lancaster in 1979 , while for Zimbabwe , retain was wrong in her approach to the land issue when the Labour Party got into power coupled by British failure to honour her promises made at Lancaster . According to Bloch (2006) it should be recalled that the British government in the person of Clare Short refused to back Zimbabwe's fast-track land reform program because returning the land to the people British settlers stole it from would, she said, damage "prospects for attracting investment."

Again Britain alleged support of the opposition in Zimbabwe was identified as amongst these causal factors that strained relations between these two state actors hence Hopkins (2000) argue that , the West pro-MDC attitude in particular Britain worsened the economic and political hardships in Zimbabwe .Accusations raged on as Zimbabwean elites condemned Britain of attempting to facilitate a regime change agenda locally through the MDC henceforth the political party was classified as Western funded. There was also a general political radicalization of ZANU-PF and nationalists over reforms in Zimbabwe in view of the resurgence of white farmer and business political mobilization against land reform and in support of a new political opposition party the MDC . Sensitive political divergence came out from Western condemnation and withholding of loans and aid while backing MDC and embedded NGOs, beginning with the constitutional Reform process (1999-2000) and in subsequent elections. .This resultantly led to Zimbabwe labelling Britain of not repenting from colonial attitudes that she does not respect the doctrine state sovereignty as she constantly interfered into the internal affairs of Zimbabwe .Thus the British support of MDC by Britain (though controversial) was cited as another cause for the relations between Zimbabwe and Britain to sour Others are of the contrary view as they argued that the accusations were just a scapegoat for ZANU-PF to achieve its political ends .

Moreover , amongst others factors that strained relations between Zimbabwe and Britain was the suspension of Zimbabwe from the Common Wealth of Nations in 2003 . The

British government cited human rights abuse particularly property rights . The need to make democratic reforms was amongst the reasons behind the suspension of Zimbabwe from the Common Wealth of Nations .This was followed by Zimbabwe's withdrawal from the organization to signify the effect of sovereignty when states relate with organizations that states can pull out of an organization if its interests are threatened a here Zimbabwe argued Britain was interfering in her domestic affairs .
In 2000 , the elections were condemned by Britain and other Western states .Zimbabwe was accused of indulging in electoral fraud , intimidation , terror and torture while Zimbabwe rubbished these accusations as tilted in favour of the MDC for their desired political aggrandizements and canal desires for regime change n as retaliation for the most hated fast track land reform program in Zimbabwe .Again in 2008 , the elections were labelled as "flawed" hence the relations between these two state actors were further strained . Again Zimbabwe introduced the Look East Policy which angered Britain which was benefiting economically . It was a foreign policy shift from relying on the West (in particular Britain and her allies) given the diplomatic raw between these two state actors in the post independence era .It was concerned at establishing new bilateral and multilateral relations in the Asian Continent , major established amongst them was the Sino-Zimbabwe bilateral relationship .Due to this arrangement Zimbabwe survived a huge economic scare by relating to China and other Asian tigers like Japan ,her benefit was in the economic sector ,military ,technological fields no wonder why Zimbabwe at one point wanted to adopt the Communist ideology .

Britain expected Zimbabwean elites to burg at the British doorstep pleading for forgiveness for the land redistribution process since her economy and markets were structured in a British way ..Instead , what Britain perceived failed to materialize as Zimbabwe established links with China henceforth Chinese projects , firms dominated in Zimbabwe .Britain felt a blow as she wanted to be the only super power in control as well as keep a track on her former colonial territory exercising great influence over Zimbabwe's internal affairs and still maintain political and economic hegemony in Zimbabwe . This further strained relations between these two state actors as Britain felt a slap in the face given the power struggle between Asia , Europe and America .As a result , the relationship between Zimbabwe and China provided the necessary security that Zimbabwe so much wanted to survive against isolation policy against her by Britain .Several instances were noticed when China used her veto powers in the United Nations

Security Council to veto against the proposed so called " Humanitarian intervention " in Zimbabwe against human rights abuse , dictatorship , bad governance . It is doubtful though , which yardstick they use to measure bad governance as their claims for bad governance are suspicious given the scot free crimes against humanity by Hitler , human rights abuse of the black American population in America by Obama .

Again Zimbabwe intervention in DRC along with Angola ,Botswana in support of Laurent Joseph Kabila was expressed with condemnation by Britain as she argued that Kabila was a dictator who disserved to be tried for crimes against humanity , bad governance the same which repeated itself in 2011 to Muammar Kaddafi in Libya .Claims from the West , America of bad governance , dictatorship violation of human rights has always raised many eyebrows given the hidden agenda that come along when these super powers are let alone to facilitate . As such things never got any better between these two state actors as Zimbabwe felt she needed to intervene on humanitarian concerns . other scholars argued Zimbabwe wanted to protect her interests as well as securing more economic interests (amongst them was the mineral interest in Diamonds as well as gaining an ally Moore (2005) .

Another school of thought perceived the sending of troops to the Democratic Republic of Congo was politically motivated consequently from immense pressure coming from war veterans who wanted the land that they were so much promised which they been promised Magaisa (2010) and given the fact that the land resource was taken through the barrel of the gun in the protracted war of liberation that led to Zimbabwe's independence in 1980 .Henceforth the sending of troops by Zimbabwe to DRC was a strategy that was meant to avoid a joint venture between the war veterans and the national army in their quest for the distribution of the promised national cake fought for a precarious position that the government so much wanted to avoid for political stability . Alexander (2006)argued that on the other hand Britain accused Zimbabwe of being wrong in her actions in the DRC as was assisting Kabila to perpetuate evil against humanity .

