

ZIMBABWE INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

REFLECTIONS ON THE TRANSITION TO A PROLETARIAN
PRINT MEDIA IN ZIMBABWE WITH SPECIAL
REFERENCE TO AGRICULTURAL CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT:
ABSTRACTIONS ON THE THEME OF ECONOMIC REPORTING

A paper prepared for the Zimbabwe Institute of
Mass Communications Course on Economic Reporting, 12 November, 1985

by

THOMAS D. SHOPO
SENIOR RESEARCH FELLOW

1 November, 1985

Economic journalists indeed have a very challenging task in Zimbabwe's transition to socialism - as guardians of our free press. Zimbabwe's democratic press has to be protected against being preyed on by international capital. They must therefore ensure that the views of indigenous progressive social forces are not censored or distorted to fit into established and patterned ways of thinking of the international bourgeoisie. This process of liberating the press can be enhanced by actually redefining what 'freedom of the press' really means for Zimbabwe, and not to continue to see it in Eurocentric ways - i.e. freedom for the press to expose swindles freedom to create scandals, and freedom to pry into the pockets of public figures. For no matter how the latter can enhance the scribe's own sense of self-importance, it does to add a jot to the more pressing task of explaining to the public the long term pragmatic goals of the state i.e. socialism. The latter can only emerge from a concerted effort by all Zimbabwean scribes and scrutators concerned with the economic well being of the nation, to see order and present order - i.e. what they write must be transformed into conceptual tools to be Zimbabwean public, that will serve as a guide with which to interpret government policies since independence. In short there is a need to re-align all concepts and notions from the arts and the social sciences, used in the writing of the news, so that the press in Zimbabwe is really free, i.e. adopts the point of view of the ordinary cultivators and wage-earners of this country. This is never a once and for all affair but an historical process.

I will be approaching the whole subject of agricultural change in Zimbabwe from the concerns of a historical researcher. With the continued operation of the 30 year rule under the National Archives Act, newspapers have indeed become the major primary source for research into our recent past. History in Zimbabwe would indeed be dead as a dodo, were we to accept the position that our colonial past cannot be objectively investigated until such and such a document were opened to public scrutiny. Adopting such a stance would only reduce Zimbabwean historians to powder monkeys, passing on primary and raw data to be fired off by foreign scholars who have their own varied concepts of what Zimbabwe is. Journalists therefore also have a responsibility to the

future generations of this nation - to present an accurate picture of this moment or moments in Zimbabwean history.

For, as Gramsci, wrote:

"To be History and not simply graphic marks, or source material or aids to memory, past events must be thought up again, and this rethinking brings them up to date, since the evaluation or ordering of those facts necessarily depends on the contemporary knowledge of the person rethinking the past event, about who makes history and made it in the past".¹

Historical understanding has indeed been rendered useless by the tendency to regard 'ideological attitudes' as an accurate index of historical change and by undue attention to bureaucratic structures. An historian writing on India under the Raj noted:

"Indeed, it is the undue attention to formal statements of policy aims that, it is now argued, has grossly misled historians about the working practice of British rule. For these both unduly anticipate the introduction of modernising administration and exaggerate its power to alter society. Colonial rule is particularly subject to the distortions of bureaucratic structures which mistake the report for the bullet, the plan for action, and what one clerk says to another for history".²

Now many studies and reports have been published in Zimbabwe, purporting to be in that misunderstood branch of learning-political economy, which attempt to trace continuity in the development of this society, by focusing the history of bureaucratic structures so that the present transition too seen in terms of colonial bureaucratic structures of government. From a disparate fusion of political and economic facts laced with anecdotes, we are being continually bombarded with the message from both the international right and left that nothing has really changed in Zimbabwe. Thus we find an Assistant Professor of International Relations at James Madison College at Michigan State University expounding from what he read in our newspapers:

"Zimbabwe is a dialectician's dream. Perhaps the most recurring and important dichotomy is that between the rhetoric of socialist transformation that monopolizes all branches of the media and the reality of the continued presence, dominance and indeed vitality of the inherited capitalist economy. If the old Rhodes is dead its spirit (as African tradition would suggest) wields continuing influence".³

