

Revisiting the Media Lawscape: A Context-Based Reappraisal of the New Media Laws in Zimbabwe

Elliot Muchena

Lecturer in the Department of Journalism and Media Studies, Zimbabwe Open University, Harare Region, Box 8306, Harare, Zimbabwe.

Abstract: *Quite often in the so-called third world countries juridical laws are shaped in line with former colonial value systems, hardly reflecting the social values of the people who are bound by such laws and this raises questions of legitimacy of such legal instruments of social protection and control. Since independence the media laws have remained generally reflective of the pre-independence era in terms of structure and content although there have been sporadic attempts at reviewing some of the media laws to suit local expectations of the role of the media. The only act to be repealed was the Powers, Privileges, and Immunities of Parliament Act, which had made it illegal for media to report on debates in parliament. In January 1981, the government set up the Zimbabwe Mass Media Trust (ZMMT) as part of the government's new media policy, under widespread criticism of the national media, which at the time was inherited from colonial control. It was originally intended to serve as an authority to oversee the transition of the media from white minority control to Zimbabwean society as a whole and to regulate the media. The government emphasised that the media be free, non-partisan, mass-orientated and serve the national interest; however, a growing presence of the Ministry of Information into the media effected its original function. The main media laws were cosmetically changed and this paper will look at Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act (AIPPA), Public Order and Security Act (POSA) and Broadcasting Authority of Zimbabwe Act (BAZ). These three laws have continued to negatively affect the operations of the media and hinder the freedom of expression. The laws will be compared to colonial laws such as Law and Order Maintenance Act (LOMA) and Rhodesia Broadcasting Service Act (RBSA) among others.*

Key Words: *Media lawscape, Media laws, AIPPA, POSA, BAZ*

I. Introduction

The operation of the media in Zimbabwe has been a contested terrain since the development of the media industry during the colonial era. Although the ruling elite have always claimed the media to be neutral, those in power both in Rhodesia and now Zimbabwe used the media as a weapon to manipulate and politically control those under them. This was being done under the guise of 'national interest', 'national security' or 'national sovereignty' (Moyo; 2004). In both pre and post independence Zimbabwe the media remained a state monopoly controlled by the Ministry of Information, thus rendering it a political tool.

Most of the sons and daughters of Zimbabwe joined the liberation struggle to fight some of the unfair pieces of legislation such as freedom of the media/expression. Today more than thirty-two years after independence the Lancaster House crafted Zimbabwean Constitution still does not specifically protect freedom of the media. Section 20(1) of the constitution spells out the right to freedom of expression and many people argue that it is widely accepted that right to protection of the media is covered there. This paper seeks to look at the media laws in pre-independent Zimbabwe and compare them with those enacted after independence. The current laws will be analysed to see if they promote freedom of expression and assist the public in making informed decisions.

Statement of the Problem

There was no freedom of expression during the colonial period in Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe). Understandably so. What is disheartening; however is that thirty-two years after independence, freedom of expression continues to elude the majority of Zimbabweans, regardless of the fact that the Lancaster Constitution which gave birth to Zimbabwe has been amended several times. What is worse is the fact that new media laws introduced such as Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act (AIPPA), Public Order and Security Act (POSA) and Broadcasting Services Act (BSA) instead of improving the situation, compound the freedom of expression dilemma. This is what warrants a critical investigation into the nature of such media laws.

Objectives: The objectives of this paper are to:

- Compare and contrast media laws in pre and post independent Zimbabwe.

- To identify the current media legislation in Zimbabwe and their impact on freedom of expression.
- To assess the current media laws and whether the general public /media are benefitting from the kind of issues channelled out of the main media institutions.
- To analyse some cases that appeared before the courts and assess their outcomes.
- To investigate if current media laws assist people in accessing information which can help them in whatever they want to do such as political participation

Research Questions

- Are Zimbabwean media laws in line with the Constitution and other international trends?
- What is the impact of media laws in Zimbabwe on the general public?
- Are Zimbabweans benefitting from their media and able to participate in national activities such as politics?
- What kind of media cases come to court and how are they resolved?
- What can be done to Zimbabwean media laws so as to guarantee freedom of expression?

II Research Methodology

The researcher used qualitative method. This was mainly document analysis and observation.