Furthermore , the legislative changes such as the Land Acquisition Act in 1992 introduced by Zimbabwe's government has also been found in between the political and diplomatic rift that existed between Zimbabwe and Britain . The later wanted

Zimbabwe to stick to the donor system in the land redistribution exercise , yet which failed to materialize in its platform held in 1998 in Harare .

This further worsened relations between these two state actors as Britain preferred the donor system which would unfold on a compensation platform to white Commercial farmers .Important to note however is the fact that although the idea of compensation seemed noble .The process was cumbersome as Zimbabwe lacked the fund to bankroll the program given the refusal by the labour party in Britain in 1997 to honour the promises that were made by the previous Margret Thatcher .Others however deny blame against Zimbabwe as they asserted that the failure by Britain to respect the Lancaster House Agreement in 1979 as she refused to deposit another second chunk of money to bankroll the land redistribution process was explained as the reason why Zimbabwean elites developed a negative attitude against Britain while others are of the notion that Zimbabwe should be blamed for the conflict as she destroyed the trust that she once had gained from Britain citing misuse of funds particularly the 40 million pounds given to her .

Chigora(2006) argue that the sanctions imposed on Zimbabwe had overall effects of increasing ;poverty levels at the same time led to the unpopularity of ZANU-PF .Zimbabwe perceived the imposition of economic sanctions as meant to derail government success on the land question , in actual fact the elites viewed it as regime change agenda standing as vendetta against the lost battle in the land conflict .As such ZANU-PF used the economic sanctions as to convince the public that sanctions were the issue behind economic failure .The government used the issue of economic sanctions to its advantage to gain public sympathy which worked to their advantage than perceived by Britain , that sanctions were to help in enforcing behaviour change towards the government's approach on human rights , rule of law and property rights .This further angered Zimbabwe as , the policy by Britain led to isolation of Zimbabwe from some of the potential , important investors henceforth she struggled to regain confidence for her drowning Tourism sector as many countries were influenced to impose travel bans to Zimbabwe for their citizens describing it as an unfit destination for tourism for their citizens given the fact it was a sanctioned nation . This never mad relations to get any better or normal but instead it words them because the art of demonization between these two states strengthened itself that the two state actors taking a positive

stance in re-engaging for positive and constructive talks Tendi (2010). Nhara (2002) argued that British government policy on intelligence services which suggested that Mugabe would drop the land reform policy and be tied to the donors especially given the economic problems that Zimbabwe was facing .It is high time a fair approach is taken on all former colonies since the notion of self governance was attained by these former colonial states as in this case Britain expected Zimbabwe to rely on her totally for the land distribution exercise , than letting her be a master of her own destiny

Chigora (2006) argued that when the labour political party in Britain assumed power relations between Zimbabwe and Britain began to deteriorate .Thus the change or shift of administration in Britain worsened the state of relations between Zimbabwe and Britain .When the labour party came to power , it denied any responsibility to the land reform program citing facts that it was a responsibility assumed by the previous regime who had made such promises and not them hence Britain would not accept any responsibility whatsoever fort the land reform in Zimbabwe . This inevitably led to policy shift by Zimbabwe from the agreed Lancaster House Agreement to the Fast Track Land Reform Program in the year 2000 .Also the divergent interests that existed between Zimbabwean n government and the newly elected Labour Party in Britain explain to much of the confrontation that existed between these two state actors , as both camps tried by all means to uphold d their own interests by at all costs this inevitably led to confrontation between these two state actors . Abiodun (2012) letter by Clare Short also explain the divergent interest that existed between these two state actors as Clare short letter to Stan Mudenge , that they did not accept that Britain had any responsibility in the fast track land reform program , resultantly led to conflicts between these two as this forced Zimbabwe to shift her domestic policy in relation to Britain

Tarisayi and Kwaramba (2009) , the era of independent brought new hopes with regard to equitable redistribution of the land resources other resources .As such conflicts over the land question were inevitable as pressure was coming from the Zimbabwean populace in need of the land resource given the effects that the populace was facing which were established by the Land Apportionment Act of 1931 that divide land n racial lines leading to the creation of Gwai and Shangani ,thus when British proposed Lancaster Constitution failed to materialize given the sunset clauses that were limiting meaning full

land distribution in Zimbabwe , the population amongst them the war veterans were pressurizing the government into catalyzing the land distribution exercise .

Alexander (2006) the vigorousrecuperation of land violently taken away from the Zimbabwean society by the white minority was not only an open denunciation of the their disrespectful attitude to the local peoples' potential to utilise their own resources for their own benefitbut a retributive action that was reversing the disrespectful seizure if the land resource of the local people .Britain and her allies locally and her allies locally and internationally highlighted the seizure of land as a sign of the breakdown of the rule of law an infringement of people's rights and an attack on the democratic principle in Zimbabwe .This led to the serious politicization and sadinternational involvement of the land question .also the Lancaster House Conference required the Robert Mugabe government to wait pass about ten years for it toput into action the land redistribution process which it did , also Britain delaying tactics towards the land reform left many questions to be answered which forced a sudden change of policy on the part of Zimbabwe . Barrette (2013) reveal that Clare Short's response to the land question also influenced the change of policy by Zimbabwe as she replied that her government was only equipped to sustain poverty alleviation land resource programs .