While many of us the humble citizenry of this country, see nothing dream like about Zimbabwe, the learned professor could perhaps pursue further research on our political economy by engaging in constructive and on-going consultation with the Secretariat of ZINATHA, to prove whether his assertion really merits our attention. The assertion is however hardly surprising nor novel, emanating as it does from that great and ancient Northern academic pursuit of modelling Africa to fit into the long term interests of imperialism. As the international traveller and journalist Patrick Marnham confessed,

"For the outsider who enters Africa, the governing dream has always been to change the place. The models for such change have been drawn from "the North" - that is, from the nations of Europe, Asia and America that lie between the thirty-fifth and sixtieth parallels - where the corn comes from.

.... As the North has penetrated Africa, it has proved less and less capable of learning from the experience; we can only instruct. Even the anthropologists, who originally approached their subject in the spirit of pure inquiry, are increasingly willing to place their knowledge at the disposal of governments or international companies whose objectives are less than detached. The North justifies its pedagogy by characterizing the African as ignorant, uneducated or impoverished. At the same time it has found in Africa 'a refuge from the intellect' or an invitation to indulge in stupidity and dishonesty on its own account. It becomes increasingly difficult for us to explain the prolonged frustration of Northern plans in terms of "backwardness" or "isolation". Much of Africa has had close contact with the North for six hundred years and the African characteristics that have survived such long exposure are not going to be eliminated now".⁴

A striking characteristic of this six hundred year old mental battle to discover the heart of Africa, has been the on-going fragmentation of knowledge. As political scientists, economists and sociologists have developed their tools and techniques for analysing social reality they have become increasingly more specialised in their areas of expertise. Different problems concerns, different methodologies, different value orientations, as well as different professional horizons have indeed created a Tower Babel and waves of unstructured dialectical dreams. We therefore need to ask ourselves, whether our further intellectual development in Zimbabwe should be predicated on the furtherance of this Tower of Babel of Capital, by gaining deeper expertise in all the fragmented atoms of western social knowledge, or whether the period of transition should rather be one for reflexive action, for re-aligning our conceptual

framework no matter our pet loves and hates, to coincide with the worldview of the ordinary cultivators and wage earners.

This has indeed proved difficult for many a Northern scholar. Thus Bill Freund in a recently published book explicitly and consciously written from the view point of 'wage-earners and cultivators', records some of his difficulties:

"Yet at the present it seems there is no single appropriate political line to be followed that can shape this perspective precisely. I therefore make my own political judgements breaking with most previous radical (and indeed liberal) writing on Africa in trying to consider nationalism in modern Africa critically rather than taking automatically a nationalist point of view".⁵

Freund's, break with previous radical and liberal interpretations, is not however complete, hence his quandary about the 'political line'. Even before deciding to be critical about nationalism in Africa, he should have made a real effort not to interpret it through the abstracted historical prism of Europe, i.e. as a development of the concept of nationalism deriving from the Treaty of Westphalia of 1648, which ended the Thirty Years War in Europe and also sounded the death-knell of the feudal mode of production.

For the very emergence of the nationalist movement in Zimbabwe, was in effect a concretised critique of the international capitalist order.⁶ This point was put in a very graphic and integrated manner by a leading Zimbabwean scribe, Nathan Shamuyarira, writing at a time when the flame of African nationalism had captured the hearts of the Zimbabwean masses:

"What an ironic story it is! Men are dispossessed of their communal land rights because the Government, drunk on the heady wine of federation, predicts a big industrial boom as soon as Kariba's hydro-electric power starts flowing south and needs a supply of urban workers. But the boom never comes, the Federation dies and the dispossessed Africans are unemployed and desperate. The great plan to revolutionize land husbandry proves revolutionary in another sense altogether. Both in the towns and the reserves there grows each month a mass of people who conclude that only political revolution will bring changes for the better. But the scholarly men in the World Bank never saw what was happening in African minds: they were told the Government's hopes and plans and lent £2 millions to help provide water in the reserves where the Act was being implemented".⁷