Media laws and policies before Independence

The history of the media laws in Zimbabwe go as far back as 1933 and 1957 when the Rhodesia Broadcasting Act (RBA) was enacted. This law was an addition since the ruling elite of the time depended on the Native Affairs department and the Prime Minister's office to regulate and guide the operations of the media especially television and radio. The RBA (1957) strengthened the colonial ideologies on media regulation. The media (both print and electronic) consolidated and protected the rights and interests of a minority group of white settler colonialists. According to Mazula (2003) such media was designed from day one to promote the cause of the settlers and their minority colonial interests.

With the strong impact of broadcasting, the media became a cultural tool of strengthening white dominance and sense of belonging. Their position was even reinforced further when in 1965 Ian Douglas Smith (Prime Minister) declared independence from Britain (Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI)).

In Zimbabwe, like many other colonies, the media were authoritarian. Licensing, suspension and banning of publications and prosecution were rampant. As already stated following UDI the Smith regime enacted a number of prohibitive laws which survived into Zimbabwe's independence in 1980. Some of these laws are still in use today although they have been superficially amended or repealed.

The most condemned piece of legislation of that time was the Law and Order Maintenance Act of 1960 (LOMA). Saunders (1999) said LOMA provided for the prosecution of the media reporters and anyone who made statements that could cause 'fear, alarm and despondency'. Under LOMA, the government had the right to detain suspected offenders without trial. White scholars with liberal ideas such as Judith Todd, Terrence Ranger and others were victimised by the Smith regime. During the 1960s and 70s when nationalism was rife, many nationalists were executed under this law and all publications with an inclination towards this ideology such as the Moto magazine, Umbowo, The African Daily News and Zimbabwe News were banned.

In 1964 the Emergency Powers Act was enacted and this effectively gave the regime wider overriding powers to silence the media and all those opposed to it. The Act was scandalous in that it gave Smith and his close elite the right to create any emergency laws they saw fit. This saw the coming up of such emergency laws as the Censorship of Publications Order of 1965 which was used against all 'mischievous' publications. In 1970 came the Official Secrets Act, which suppressed all unfavourable information about the regime's policies, and was an effective tool against those white 'liberals' and indigenous blacks who had started talking about ruling 'their' country. According to Ndlela (2003) the Act prohibited the disclosure of any information that might be prejudicial to the safety of the state's interest or any information that might be useful to an enemy. This law totally caused a blackout on any information since any information could be termed sensitive so as to frustrate its opponents.

Besides the laws mentioned above, other repressive laws such as The African Affairs Act and the Censorship Entertainment Act (1965) were put in place to curtail the operation of the media. Smith's major aim was to safeguard his rule and achieve his main goal of thwarting nationalists' agenda of ruling themselves.

As Moyo (2004) noted, the censorship which was being imposed aimed to control nationalist politics and to keep black majority exposed only to their ideas. This became very effective because Broadcasting Act (1957) made RBC a monopoly for the whole country.

The public broadcaster role which was initially modelled along the BBC and SABC format was changed soon after the Smith's UDI. This led the broadcaster to be placed under the Ministry of Information thus becoming state controlled.

III Discussion of Findings

New System at Independence

Soon after independence in 1980, the new government adopted the Rhodesia Broadcasting Services Act (RBSA) of 1973 and renamed it the Zimbabwe Broadcasting Act (ZBA), 1980. This was easily done since the electronic media under Rhodesian laws were under the government control. Chirume (2005), pointed out that despite the change in political leadership, the Act remained predominantly the same after independence. ZBC only shifted from protecting the white supremacy to endorse the black political power (MISA, 2001). Key issues that dominated the media turned to education and health for all and black empowerment. For the new nation such issues were fundamental rather than working on changing colonial legislations. This led to old media laws like Law and Order Maintenance Act (LOMA) and Official Secrets Act (OSA) remaining in the statute books of Zimbabwe. Newspapers remained under the Argus group of South Africa until Zimbabwe acquired a loan from Nigeria to buy off the Argus shares as a way of satisfying its 4Ds of decolonisation (buying shares from a foreign company-Argus), democratisation (giving people access to the media), decentralisation (taking the media to people) and demonopolisation (removing private monopoly of the Argus Group) (Chari et al, 2003).

So today, we can see that Zimbabwe is still using the 1979 Lancaster House constitution as its supreme law. This is a Westminster document which was designed to spearhead multi-party democracy but has remained in force for almost thirty-two years. It may be apparent therefore that Zimbabwe's laws are remnants of the pre-historic colonial era.