According to Mudenge (2003) , the fast track land reform program resulted in the formation of a hostile alliance on Zimbabwe both in the world system and domestically in the name of the opposition political party the MDC together with white commercial farmers . Also Joseph Winter (the British Broadcasting Corporation agent in Zimbabwe)wasexpelled which worsened relations between Zimbabwe and Britain . Stiff(2000) presents a rather divergent perspective as he postulates that , the government's land distribution is perhaps one of the most brutal and most angrilycondemnedeconomic and political matter as far as the Zimbabwean nation is concerned ,It has been criticized for the violence and coercion which spoileda number ofallotmentsand the logicalcollapse of internal financial institutions that were in control billions of bonds of properties in non financial form .

Smear campaign by Britain worsened further relations between her and Zimbabwe as Tendi (2014) argued that constituent demeaning your adversaryis a hindrance to establishing peaceful negotiations talks with them because leaders are assumed to fail

keeping their promises after negotiations .British government often demonized Mugabe in its rhetoric condemnation ,demonization between Zimbabwe and British government made political negotiations impossible .It is noble to adopt the idea that confrontation and demonization does not encourage meaningful diplomatic negotiations between two conflicting parties .Britain labelled Zimbabwean leaders as dictators while Zimbabwe labelled Britain as after manipulating her territorial integrity . Also pertinent to note is the fact that the relations between Zimbabwe and Britain were worsened by constant interference by Britain into the internal affairs of Zimbabwe , the most prevalent noted was that of elections the well as violating the notion of free and fair elections chief noted elections are the 2000 June elections which prior to their event the Fast Track Land Program .Most scholars generally agree that relations between Zimbabwe and Britain in the early post independence era cordial given Britain's support to the Zimbabwean government for the Land Reform Mlambo (2014) , in the first two decades of independence , Zimbabwe received financial assistance from various governments on a donor platform .

3.1.4 MEASURES THAT WERE TAKEN BY ZIMBABWE TO SURVIVE

Having realized that she was now isolated in the international system despite her links with Asian states , Russia , Libya and others .Zimbabwean elites used their quality leadership skills and intelligence to draft plans to survive the '' cold war '' between her and Britain .Measures adopted by Zimbabwe were many , amongst them were policies , strategies to survive this political and economic raw with Britain .Fast track land reform , withdrawal from the Common Wealth of Nations , smear campaign , policy shift among others were deployed by Zimbabwe in order to survive in the international system after the isolationist policy by Britain to isolate her from getting any support internationally .

Krieger (2006) argue that the Zimbabwean government perceived the use of economic sanctions as an unlawful tool to destabilize her internal political and economic affairs .It has therefore been supported by Tendi (2010) who allude that , the art of demonization can actually work to fulfil an internal political objective as ZANU-PF made use of economic sanctions to get some sympathy from the general populace .Party leaders would tell the

public , that the country is failing to performing well economically due to economic sanctions . As a result ,economic sanctions worked to the advantage of Zimbabwe as Bond and Manyanya (2012) argued that whoever thought sanctions were effective in dethroning ZANU-PF was mistaken as the party instead used sanctions to its own political advantage and as such ZANU-PF has soldiered on despite the effects of economic sanctions to her economy .

Also Zimbabwe shifted her foreign policy from totally depending on the West to establishing relations with Asia , Russia and the Middle East .This resultantly led to the Look East policy .From these multilateral and bilateral relationships , Zimbabwe benefited economically ,militarily ., technologically .Economic deals were signed between Zimbabwe and China , Japan , again trade t intensified between Zimbabwe and these states .

3.1.5 THE PARTY THATSHOULD BE BLAMED FOR THE SOURING OF RELATIONS BETWEEN ZIMBABWE AND BRITAIN

The issue establishing who to blame for the cold relations that exist between Zimbabwe and Britain has presented itself with challenges to this discourse as various argument contested for supremacy to point which camp was responsible for the sour relations that exist between these two confronting camps .This discourse has adopted many of the views in order to give an unbiased view .At the end , the study shall indicate its own perception regarding the relations between Zimbabwe and Britain .From the literature consulted , it has firstly been argued that Zimbabwe should be blamed for the state of relations that exist between these two states .The first argument was glued at Zimbabwe's ' misuse of funds' that were directed for land distribution the position that was also adopted by Magaisa (2010) . It was also further argued if Zimbabwe had not 'abused' the funds she received from Britain for the land process ,the later would have been open to continue with her financial support to Zimbabwe .This was expressed by Clare Short in her letter to Zimbabwe's Foreign Affairs Minister Stan Mudenge as she questioned the guarantee for a transparent process in the use of the funds for land redistribution in Zimbabwe Abiodun (2012) as well as Tony Blair's attitude to Zimbabwe upon his inception and inauguration into political office .

The second argument blamed Zimbabwe for ruining her bilateral relationship with Britain mainly because of her policy inconsistence .The sudden policy shift by Zimbabwe from the agreed Lancaster House Agreement to the Fast Track Land Reform Program (FTLRP) . The policy which was introduced in 2000 was described as the turning point of the Anglo –Zimbabwe as Britain argued that Zimbabwe violated the clauses in the Lancaster House Agreement that expressed land distribution in Zimbabwe on a willing buyer willing seller where white commercial farmers were to be compensated for development .The introduction of the FTLRP was explained as a political device to assist ZANU-PF political expedience which was surrounded by the powerfully and popularly emerging political party MDC and the 2000 June parliamentary elections that were around the corner as posited by Muzondibaya (2006) .This led to cold sentiments between her and Britain as the latter blamed Zimbabwe for violating property rights if Britain is so concerned about the human rights gospel how come Obiang was welcomed by Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice as a "good friend" of the U.S worse still given the abysmal human rights record in Equatorial Guinea and the crimes committed by the dictator and his cronies have received little media attention in the West. Despite the wealth generated by oil, nearly half of all Equatorial Guinea children under five are malnourished and live in miserable condition without potable water or electricity. According to the CIA World Fact book (2011) .Henceforth it is noble to argue that although Zimbabwe is criticised so much though she was also wrong in some instances , one ought to take note of the fact that both parties had a had a hand on the fire that has stood out to be difficult to put off given the fact that it takes two to tussle.Also Zimbabwe's introduction of the FTLRP the worsened the situation the relations the argument that the British side is posing , South Africa , Zambia , Nigeria were pointed a s examples of states that " kept their heads cool" in the land exercise .Others have alluded to Zambia's off late agricultural performance to the migration of commercial farmers from Zimbabwe given the warm relations that exist between her and Britain .