The emergence of modern nationalism in Zimbabwe involved a redefinition of what 'politics' 'and political affairs' were. This fact is now only being discovered by a few British social scientists. The fact that most social analysts have yet to redefine their conception of politics is evidence of capital's power in not only fragmenting reality but in effectively censoring such redefinition. Brian Raftopolous has gone some way in accounting for this censorial power of capital in his critique of the Dar-es-Salaam debates, where inter alia he stresses how studies done from an explicitly Marxist-Leninist point of view of stressing the global power of finance imperialism, end up inducing a kind of resigned fatalism about the prospects for social change - a type of helpless utopianism.⁸

The growth of capital's censorial world-view, can thus be linked to the fact that much radical writing on Africa has tried to either ignore or sidestep Marx's emphasis on the dynamism and qualitative transformation induced by capitalism not only in the physical world of material production but also in the non physical world wherein social paradigms are formulated.

The curtailment of press freedom by capital is in many ways more harmful than actual and formal state regulation of public opinion, as it mystifies social reality. The actual blow for blow details of this process in Zimbabwe have been dealt with in a Zimbabwe Institute of Development Studies working paper still in press by Bornwell Chakaodza. Within the scope of this paper, it will suffice, to point out how a definition of politics emanating from the requirements of capital rather than from those of labour are likely to introduce a blanket of social censorship in the media.

It is nevertheless clear without having to cite any particular articles from our national press, that the conventional and dominant view of what politics is is still shaped by the prevailing one in advanced capitalist countries i.e. one in which politicians are regarded as 'people engaged in unpleasant squabbles for power, who manoeuvre and jockey for position and advantage. And one would agree with reference to our own media, Adrian Leftwich's assertion that:

"The way in which the media treat politics has helped to shape such a view and acts daily to confirm it. The discipline of Politics, moreover serves to sustain this by one of its mainstream occupations. This is its focus on largely constitutional affairs, parties, voting, elections and the institutions of government, mainly in the so-called advanced societies or where

The emergence of modern nationalism in Zimbabwe involved a redefinition of what 'politics' and political affairs' were. This fact is now only being discovered by a few British social scientists. The fact that most social analysts have yet to redefine their conception of politics is evidence of capital's power in not only fragmenting reality but in effectively censoring such redefinition. Brian Raftopolous has gone some way in accounting for this censorial power of capital in his critique of the Dar-es-Salaam debates, where inter alia he stresses how studies done from an explicitly Marxist-Leninist point of view of stressing the global power of finance imperialism, end up inducing a kind of resigned fatalism about the prospects for social change - a type of helpless utopianism.⁸

The growth of capital's censorial world-view, can thus be linked to the fact that much radical writing on Africa has tried to either ignore or sidestep Marx's emphasis on the dynamism and qualitative transformation induced by capitalism not only in the physical world of material production but also in the non physical world wherein social paradigms are formulated.

The curtailment of press freedom by capital is in many ways more harmful than actual and formal state regulation of public opinion, as it mystifies social reality. The actual blow for blow details of this process in Zimbabwe have been dealt with in a Zimbabwe Institute of Development Studies working paper still in press by Bornwell Chakaodza. Within the scope of this paper, it will suffice, to point out how a definition of politics emanating from the requirements of capital rather than from those of labour are likely to introduce a blanket of social censorship in the media.

It is nevertheless clear without having to cite any particular articles from our national press, that the conventional and dominant view of what politics is is still shaped by the prevailing one in advanced capitalist countries i.e. one in which politicians are regarded as 'people engaged in unpleasant squabbles for power, who manouvre and jockey for position and advantage. And one would agree with reference to our own media, Adrian Leftwich's assertion that:

"The way in which the media treat politics has helped to shape such a view and acts daily to confirm it. The discipline of Politics, moreover serves to sustain this by one of its mainstream occupations. This is its focus on largely constitutional affairs, parties, voting, elections and the institutions of government, mainly in the so-called advanced societies or where there is a state. Indeed some specialists in the discipline argue that there are societies where there is simply no politics".⁹

Leftwich goes on to offer a more operational definition of politics, free from any kind of technical determinism:

"Politics consists of all the activities of co-operation and conflict, within and between societies, whereby the human species goes about obtaining, using, producing and distributing resources in the course of the production and reproduction of its social and biological life. These activities are not isolated from other features of social life. They everywhere influence and are influenced by, the distribution of power and decision making, the systems of social organisation, culture and ideology in a society as well as its relations with the natural environment and other societies. Politics is therefore a defining characteristic of all human groups and always has been".¹⁰

Is this of any relevance to economic reporters in Zimbabwe? It is, because the redefinition of what is political not in the academic definition quoted above is an actual process in our transition to socialism, as evident in the restructuring of the state apparatus, and the struggle for political liberation before 1980.— And yet such a redefinition has yet to permeate the ranks of our Fourth Estate. Why is this so?