It is also important to note that just like in 1979, when there were disputed election in Zimbabwe after the 2008 elections, three parties namely Zimbabwe African National Union Patriotic Front (ZANU PF) under Mugabe and the two Movement for Democratic Change (MDC)s under Tsvangirai and Mutambara respectively came together and formed the inclusive government brokered by the South African former president Mbeki. Under this agreement the three parties in government have started working on a new constitution and it is hoped that this new set up will bring changes to other laws especially those related to the media.

Under the Global Political Agreement (GPA) / inclusive government arrangement the three parties agreed to introduce the following:

- to immediately process by appropriate authorities all applications for re-registration and registration of media licenses in terms of the Broadcasting Act as well as the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
- that steps be taken to ensure that the public media provides balanced and fair coverage to all political parties for their legitimate political activities etc.

It is sad to note the inclusive government has not implemented proposed media reforms even those from the colonial past.

It is noted that the pre-independence media legislation was perceived as useful for disseminating information approved by the government. Generally the Powers, Privileges and Immunities of Parliament Act (PPIPA, 1991) was the only Act repealed, plus the setting up of the Zimbabwe Mass Media Trust (ZMMT). No major changes have taken place in repealing laws enacted during Smith's time. The provisions of LOMA for example have been re-enacted and adopted under POSA as well as OSA which have remained up to today and have been strengthened under AIPPA. It can be concluded that media freedom under the Smith regime is almost the same in many respects to the current set up.

From the 1990s to date, the independent media in Zimbabwe has tried to express its views but has through self censorship attempted to reflect the government line during reporting. The private press still exists and in June 2012 our first private/commercial radio station started operating. In 2002 AIPPA was enacted and resulted in some media outlets closing shop such as the Daily News in 2003 which was seen as supporting opposition politics. Such stringent measures led to young and experienced Zimbabweans setting up radio and newspaper organisations in both neighbouring and western countries. According to Reporters Without Borders media regulation in Zimbabwe is hinged on threats, imprisonment, surveillance, censorship, blackmail, abuse of power and denial of justice to maintain a firm grip over news. As a result dissenting voices are never covered or mentioned in state media or those media in which government has an interest such as The Herald, Sunday Mail and Zimbabwe Broadcasting Corporation (ZBC).

IV Current Media Legislation and the Challenges to New Media Laws

Zimbabwe has always had an assortment of legislations that have subdued freedom of expression from the UDI era to independence and in 2002 the situation even got worse. New laws such as AIPPA, POSA and BSA came into effect.

In 2000 as political pressure on the ZANU PF government mounted due to economic hardships, Jonathan Moyo ascended to the helm of the Ministry of Information and Publicity. The elevation of Jonathan Moyo a former outspoken critic of President Mugabe was a strategic move by the government. According to

Chari et al (2003) Moyo demonstrated his ability well in this position where he promoted the ZANU PF hegemony with excellence. He matched very well George Charamba who was appointed the Permanent Secretary of the same Ministry. The two re-oriented and reorganised the new Ministry of Information and Publicity abandoning the old one (Ministry of Information, Post and Telecommunications) which had been so passive. All the changes at the Ministry were done in preparation for the 2002 Presidential and Parliamentary elections against the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC) which was heavily supported by the international media such as BBC and Voice of America.

Such support led the BBC for example to be banned in 2001 as a result of the restrictive laws. BBC only came back in September 2009 after a series of meetings with government representatives.

V Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act (AIPPA)

It was when Moyo was at the helm of the Information Ministry that Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act (AIPPA) was passed by the Zimbabwean parliament in January 2002 and assented to by President Mugabe on March 15, 2002. AIPPA governs the operations and general conduct of the media in a way that leaves the media with very little breathing space. Since coming into force the local journalists and other media personnel have continued to face harassment and threats as the media landscape narrowed when private owned newspapers were closed. The establishment of the inclusive government in 2009 slightly changed this piece of legislation but the major tenants have remained.

Today the media has little space to fulfil its public watchdog role over the government. Still citizens continue to be deprived of their right to freedom of expression and right to access information. The act (AIPPA) provides for access to information in public bodies but the heads of such bodies have the right to decide what to give and what to withhold “in the public interest”. It is quite ironic here that someone decides on behalf of the public what is in their interest. AIPPA allows public officials to hold on to information for thirty days after a request is made which is a real set back according to journalists operations (MISA, 2009). Worse still the thirty days may be extended if permission is sought from the Media and Information Commission (MIC) which was replaced by the Zimbabwe Media Commission (ZMC) in 2009. MISA (2009) pointed out that in cases where the information requested affects a third party, the latter is given up to thirty days to respond.