Also vote " rigging" or electoral fraud has been a major debate between Zimbabwe and Britain as the later accused Zimbabwe for violating democratic principles and human rights .The 2000, 2002, 2008elections were cited as lacking credibility and hence were condemned by Britain and her allies arguing that Zimbabwe was using dictatorship to govern people .This led to a diplomatic raw between Zimbabwe and Britain as the

former viewed the accusations as a direct lack of respect of her territorial and political integrity by interfering in her electoral outcomes and issues .Masaka (2010) .

On the other hand Britain was accused for failing to honour her obligations at Lancaster House to fund the land reform program .This angered the Zimbabwean elites who had been promised funds for the land exercise as they perceived they had been tricked into signing the Lancaster House Agreement .Abiodun (2012) argued that British response through Clare Short when they were reminded of the funds angered Zimbabwe as she was blamed for downplaying Zimbabwe against the promises she had made , one wonders what position Britain was to take if Zimbabwe was the one that had made the promise to bankroll the land exercise in Britain .Again Tony Blair's argument was challenged as the previous regimes had promised to fund the process according to

Dore (2005) alludes that British alleged support of MDC has been expressed as part of the reasons that further strained the relations between Zimbabwe and Britain as Zimbabwe interpreted this attitude as anaim to destabilise and oust her government effort locally through MDC .Also British alleged influence on the European Union to impose economic sanctions on Zimbabwe were met with distaste by Zimbabwe as she argued that they were meant to cripple her economy as well as to facilitate the inception of a puppet regime as was done in Libya Chomsky (2010) , a regime that would adhere to all their needs also as happening to South Africa as she does not have a grip on her land .Britain argued that economic sanctions were to effect behaviour change n terms of good governance , upholding of the use cogence (internationally accepted inviolable norms such as the right to life , property rights , education amongst others) in Zimbabwe .Sanctions have never been a shrewd way of solving problems because , Zimbabwe managed to survive yet economic sanctions were imposed on her as she used them for her survival and gaining public sympathy ,Tendi (2010) .

The international community is also to blame for failing to bring the state of relations between Zimbabwe and Britain to calmer waters .The international and regional bodies failed to successfully mediate between these two states in order to bring these two state actors to a cordial platform .There is need to persuade these two states to reengage for the resolution of the problem that exist between these two states instead much of the international system has been corrupted into grudging against Zimbabwe .Nevertheless

the Nigerian initiative in the context of the Common Wealth played a crucial role , worriedby the consistent disharmony and confrontation between Zimbabwe and European Union states under British influence Nigerian leader Obasanjo recommendedthat all allies of both Britain and Zimbabwewho are members of the Common Wealth mediatein order to help proffer solutions in as far as the land question was concerned in Zimbabwe , hence a commissioncomprised of 9 ministers (of Common Wealth) held a meeting in Nigeria's capital city from 6-7 September 2001 chaired by Nigeria.

At the end of the meeting Zimbabwe reconfirmed her promiseto initiate the land allotment exercise in accordance to her constitutional provisions and guaranteed that invasions on white owned commercial farms were not to occur again , she also agreed to speed up negotiations with the UNDP to make feasibleUNDP's attempts in organising internationally backed support on the land redistribution process in Zimbabwe , however the British failed to respect ant provisions arrived at in Abuja including amongst them financial responsibilities on her Zimbabwean this initiative cannot be ignored cannot be ignored as I also played a part in trying to normalize the relations between Zimbabwe and Britain as revealed by the Zimbabwean Embassy (2009).According to Bloch (2006) Zimbabwe's tragedy is a Western-created tragedy. Western leaders who pretend to be committed to democracy, human rights and ending the suffering of the Zimbabwean people are crying wolf. If the U.S., Britain and their allies are as committed to democracy, human rights, the roles of international law and civilized norms as they claim to be, then they should first end their murderous Occupations of Iraq and Afghanistan. It is clear here that the West have pretended to be fighting for the noble cause in as far as Zimbabwe is concerned as a smokescreen to fulfil their canal desires and political aggrandisements

3 .1.6 CONCLUSION

The chapter outlined an exhibited the causal factors that led to the souring of relations between Zimbabwe and Britain .As revealed above , there were many factors to account for when articulating on the factors that affected the bilateral relationship that existed between Zimbabwe and Britain and amongst them was the Land Reform Program .Land resource has been a recurrent idea that proved to have caused that diplomatic raw that exist between

Zimbabwe and Britain in tracing the historical background of these two state actors .Other factors such as the change of foreign policy on Zimbabwe and Britain , abuse of funds , economic sanctions , suspension of Zimbabwe from the common Wealth of Nations all further strained the Anglo-Zimbabwe bilateral relationship .