The first is that there has emerged a dominant social paradigm of politics amongst the educated classes in Zimbabwe, under the tutelage of foreign academics, and consultants. The latter, when they focus on the state in Zimbabwe be it from a political or economic angle, see it as an 'externality'. Something willy nilly imposed on this country and made to work by bureaucrats and technocrats. Such a focus is not only misguided, but dangerous. Even those avowed socialists who insist on the primacy of 'class' have yet to make a transition to a redefinition of politics that accords with the arrangement of the present governmental structure. The so-called problem of the 'class' nature of the political power since 1980, is not one for the uninvolved foreign experts or local academic. The problem is itself part of the political and social struggle against International capital going on in Zimbabwe under the direction and guidance of the ruling party, and it may not be resolvable by theory and political management but only in the course of the struggle for social and economic liberation. The struggle for the scribe is about communication i.e. that is of finding the appropriate style with which to institutionalise persuasion - i.e. convincing the ordinary wage-

earners and cultivators - not only of who represents what functions (passive formulation) but of who to act through and with in the state apparatus. This does not so much call for a good grounding in Marxology, but rather requires acute sensitivity by the reporter to both appreciate the significance of structural arrangements for the administration of economic affairs and to the needs and aspirations of the public.

The first five years of independence have seen the obliteration of the colonial dual administration of the agricultural economy of this country - wherein there was one Ministry dealing with the so-called "native" and "backward" peasant agriculture and the other dealing with the more technical and more industrialised sort of agriculture - European or Commercial agriculture. It has been demonstrated during the last harvest in Zimbabwe that given the correct political line and conditions and hence the right prices and necessary technical inputs, within the monetary reach of the communal area household, peasants in this country were not after all irrational and non-monetised as economists had been led to believe.

That reality has been formalised in a number of structural re-arrangements of the functions of ministries. The significance of such structural changes, however, is often lost in the present preoccupation with personalities so that the last cabinet reshuffle indeed seemed to be a non-event for most journalists. The last reshuffle however, established a definite framework within which to interpret the state's agricultural policy.¹¹

This redefinition of the state's role has to be counterpoised against the actual economic activity, i.e. both production and consumption of rural and urban households. There should therefore be no need for discussion on such matters to wait for press conferences and interviews, where in many instances, embarrassingly self evident questions are posed to government ministers. This indeed accounts for the "undemocratic" image of our press abroad.

Conversely economic reporters should not view their role as one of merely registering post hoc verdicts on the state's agricultural policy. They can only do this if they subscribe to the simple dichotomy touted by foreign correspondents between the state and the people, wherein by virtue of their superior education, they create for themselves the

role of the power-brokers in society. Journalists must be continually involved in the process of transforming news into an accurate conceptual framework, which can be used and readily understood by the real producers of the wealth of this country - the workers and the peasants.

Doing this will entail the unequivocal adoption of a proletarian perspective. For if economic reporters are to fulfill the national goals of socialist transformation, they have to see such transformation not in terms of administrative structures, legislation, important personalities etc, but above all a transformation of people's thinking. We normally use the term "proletariat" with the broad meaning of wage workers. This has given rise to Social-Darwinist perspectives of 'worker consciousness' which are invariably traced to some isolated mine compound in Zimbabwe in the 1930s.¹²

It is necessary to be more exact about what a proletarian perspective is, not so much for the sake of scientific accuracy but rather in order to dispense with some common misunderstandings of the political import of proletarian revolution touted in Trotskyite circles. Hal Draper has noted that Marx's attitude towards the precise definition in political terminology was typical of his day in being relatively permissive as compared with contemporary standards, "but he grew more inclined to precision at least in the field of economic science".¹³