As mentioned before there are no changes to talk about since we switched from MIC to ZMC. AIPPA still has the following problems related to the freedom of expression and the media in general.

- (i) The ZMC was given too much power over journalists and media houses, when such a body is directly and indirectly controlled by government.
- (ii) The ZMC registers all media houses and offer certificates of registration (section 78 and 79).
- (iii) Journalists have to be accredited before assuming work which is a form of licensing.
- (iv) Only Zimbabwean citizens and permanent residents are allowed to be employed by both local and foreign media houses.
- (v) Foreign nationals do not own shares in Zimbabwean media houses, but can have minority shares in companies with media shares.

Section 39 of AIPPA empowers the ZMC to come up with a code of conduct to bind all journalists and if one goes against this he/she is struck off the roll of journalists, suspended or asked to pay a heavy fine. Although the Daily News and the Daily News on Sunday which were very critical to the government since 1999 are back on the streets, they were once closed down for not registering with the commission set under AIPPA.

AIPPA caused serious suffering among Zimbabweans emotionally and physically since 2002. The main victims were journalists, newspaper vendors and photographers who were arrested, harassed or even jailed. These were mainly from the private media. This piece of legislation which is still in force today is being maintained as a shield against criticism and exposure of corruption by senior government officials.

VI. The Public Order and Security Act (POSA)

It was promulgated in 2002, replacing LOMA, but this new law was a re-worded version of LOMA. POSA curtailed freedom of expression. This law accommodated components of the 1964 Preservation of Constitutional Government Act of 1964 which was repealed in 1999. The repealed law was used by the Smith government to suppress nationalist movements like ZANU PF and ZAPU. The current leaders, having had suffered under such laws, POSA carried a stiffer penalty of up to 20 years in prison and no option of fine if one deliberately published falsehoods. The falsehoods were vaguely defined to include negatively reflecting on the government or those in authority. Section 5 of this legislation has very broad provisions that incorporate the common law crime of treason. It also makes it an offence to set up, organise, or advocate for a group or body that may “coerce or attempt to coerce the government”. The law further prohibits any person to support, assist or even threaten such action, with or without the threat of violence. (MISA, 2007)

Section 15 of POSA covers the communication of “false statements” prejudicial to the state. Under section 15(1) it is a crime to communicate anything that is false and can cause/promote public disorder or endangers public safety, affects adversely the economic interests and security of Zimbabwe, undermines public confidence in defence and disrupt essential services. Where the above mentioned cases are proved correct then one would be convicted and jailed for up to 5 years or a fine. This provision is a re-enactment of section 50 of LOMA.

To make sure media houses and journalists practice self censorship, Section 15(2) prohibits the publication of a statement when one knows it is false or does not have reasonable grounds for believing the statement to be true. By going beyond defence, public safety, economic interests of Zimbabwe and public order, this subsection exceeded the permissible limits set out under section 20(2) of the country’s supreme law (constitution).

Once the court is convinced that you do not have reasonable grounds for believing the statement is true, then you are convicted. Since the private media played the watchdog role well, this section was used against them, thus impinging on the rights of freedom of expression. Members of the civic society and opposition parties critical to the government were heavily affected by this law although most charges were dropped on the advice from the Attorney General’s Office (MISA 2007). Section 16 (2) of POSA deals with issues of undermining authority of, or insulting President, and is taken from section 46 of LOMA. Section 16 prohibits the making, publicly and intentionally, of any false statement (including an act or gesture) about or concerning the President or Acting President if the person knows or realizes that there is a risk or possibility of engendering feelings of hostility towards or causing hatred, contempt or ridicule of the President or Acting President, whether in their official or personal capacity.

It is also an offence to make abusive, indecent, obscene or false statements about the President. None of these terms are defined. It is submitted that such ill defined provisions hamper freedom of expression and the free operation of media houses. There is no logical or moral basis on which public officers should be shielded from scrutiny if one takes into account that they hold their offices at the pleasure of the electorate to whom they should be accountable. The media undoubtedly plays a crucial role in exposing officialdom misdemeanour. Comparatively in other open democracies like the United States the office of the President is subjected to intensive public scrutiny to ensure transparency. It is accordingly submitted that any ill defined provisions shielding the office of the President from the public eye is not justifiable in a democratic society and therefore incongruent with the constitution and global trends.