CHAPTER 4

4.1.0. INTRODUCTION

This chapter is about to reveal the data collection procedures , data that was collected as well as the methods used . Also important to note is the fact that the chapter shall exhibit recommendations to the problem in question and a summary to the whole study

4.1.1.RESEACH DESGN

Kathari explain it as a science of studying scientifically , articulating how the study is going to be carried out .In this discourse , the study shall use Descriptive research which is determined to explain a certain phenomena , population or trend .Zikmund (2003) explain further as he posits that it seeks to meet certain unattended questions or problem in question .It guarantees a lot of information as clients can explain or narrate the events as they transpired , written information on the ground can be used .

4.1.2 THE PURPOSE OF USING DESCRIPTIVE RESEARCH

It is specific as the researcher can target a specific group of people for specific discursive exercise concerning a certain phenomena .It can include obtaining information that is qualitative and a lot of information can be accessed .It can also be used to test indirectly theories , models as well as its ability to study a specific behaviour in a certain unity .

4.1.3CHALLENGES OF USING DESCRIPTIVE RESEACH

Firstly it is less analytical and at the same time documents may be difficult to access especially in Government departments . There is also the need to thoroughly inspect the data because it is prone to bias .It is expensive in cases where travels are required to access stored documents .

4:1.4 PURPOSIVE SAMPLING

Babbie (1990) explain purposive sampling as a process of selecting a sample on the basis of your own knowledge of the population , its elements and the nature of the research. Individual characteristics are selected to meet specific questions of the study , the researcher is the able to select a particular unity because he is well versed with its nature , culture , elements which then suit well the questions of the research , MacNeally (1999) .This study has adopted purposive sampling because of its advantages , that it is specific and time saving as it targets certain units for a specific research , in this case the study made use of farm owners .This unit presented a unique revelation as to what really transpired pertaining t reasons that led to the souring of relations between Zimbabwe Britain .From this sample it was deduced that the land issue was at the centre of the confrontation that exist between these state actors .

From the whole unity that was sampled , there were different views that were gathered .The first view presented that the , the willing buyer willing seller was a biased agreement that stood in the of a meaning full land redistribution exercise because it prevented the government to purchase the land before 10 years , that the white commercial farmers were not willing to sell the land .The argument was based on the fact that whatever land was sold was poor for agriculture for the subsistent farmers in Zimbabwe hence there was the need to catalyse the land reform process because the willing buyer was not bearing any fruits .Again the sample revealed that ,the government can be blamed for the fast track land reform because it did not indulge in any violent manner but whatever the violence that that transpired was from a part of public pressure for the land that they waited for so much since they were so excited about independence and getting the national cake .they lastly argued that it is senseless to argue that they were persuaded to support the opposition party by their superiors because in any way the white farmers would not support an party that promised land to people given the fact that they were not willing to sell the land as they only sold poor portions of it .In overall terms they agreed that the fast track land reform programme was the turning point of the relations between Zimbabwe and Britain .

Some section of the former farm workers responded by saying that they did not support the opposition when the 2000 referendum was held because they wanted the white farmers to be evicted for them to get a chance to be resettled and maybe get some land ,while another

section of the population in this unit selected admitted that they did supported the MDC opposition political party because their manifesto was appealing , they thought that if they support the opposition land would be given to them since the present government seemed to .Part of it condemned the governments action to chase away the white farmers citing economic benefits .

From the research conducted in the field , many views were gathered as to the problem in question .Questions were answered as to what caused the relations between Zimbabwe and Britain to sour , who is to blame for the state of relations between these two state actors as well as the effects of these strained relations on the Zimbabwean nation .Views were gathered through discussion groups , purposive sampling , interviews , however problems were encountered that militate against effective data collection . Amongst the challenges encountered were , refusal to reveal documents or information ,some personnel in some government were too occupied to attend to an interview ,others failed to participate because they were afraid of being victimised citing that some of the information asked for was sensitive .

4.1.5THE PURPOSE OF USING PURPOSIVE SAMPLING

Purposive sampling is a type of a reach that explain phenomena and as such it is an advantage to the researcher as he is able to get more information since it explains a certain phenomena .Since it is less mathematical the probability of errors is low .Also , purposive sampling saves time since it can be used for a specific type of a research in this case the research hovers around the complexity of the land redistribution in Zimbabwe that has become the centre of political and economic conflict between Zimbabwe and Britain .

4.1.6. CHALLENGES OFUSING PURPOSIVE SAMPLING

When using purposive sampling there are challenges that are challenges that can b encountered by the researcher .Firstly it lacks the mathematical essence and as such it does not give a conclusive justification of the problem henceforth , there is need to combine it with other methods in order to compliment the study .At the same time , purposive sampling involves the need to access documents , records and as such it becomes problematic since there has been a tendency of refusing to let researchers access records due to the fear that

privacy would be compromised .Again the fact that it is specific it presents problems to the researcher in that it is not flexible .

4.1.7 FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION

It is a type of a research were a group interview is doneand a moderator is present to moderate the group discussion in which various topic are discussed .In this case only interested clients are involved in the focus group discussion .Concerning the Zimbabwean British relations focus group discussions were used because of the fact that , they are relatively quick , relatively inexpensive ,they are excellent for gathering background information , it is a flexible investigation approach were clients can participate in the discussion if appropriate and lastly that it provides a good chance for the clients to hear real consumer talking .Political party representatives were approached for a focus group discussion concerning the sour relations between Zimbabwe and Britain and many questions were answered as presented below .