Part of the problem, Draper states was that, although proletarian was already in use as a broader term than worker, Marx came to assign a narrower scope to it as a result of the development of his economic theory. Over the span of Marx's life socialist writing attached a whole spectrum of meaning to the word. A good example of the wide spectrum for applying the term, was in a programmatic statement of the Communist League probably written by Schapper shortly before the Communist Manifesto:

"In present day society proletarians are all those who cannot live on their capital, the workers as well as the men of learning, the artist as well as the petty bourgeois".¹⁴

At that time, such an unworkably broad usage resulted from the strong "honorific coloration" that the word was intended to convey in socialist circles. Actually the real sense was a negative: all who were not idlers. As Draper emphasises:

"In Marx's theory, the proletariat is the working class peculiar to capitalist relations of production. It does not comprise all who work for a living or who do useful or necessary work. It consists of workers whose livelihood depends on a wage relationship with employers of labour power, and who therefore produce surplus value in the process of commodity production".¹⁵

This is important to stress especially in the case of agricultural economics in Zimbabwe where Mkandawire has already sounded out a warning about the pitfalls of "one sector chauvinism". This has also been compounded by the tendency to see workers and peasants as atomised individuals, rather than as societal units for consumption and production. And in the case of Zimbabwe, the household as a unit of consumption and production, straddles both the "urban" and the so-called "communal areas". It would therefore be a futile task for one to attempt to disentangle the working class strategies for struggle against capital, from those historically pursued by the peasants. The production of surplus value, in Zimbabwe has not taken place in the neat little compartments suggested by the labour reserve hypothesis.

The proletariat, therefore does not consist only of industrial workers, who have only been one group in the production of surplus value, in the history of commodity production in this country. This is as we have suggested elsewhere in attempting to historically trace the basic causes of hunger - that in Zimbabwe the formal subsumption of labour under capital has occurred even in the absence of complete monetisation of our social relations of production and in the absence of formal dispossession of land. In other words, simple commodity producers who had been producing subsistence goods for their own consumption on "free land" prior to the forcible and violent introduction of the capitalist mode of production at the turn of this century were after the establishment of a British settler state progressively separated from the surplus value they produced (that is 'formally exploited by capital'). The legislative and other modalities for effecting this separation ranged all the way from the Land Apportionment Act to the Master and Servants Act to the Industrial Conciliation Act the Vagrancy Act (1971) the Native Urban Registration and Accommodation Act. All that was required for this to happen was the enforcement of the whole range agricultural and labour pricing policies pursued by the settler state that forced the people of this country (not in a populist sense) to 'maximise' the value of the ingredients used in production (ranging all the way from seed, fertiliser, and the sweat

and blood of their own brows), according to the market calculations of the settler bureaucracy - and sometimes actually valorise them - for instance in lobola transactions.¹⁶ It has really mattered very little whether the calculations of the ordinary Zimbabwean on any of the High-deck Omnibuses, have been based on a reading of Samuelson, Keynes, or Adam Smith or any of these worthy gentlemen. In attempting to realise 'subsistence commodity values' (as distinct from 'non commodified') that traditionally regulated our civil society, we have had to calculate the value of our labour power and allocate it along lines indicated by its general valuation in the economy as formalised in the Annual Estimates of Expenditure of the Southern Rhodesian/Rhodesian/Zimbabwe-Rhodesia Parliament. This was the way any working black man and woman, whether on the land or in a factory or in a white collar had to do in some instances in order to provide daily sustenance for his family, but in a majority of cases - this was part of the whole struggle to survive. The entire political economic and social logic of capital, whether local or international in colonial Zimbabwe ensured that by calculating the value of their own labour power and allocating it along lines indicated by its general valuation in the economy, the majority of producers in this country transferred the value of these non-monetised goods to other goods that they sold - ranging from maize, cattle and their own labour power. Capital, which in the case of colonial Zimbabwe would include the state, (a debate on the differences or linkages between state and capital in colonial Zimbabwe is only of scholastic relevance), was able to realise this value because the interaction between subsistence production and wage labour progressively caused the undervaluation of both labour power and other goods produced. Agricultural pricing and credit policies for maize, beef, as outlined in Maize Control Act, the Beef Levy Act etc., and administered through the agency of parastatal bodies such as the Grain Marketing Board, the Cold Storage Commission etc ensured that this happened.¹⁷