In terms of section 24 of POSA, anyone organising a public gathering has to give the police at least four days notice. Many police stations, whether deliberately or by mistake, interpret this provision to mean that the organiser must apply for, and obtain police permission to hold a gathering, whereas the law simply requires notification. The Police relying on this provision have broken up many gatherings. The impact on media freedom is self evident. It inevitably follows that each time such gatherings are either disbanded or disallowed on vague grounds the media’s role to report on such activities is also interfered with. It is respectfully submitted that this provision is in-consistent with the Constitution.

This section has led to many gatherings organised by the opposition and other civic organisations critical to the government not being allowed to go ahead.

VII The Broadcasting Services Act (BSA)

The act came into force after attempts by Capitol Radio to broadcast in 2000. This was a private radio which at one time broadcasted into Zimbabwe from outside the country after being denied permission to operate (Weza, 2001). This act established the Broadcasting Authority of Zimbabwe (BAZ) which licences all broadcasting players. BAZ is an autonomous entity run by a board appointed by the Minister of Information and Publicity just like those at ZMC. Since its inception the board has recently licensed two new private radio stations bringing an end to ZBC’s monopoly.

The BAZ board recently called for applications for community radio station licenses but the process has been stalled. Under BSA, you cannot broadcast without a license, and only citizens and permanent residents of Zimbabwe or a body corporate whose controlling interest are held in Zimbabwe can apply for a licence. Going against the law attracts a fine or two years imprisonment or both. Under this law, all broadcasters are required to give/allocate a one hour programming per week for Government to explain its policies. It also calls for 75% local content or from Africa (MISA 2001).

Although it is good for such an authority to register broadcasters, in our case BAZ seem to have ill defined powers whereby it can refuse to register other media houses. There was an outcry recently when it is assumed that the two licensed new radio stations have links to ZANU PF and those with no strings attached to the former ruling party were denied licences.

MISA (2000) pointed out that despite the media insults Jonathan Moyo received following the enactment of BSA in 2001 he strengthened his grip on the media. With the scenario created by Capitol radio of going on air unlicensed the Ministry of Information moved fast to close the vacuum and stated the political

position of the government especially on the media arena which was now receiving good attention from the public due to biting economic hardship.

Jonathan Moyo came up with more new laws like the ZBC Commercialisation Bill which split the ZBC into two, i.e. Transmedia (a signal carrier) and Zimbabwe Broadcasting Holdings. This new law allowed the state broadcaster to operate along commercial lines. Still like all other boards mentioned above the individuals here were also appointed by the Minister. The new holding company was and is still controlled by government and consists of two television and five radio stations. The leadership of these entities is selected on the basis of their allegiance to the government.

Ndlela highlighted that the delay in licensing broadcasters is not unique to Zimbabwe alone but is common to a number of African countries. In Zambia for example the public broadcaster was part of Ministry of Information and served the needs of the government while in Ghana broadcasting remained a state monopoly for almost 40 years (Ndlela 2007). Of the British former colonies it was only South Africa that swiftly moved away from colonial laws when it became independent.

MISA (2001) argues that dominant policy crises affecting most African countries, Zimbabwe included are a legacy of repressive laws from the colonial era.

Despite most nationalists having criticised these laws, they have remained in the statute books of African countries for too long irrespective of them being incompatible with the new constitutional protection (MISA, 2001).

In Zimbabwe, POSA, AIPPA and BSA violate human fundamental rights enshrined in the country's bill of rights as well as African Convention of Human People's rights, SADC protocol on Culture, Information and sport other instruments Zimbabwe is party to.

VIII Legal Battles with the Media Laws in Post Independent Zimbabwe

The following were some of the main cases brought to the courts where members of the media were challenging the constitutionality of the Zimbabwe media laws.

ANZ vs. Minister of Information: the Supreme Court Judgment

After the enactment of AIPPA the Daily News approached the Supreme Court challenging the constitutionality of some sections of this law like section 66 which made it obligatory for all media houses to register with the Media and Information Commission as a precondition to start operations. They also challenged sections 39,40,41,65,70,71,79,80 (which have already been repealed), 83 and 89 as well as SI 169c of 2002 made under the principal Act. The argument of the Daily News was that the Minister of Information and the Media and Commission responsible for applying the controls were partisan and patently biased against the private press and would apply AIPPA in a biased and prejudicial manner.