4.1.8THE PURPOSE OF USING FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION

There are advantages associated with focus group discussion . Firstly it is definitely less expensive since they can be conducted anywhere as travels are minimised in cases where financial problems affect the researcher .At the same time , it is time saving and convenient since clients can get to be in the discussion for a specific period .It is voluntary as a result clients can willingly express their willingness to be or not be part of the discussion .Focus group discussion also enhances research as many views can be aired out by participants .

4.2.0 CHALLENGES OF USINGOF FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION

When using focus group discussion ,some clients may not be comfortable in revealing their position when it come to arguments that are sensitive , for instance in the Zimbabwean - British conflict some were not willing to express their views on who to blame fearing victimization afterwards as well as issues of job security were at stake .Also others refused to be part of the discussion due to work place politics .

4.2.1 INTERVIEWS

Interviews enable the researcher to explore various views pertaining the research since he or she will be i a position to accessfirst hand information .Ideas can be gathered in variance as the researcher has to reach many respondents . it is an effective tool for data collection since the researcher can get in contact with the eye witness.

4.2.2 THE PURPOSE OF USING INTERVIEWS

According to Kumar the application of interviews in gathering information in the field of research bear more tangible fruits to the study as since the researcher will be in direct contact with the client as a result he can get first hands information .Again the researcher can get various ideas pertaining the t study since he can meet many respondents .Not only that , interviews can enable the researcher to there and there determine the truthfulness of the respondents through attending to facial expressions and tone were sensitive questions are asked .It is also quick hence time saving as a n interview can be timed .

4.2.3 CHALLENGES OF USING INTERVIEWS

Nevertheless , interviews as a tool in collecting data present themselves with challenges to the researcher .Noted challenges are , the need for the researcher to move from place to place as respondents may not be in one place , there is also the need for the researcher to compile the information obtained in the interview as well as covering the gap left by interviewed information .In some cases respondents were not willing to revealing information in this case given the legislative limitation sin Zimbabwe such as the Official Secrets Acts , which hinder a public official from revealing information needed by the researcher as they fear getting sacked by the superiors .The researcher also needs to compliment the data with Secondary data for a comprehensive discourse .

4.2.4 THE INTERNET

The internet which gives access to global articles and books researched about was also accessed to verify as wellas enhancing information about the relations between Zimbabwe and Britain .There was also video access to the discussion Zimbabwe Has Taken Back Its

Land ,were debates were witnessed .The video helped in cementing this research's thesis that Britain is to blame for the sour relations between her and Zimbabwe .It was argued that the FTLRP was neither a government or ZANU-PF policy but a mass action in which the government tried to reverse but the war vets , the other part of the populace had already invaded the farms . The funds given to Zimbabwe were not enough to compensate the white commercial farmers and that the British refusal to carry on with obligation was a wrong action while in the debate Zimbabwe was also blamed for human rights abuses and corruption in the handling the funds .

More interestingly , the debate revealed that Britain tried to sabotage the Zimbabwean economy through sanctions as well as the support of the opposition MDC .The debate also prised the newly settled Zimbabwe farmers as doing well and that it took the white farmers a generation to be productive on the farms hence the same will happen to the Zimbabwean farmers who are requiring loans , intensive agricultural research , loans and security on the market as well as finding them markets to sell their produce .The most intriguing revelation was that the displacements of white farmers was he same situation in the 1950a's and 1940's when Smith removed the indigenous people off the land which he had been given ,again the occupation of Zimbabwe saw the displacement of the native people from their land to the reserves all this which was argued to be unreasonable and hence the Zimbabwean nation was right in responding the way it did .After these displacements , the same people from the families who had been forcefully removed went to liberations for the land they had lost and as such they the first people that are suppose to be talked about in as far as compensation is concerned as the compensation issue has protruded to the new millennium .

4 .2.5 .FACTORS THAT CAUSED RELATIONS BETWEEN ZIMBABWE AND BRITAIN TO SOUR

The topic presented an exciting discussion and responses from the approached clients ,many arguments were brought to the fore as to what really transpired between Zimbabwe and Britain .The land resource was placed at the heart of the confrontation between Zimbabwe and Britain .Clients generally agreed that the reason why the Zimbabwean populace went to war was the issue of land and as such it was normal to se conflicts arising out because of land

.They even went further to argue that it was senseless for Zimbabwe to compensate the white commercial farmers for the land taken to the ,in the first place the Zimbabwean society was not compensated when the seizure of land occurred as well as the creation of Gwai and Shangani in their when fast track land seizure , land has always belonged to Zimbabwe . In this discussion the nationalistic sentiments were evident as the clients vividly criticised the government for accepting their counterparts to include the willing buyer language in the Lancaster House Constitution.

They supported strongly the fast track land reform as noble because there was no need for the government to keep waiting for Britain since the country was already independent henceforth had to make decisions for themselves .British interference in the land reform was just a matter of trying to safeguard her interests . It argued that British refusal to keep on with the land reform process in Zimbabwe strained the relations between ten two because if Britain had not refused to keep o supporting the program , Zimbabwe would have stuck to the game plan .Economic sanctions were also noted as one of the factors that worsened the already strained relations between Zimbabwe and Britain .Views revealed a tone of anger at Britain's imposition of economic sanctions , it was argued that Britain was not respectful of Zimbabwean dignity after all her colonising and causing havoc to the Zimbabwean culture , standards of living .As at two who should be blamed ,the dominating view from the discussion was that the British approach was a determine factor and hence Britain can be blamed for the sour relations that currently exist between Zimbabwe and Britain and that Zimbabwe was just trying only to safeguard her gains of the revolution .