The real basic causes of hunger in Zimbabwe which I have described in Zimbabwe Institute of Development Studies Working Paper Number three, are to be found in the historical interaction between simple commodity production and wage labour. Thus while wage labour came to exist on an extensive but not intensive level in the economy, the majority of African households could neither subsist on local wages alone nor the proceeds from the sale of their farm produce, because the continued existence of subsistence production in the reserves and the ceiling on

wages for Africans in formal employment led to a market undervaluation of labour power both in the industrial and agricultural sectors of material production. During the Great Depression of the 1930s and after World War II, subsistence producers (as a class) were forced to work for wages lower than their reproductive costs, giving rise to rapid urbanisation.¹⁸ The average household head thus has had to carry on some 'subsistence' production whether in the reserve or in some informal activity in the towns, in combination with wage work in order for his family to get a minimum of basic needs. Conversely low wages, have meant that 'subsistence producers' in the communal lands (50% of whom are women today) have had to undervalue their own products whether cash food crops and handicrafts which they have had to value in terms of the price of labour power needed to produce them as established by the local market. Capital, therefore, right up until 1980 when we regained independence got both cheap goods and cheap labour from the black population of this country, both undervalued by the local market. This undervaluation of goods produced by blacks in this country was not only limited to what produced with their hands, but even the products of their minds - or intellectual labour. Thus whatever research or writing our intellectuals produced was undervalued not only by the local market but by the international market as well. The best status our intellectuals could aim for was to be powder monkeys for the academics of the metropolitan centres of learning.

Therefore in the real sense the proletariat Zimbabwe inherited at independence did not consist only of manual workers. There was a whole sphere of intellectual or mental labour which was as proletarian as any other. For the proletariat does not consist only of workers engaged in producing tangible commodities. The producers of services (non-material commodities) which neo-classical economists writing on Africa have dubbed the 'informal sector' also produced surplus value.¹⁹

This undervaluation of the labour power of Zimbabweans in the local market, whether for manual work or intellectual work, was neatly summed up in the Director's Introduction to the National Manpower Survey Report of 1981.²⁰ The most revealing aspect about the Zimbabwe National Manpower Survey's findings was that this underevaluation was not only expressed in monetary terms (i.e. salary scales), but by the very racist grading system employed. At the level of the shop-floor, Ibbo Mandaza was even able to show how this racist grading system operated: china tea cups for white workers; plastic mugs or cups for so-called Asians and coloureds; and tin mugs or roughly

edged cans for the African worker.

This is enough background material for one to start asking whether all this has changed and what indeed are the new gradings being employed to assess the value of labour power across all sectors of the economy from one to nine (using the ISIC 1968 U.N. coding system). And to what extent do they reflect a realignment in our society's values away from those of the British settlers, and back to those of our grandfathers at the turn of the century. I am sure that would be a task that can only be undertaken by a collective team and not a sole individual. But in this question will lie the answer of where we are exactly now almost twenty years to the day Ian Smith Declared, U.D.I. and Harold Wilson's famous statement that this treacherous act would only be a seven day word. We all know that this was to be longer than seven days, so there can no longer be stale historical debates about the timing of changes brought about by colonialism. The debate should rather be now about the quality of these changes, that colonialism wreaked on our society.

For the economic journalist this means clearly understanding that the basic unit of the proletariat in capitalist production in Zimbabwe today considered structurally is not any individual but the collective labourer. This term of Marx's refers to the collectivity of workers whose labour taken together is necessary to produce a given commodity. It may be a small number (rarely and never one!) or a very large collectivity, but more importantly it commonly unites both manual and intellectual (mental) "labour specialties, both labour at the point of production and away from the factory, both labour expended directly on the product and labour indirectly associated with the necessities of production (like floor sweeping). It also includes supervisory labour of any type necessary to the production of the commodity. No one of this collectivity is responsible for the value embodied in the commodity; all of them collectively. There is no basis for distinguishing between proletarian and the non proletarian constituents of the collective labourer, all of them are members of the proletariat".²¹