The Supreme Court turned down the application on the grounds that ANZ should have first registered as per the Act and then sort for redress later. This meant that the media house should have complied first. It was ruled that The Daily News had come to court with dirty hands and so could not be given audience until it had its "dirty hands" status purged.

Nyarota and Mudiwa vs. the State

On 23 April 2002 these two journalists were arrested after publishing a story that an opposition party supporter had been beheaded by ruling party supporters. When the story was proved to be false the newspaper apologized and retracted the story but the two as Editor and reporter were arrested and charged under AIPPA for having published falsehoods. Nyarota and Mudiwa then went to the Supreme Court challenging section 80 (1) of AIPPA stating that the 'false news offence' section breached the freedom of expression and protection of the law as given under Section 18 and 20 of the Constitution.

Surprisingly the state did not oppose this and on the day the matter was set down to be heard, the state filed a notice that it was not opposed to what the defense lawyers were saying, that the section is unconstitutional. The state did this on the basis that section 80 had already been amended so that it would "avoid any apparent conflict with the constitutional freedom of expression. (Feltoe, 2003)

According to Feltoe (2003) the full bench of the Supreme Court headed by the Chief Justice Godfrey Chidyausiku then made the following order:

- (a) Section 80(1) (b) as read with section 80(2) of the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act Chapter 10:027 is hereby declared to be *ultra vires* Section 20 of the Constitution and is struck down as being of no force and effect.
- (b) Respondent bears the costs of the application.

The state conceded that article 80(1) (b) was unconstitutional, and the Supreme Court nullified this section of the law and set in motion an apparent trend whereby court nullified only sections of laws that the state conceded to.

N/B: Such rulings betray the judiciary as partisan, siding with the ruling party rather than despatching justice.

IX Conclusion

POSA, AIPPA and BSA violate the freedoms enshrined in article 9 of the African Charter by impeding members of the public from receiving information which is regulated by the executive and state apparatus.

It was a brilliant idea when the African Union (AU) came up with its own charter so as to move away from the norms of the colonialists. AU's article 9 of the charter states that "every individual shall have the right to receive information. Every individual has right to express and disseminate his opinions within the law."

Media because of its importance today has become heavily regulated to the extent that even the United Nations (UN) has come up with universal guidelines where media is a human right.

Generally it was viewed that media laws in Zimbabwe are more authoritarian than the most preferred libertarian system where the media is free to express views without fear and establish the truth including checking the government. These laws which have continued since the 1960s have made it impossible for the media to be a vehicle of public expression, political accountability and empowerment. The three laws looked at have shown that the public are totally excluded from interacting with the media and that a few elite want to determine issues on behalf of the public. The media should have been left to play a social responsibility and motivate informed public debate.

The laws enacted in Zimbabwe also raise eyebrows on the role of the state in communications and cultural policymaking within a global context (Moyo 2004). Some of the regulations are good but what is worrisome in our case is the push to establish communicative sovereignty coloured by self-interest of the former ruling party whose desire is to perpetuate its stay in power.

X Recommendations

From this presentation it is recommended that:

- (i) AIPPA, POSA and BSA are repealed if the country's laws are to respect human rights and freedom of expression.
- (ii) Government institutes comprehensive media reforms that will facilitate the establishment of a transparent and democratic media regulating mechanism to foster and protect diverse media and the free flow of information and access to alternative sources of information.
- (iii) Zimbabwe is allowed to have multiple broadcasters and establish a more viable voluntary media council and remove the current statutory regulator.
- (iv) Licences to new players in the broadcasting industry are awarded on merit and not on suspicions so that the society will have a variety of views and wider choice rather than have media players of the same ideology.
- (v) The GPA move with speed to enact laws which instil a culture of self-regulation within our media just like the medical and law professions for example.
- (vi) A code of conduct for journalists is buttressed by sound editorial guidelines. This can be done with the help of civil society then adopted by the all media organisations.
- (vii) The Zimbabwean media is dominated by non-partisan individuals.
- (viii) An investor friendly environment is established.