Again , another interview was held in a bid to establish the causal factors for the souring of relations' between Zimbabwean and Britain .There were various views contesting to establish what caused the relations between Zimbabwe Britain to be in conflict .In this case it was argued that policy inconsistence by Zimbabwe caused relations between her and Britain to sour .It was argued that Zimbabwe failed to stick to the agreed policy towards land distribution and that had she not shifted her policy to a fast track things could have been better for with Britain up to now .The argument posited that she was suppose to stick to the willing buyer willing seller but instead the Zimbabwean government used the land resource for political expedience and again the need to gain the electorate was cited by the clients as the reason why ZANU-P used the fast track land reform was enacted against the will the public given the threat that the new opposition political party MDC was posing the ruling

party ZANU-PF .It was argued that this was done to gain the electorate .It was argues that Britain was willing to support the land exercise but the problem was with Zimbabwe as she misused the funds that were given to her for the land process hence this destructed any trust that Britain had on Zimbabwe .When questioned about the feasibility of the letter by Clare Short to Zimbabwe's Minister of Foreign AffairsMudenge , the clients responded by arguing that it was justified as no donor can pour money where results are not apparent .The clients emphasized that if any one keep on dreaming that Britain would be wrong for her action it was them who being misled as the point that Britain failed to honour her obligation to bankroll the land reform was a fallacy because Zimbabwe was given the funds to bankroll the program but she directed part of the funds other parts of the economy and the other little amount was misused though it was not enough to cater for the hole process .As the interview went on the argument was cemented by reference to the Flora Bhuka report revealed in 2003 Thatargued against the dislocation of resettled farmers withsuperior politicians.

The argument that the fast track land reform was enacted to cater for public interest was dismissed as the clients presented that thepolicy was applied in an irrational manner as it sought to eliminate the strength of MDC .The discussion blamed Zimbabwe for violating property rights in the way it undertook the land reform .The Campbell case in 2008 was cited as one such incident were property rights were violated which strained her relations with Britain as she also argued that the treatment of white commercial farmers was against the property rights norms .

4. 2 .5 DATA ANALYSIS

Is the systematic interpretation of information gathered ,this is done to authenticate as well as to take note of any bias and through an analysis of the data gathered from interviews , discussion groups and as such gathered information can be combined well for analysis .On data that was collected through interviews , qualitative methods will be used to analyse the data which was gathered .

4.2.6 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In order to uphold generally accepted ethical research principles when conducting a research , the researcher shall first of all approach the clients or respondents with respect as societal norms ought to be respected to ensure ethics .The researcher shall also apply a voluntary platform when requesting for respondents to participate in the research .At the same time there is need for guaranteed protection of the respondent's identity to avoid victimization of the clients .When sensitive information is needed the researcher shall desist from bribing the responded to reveal the required information otherwise the respondent may end up giving false information just for the sake of getting a bribe from the researcher , a predicament that the researcher need so much to avoid if any meaningful research is to be established .Moreover , there is need for the researcher to be apolitical when carrying out the research henceforth he has to clearly reveal to the respondents that the study is strictly for academic purposes . Most importantly , the researcher ought to respect the legal framework in Zimbabwe when collecting data or approaching respondents .

4.2.7 .RECOMMENDATIONS

Establishing solutions to the cold relations that exist between Zimbabwe and Britain has been a mammoth task as the scope of relations between Zimbabwe and Britain is complex .This study has nevertheless provided a number of remedies to warm the sour relations that exist between Zimbabwe and Britain and amongst them are , the need for a interim committee form both Europe and Africa as well as Asia to mediate between these two antagonists to establish a common reasonable understanding between Zimbabwe and Britain .Secondly there is need for the removal of economic sanctions on Zimbabwe if any meaningful negotiations are to take place because as long as sanctions are there for Zimbabwe the art of demonization will always be there against Britain .Also there is need for Zimbabwe to uphold human rights while Britain must stop defining human rights and democracy on a European context as well asstopping her attitude of demonization on the Zimbabwean leaders .Again Britain must desist from indulging in any colonialist acts on Zimbabwe if she can expect to gain any trust from Zimbabwe as she has of late been accusedof doing so .

Again , both states must reengage for meaningful talks and Zimbabwe must prove that this she time can use funds directed to her purposefully for developmental processes than squander it .This was the argument by Clare Short when she pointed the lack of transparency which was even proved from the data collected through interviews , focus group discussion groups , sampling.Also Britain has to respect Zimbabwe's sovereignty in order to avoid any conflicts with her .Zimbabwe has to forge the way forward and not keep on holding to the past as history was already written because it is the population , heritage and resources that are at stake .

4.2.8 CONCLUSION

The relations between Zimbabwe as traced long back from the pre- independence era , are dynamic and complex .There have been challenges in indentifying the cause of sour relations between Zimbabwe and Britain to be strained and indeed they were many .Amongst them were the refusal by some officials to give information fearing victimisation , some clients refused to participate in the dialogue , lack of resources to reach some clients for interviews .Of paramount importance to note however is the fact that the land resource was identified as at the heart of the diplomatic row that exist between Zimbabwe and Britain .Since land has always been at the heart of the conflicts that led to the protracted war of liberation ,when Zimbabwe got independence the issue did not stop as the general population was angered at their lose of land during the pre-colonial and colonial era and as such they were eager to get back the land .Most importantly , parallel values , interests ,vision between Zimbabwe and Britain also give evidence to much of the conflict that has taken place .

The policy shift by Zimbabwe from the land reform to the fast track land reform was a noble initiative but what was detrimentalabout it was the process or way in which it was carried out , it required a swift change over as violence does not translate well in problem solving procedures .On the other hand Britain has to be fair and take up responsibility for the problem which she herself crafted if one is to trace the conflicts back to the colonial era when the seizure of land , which so much the Zimbabwean society attempted to reverse against the barrel of the gun with a lot of bloodshed which was the first Chimurenga . Both parties need to be mature enough and reengage for peaceful talks and stop the demonization game they are playing against each other .The views above were again substantiated from the data that was collected which revealed that the fast track land reform program was the turning point and

that Zimbabwe was to blame for the souring of relations because she shifted from the agreed Lancaster House Agreement of a willing buyer willing seller .It should however not be over emphasised on Zimbabwe because even Britain played a big role on the souring relations between her and Zimbabwe henceforth it should be born in mind that even though Zimbabwe was at fault she cannot bear alone the blame for the sour relations because all parties bear responsibility for the sour relations and henceforth Zimbabwe.Firstly Zimbabwe's shift to the Fast track Land Reform caused an upset to the British officials while British refusal to continue paying for the farmers that were to lose their land , economic sanctions and the suspension of Zimbabwe from the Common Wealth of Nations amongst other factors mentioned in the discourse above all testified. .

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander ,J.(2006) The Unsettled Land: State Making And The Politics Of Land In Zimbabwe1983-2003,Harare ,Weaver Press .

Adromidas , D. (2000) " New Anti Zimbabwe Front Is Created ":In Executive Intelligence Review .

Abiodun (2012) ,Mugabe and the Politics of Security in Zimbabwe , Montreal ,Quebec and Kingdom ,Ontario : McGill , Queen's University Press .ISBN978-7735-4044-6 .

Gregory ,E (2006), Strange liberators: Militarism, Mayhem, and the Pursuit of Profit. Llumina Press,).

Chigora , P . Dewa (2009) Surviving In A Hostile Environment : An Analysis of Zimbabwe's ForeignRelations In the 21 century :African journal Of Political Science And International Relations .:3(9):92-98 .

Chingono , H(2010) ,Zimbabwe Sanctions : An Analysis Of The 'Lingo' guarding the perception of the sanctionerssanctionees : The Journal of Political Science and International Relations vol 4(2) pg 66-74.http//www.acadamicjournals.org .

Chinamasa ,P .(2011) Zimbabwe Has Taken Back Its Land ,www.aljazeera.com

Chigora , P.(2006) ,On The Crossroads : Reflections on the Zimbabwe's relations with Britain at thenew millennium : Alternative Turkish Journal of International Relations : Vol 5(3) .

Chigora , P .(2007) Zimbabwe's Foreign Policy with the West , Journal of Sustainable Development In Africa , Fayetteville State University , North Carolina , USA ,Vol 9 , No 9 ,pp170-183 .

Dore , D .(2012) "Myth ,Reality And The Inconvenient Truth About Zimbabwe's Land Resettlement Programme Sokwanele .Retrieved 18 June 2013 .

Evans, A (2006)A Brief History Of Zimbabwe –Part 2 and 3 ,www,readingfanatic.com.
Rodney ,W (1972) Hoe Europe Under Developed Africa ,Bogle-L'OUVERTURE PROBLEMS ,1972 ,PAGE 132

Krieger ,N .(2007) ,Liberation From Constitutional Constrains : Land Reform in Zimbabwe .Vol 27 , No 12 , Hopkins Press .

Kwaramba ,M(2009) State Fragility :Zimbabwe's Horrific Journey In The New Millennium ,A Research Paper Presented At The European Report On Development (ERD),Accra .

Linnington ,G (2001) Constitution Of Zimbabwe , Legal Resources Foundation, Harare

Latham ,B,(2007) What Is Purposive Sampling ,Quantitative Research Methods .ENGL 537 , Spring .

Raftopoulos ,B(2006) The Crisis In Zimbabwe ,1998-2008 ,In B , Raftopoulos And Mlambo (ed) Becoming Zimbabwe : A History From Pre-Colonial Period To 2008.(page 201-232) , Harare: Weaver Press .

Tendi ,B ,M.(2014) Britain –Zimbabwe Relations : A Tale Of Demonization. Zimbabwe Independent .

Masaka (2012) Paradoxes In The Sanctions Discourse , www.researchgate.net .

Mlambo ,A.(2014)A History Of Zimbabwe ,Cambridge ,Cambridge Press.

Moore ,D.(2005), Suffering For Territory : Race , Place , Powering Zimbabwe , Harare . Weaver Press.

Moses ,W,J.(19980) 'Introduction': Afrotopia.The Roots Of African American Popular History ,Cambridge Press ,Cambridge ,

Moyo .S ,(1995) The Land Question ,SAPES ,books at p1 .

Moyo ,G .Ashurst ,M(eds) 'Sleight Of Land At Lancaster ' ,in Day After Mugabe ,Africa Research Institute ,2007 ,p .160 .

Preston ,M(2004)Ending Civil War :Rhodesia And Lebanon In Perspective .London Tauris ,page 25.ISBN 1850435790

Yeoba , A (2009) , Avoiding Electoral Violence : A Comparative Overview of Kenyan , Zimbabwean and Sierra-Leon –Ghana,www.actionaid.org22 Feb 2009 .

Viewpoint (2012) ,:Kaunda On Mugabe :BBC NEWS .12 June , Retrieved 20 Nov 2012.

Zimbabwean Embassy (2009) Land Reform .www.zimembassy.se/land-reform-doc.html.