References

- [1] *Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 2002*: Zimbabwe Government. Harare. Printflow
- [2] *African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, 1981*: Available at: http://www.achpr.org/english/info/charter_en.html [Accessed: 10 April 2012].
- [3] Auret, M. & Jackson, G. 2007. *Policies and Legalities Surrounding Capital Radio*: Available at: <http://www.afrol.com/countries/zimbabwe/backgr%20capital%20radio.htm> [Accessed: 11 April 2012]
- [4] Chari, T.J., Bvuma, T.S & Maputsani, C. 2003. *Media and Communication in Zimbabwe and Africa*. Harare, Zimbabwe Open University.
- [5] Chirume, C. 2005. *The Politics of Media Regulation: A study of the origins of AIPPA 2001*. An unpublished Masters Dissertation for the Partial Fulfilment of MSSC in Communication, University of Zimbabwe. University Press.
- [6] *Daily News in Exile 2007*: Available at: http://www.zimbabwejournalists.com/uploaddocs/Daily_News_in_Exile_2007_for_websites.pdf [Accessed: 23 August 2010].
- [7] Frederiske, J. 1990. *None but Ourselves: Masses vs. Media in the making of Zimbabwe* Harare: Oral Traditions Association of Zimbabwe with Anvil Press.
- [8] Kaitira Kandji: Programme Manager- MISA in a paper presented at a workshop: *Media and Corruption: Raising the Bar*, May 29 – June 3, 2005 Park Plaza Hotel, Sandton, South Africa.
- [9] Mazula, R., Hussein, T., Mararike, C., Deketeke, P & Mandigora T. 2003. "National Survey on Broadcasting in Zimbabwe: A Report on a Survey carried out by the Broadcasting Authority of Zimbabwe". Harare: BAZ.
- [10] MISA, 2000. *Afrol. Com. Draconian New Broadcasting Regulations in Zimbabwe*. Available at: www.afrol.com/News/zim053_broadcasting_regulations.htm Media & political.pdf [Accessed: 2 August 2009].

- [11] MISA, 2001. The Windhoek seminar: “Ten years on: Assessment, challenges and prospects” Windhoek, Namibia: Available at: <http://africa.ifj.org/assets/docs/218/116/4eaacda-5082674.pdf> [Accessed: 29 October 2010].
- [12] MISA- Zimbabwe 2009. *Repressive Media Law (AIPPA)*: Available at: <http://www.misa.org/cgi-bin/viewnews.cgi?category=2&id=1137054440> [Accessed: 29 October 2010].
- [13] MISA-Zimbabwe.2009. *Submission and Position paper on broadcasting in Zimbabwe*: Available at: <http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/research/ZIM%20Broadcasting%20Draft.pdf> [Accessed: 1 November 2010].
- [14] Moyo,D 2004. *From Rhodesia to Zimbabwe: Change without Change?* Broadcasting Policy Reform and Political Control. Available at: <http://www.isn.eth.ch>.(Accessed:10 March 2012)
- [15] Mudzengi, E., Gunduza, M.C & Nyakupinda, D.2003. *Radio and Television studies*. Harare, the Zimbabwe Open University.
- [16] Ndlela,N 2003. *Critical analysis of the media law in Zimbabwe*. [http:// www.books.google.co.zw](http://www.books.google.co.zw). (Accessed 3 May 2012)
- [17] Ndlela, N.2007 *Broadcasting Reforms in Southern Africa: Continuity and Change in the Era of Globalisation*. Available at: http://reference.kfupm.edu.sa/content/b/tr/broadcasting_reforms_in_southern_africa_77599.pdf.pdf [Accessed: 28 October 2010].
- [18] Saunders,R.1999. *Dancing out of Tune*. A history of the Media in Zimbabwe. Harare. Brylee Printers
- [19] *The Constitution of Zimbabwe, 2009*. As Amended at 13th February, 2009 (including the amendments made by the Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment No19): Available at: http://www.kubatana.net/docs/legisl/constitution_zim_090213.pdf [Accessed: 12 April 2012].
- [20] *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948*. Available at: [<http://www.cirp.org/library/ethics/UN-human/>] [Accessed: 7 July 2012].
- [21] *The Zimbabwe Times*. 2009. BBC, CNN now free to cover Zimbabwe: Available at: <http://www.thezimbabwetimes.com/?p=20358> [Accessed:30 October 2010].
- [22] Weza,S. 2001. *Zimbabwean media in crisis: issues and challenges*: Available at: http://pcmlp.socleg.ox.ac.uk/archive/transition/issue2_3/weza.htm [Accessed: 15 December October 2011].
- [23] Windrich, E.1981. *The Mass Media in the struggle for Zimbabwe. Censorship and Propaganda under Rhodesia Front Rule*. Gweru: Mambo Press.