The bourgeois/proletariat antagonism on which Marx bases the modern class struggle is not represented by "the dichotomy between dirt splattered, horny-handed, blue-coloured toilers on one side" of the fence "and clean shirted, chair-warming manipulators" on the other side. The latter is a bourgeois conception born in student union cafeterias in the advanced

capitalist countries. This means that it arises from class conceptions of social antagonisms that have for the ruling classes of the West, become a self serving stereotype or caricature/cartoon of the real world. This would remain true even if it were inverted i.e. when the horny-handed lower class image is inverted by left-wing consultant academics in Zimbabwe i.e. when the horny-handed lower class image is idealised by an alienated bourgeoisie - the 'positive deviants' of Western academia, who wish to break with their class and nation.

The proletarian view is not about the sanctification of the workers, by showing that they are cleverer, more courageous or humanitarian than other people or that they have an invariable affinity for progressive causes. It is more important to view the proletariat as a process. As Draper states:

"The maturation of the proletariat goes hand in hand, if not step by step with the level of development of the capitalist economy itself. There cannot be a strong proletariat without widespread or intensive industrialisation. Contrariwise, weak development of industry and commerce implies an underdeveloped proletariat. In addition, disparities will arise in the stage of social development of the working class within a country and between countries".²²

The latter points requires special emphasis because too often a well-meaning economic journalist who has had some brush with elementary Marxism, will get tangled in Trotskyite dreams about international working class solidarity - between workers on one hand whose societies march towards capitalism was perfected centuries ago, and workers in a society such as Zimbabwe whose government has unequivocally announced the pragmatic long term goal of socialism.

Whether our journalists in Zimbabwe have fallen victim to capital's censorial guillotine can not be answered at the moment with absolute certainty. Journalists are not a socio-economic class and attention should be directed at their social role as ideological servicemen rather than their individual motivation or psychology.

At any rate, it is time some evaluative assesment was done of the social role of newswriters in Zimbabwe. For without such information it would indeed be difficult to make an academic judgement whether our print media can effectively provide an institutional framework for persuading people

about the transition to socialism. And in such a dynamic situation as we have in Zimbabwe it is best to assume that all upstanding journalists are motivated by the search for Truth and Light just as all bureaucrats desire Justice. However, we always have to apply the quis custodiet cust principle to ensure that those seekers for Truth and Light whose search leads them to promote the interests of international capital are kept in check; and that more is heard from those who search leads them to counter the dominant social paradigm of the Western bourgeoisie. This will be only giving due recognition to a well-worn truth that the objective result of what is put into print for society in general is scarcely determined by good intentions. If a particular intellectual activity is more or less socially neutral by nature, say chess playing - its practitioners will be expected at least not to use their activities and prestige to contravene the dominant social values and interests of the majority.

—The freedom of the press that is being called for, is one which no government can legislate for, but will have to be defined in the course of struggle. For economic journalists this means the widening of their role beyond the scope of the business supplements agricultural supplements in the newspaper. As one economist has put it:

"For many years economists suffered from analytical myopia produced by prolonged concentration upon the economics of the market place. In recent years the economist's field of vision has been widened to include non-market allocative processes. This shift in emphasis has resulted in economics incorporating much more of the social structure into its analysis..."²³

Incorporating the social structure into economic analysis, in a period of transition to socialism, however, requires a self-screening process on the part of journalists and intellectuals at large - not by the creation of inter-personal sectarian networks but by a sustained struggle against the following tendencies:

- a) the substitution of a sentimental emphasis for a class struggle approach
- b) elitism and authoritarianism - assuming the natural superiority of educated talents and their prerogative to become shepherds leading the flock of the unenlightened.

These tendencies were remarked on by Engels in a letter to Kautsky concerning the Fabians in Britain, but have relevance for intellectuals in Zimbabwe, when he wrote:

"You (Kautsky) see something unfinished in the Fabian Society. On the contrary this crowd is only too finished: a clique of bourgeois "socialists" of diverse calibers, from careerists to sentimental socialists and philanthropists, united only by their fear of the threatening rule of the workers and doing all in their power to spike this danger by making their own leadership secure, the leadership exercised by the "edicated",

The Fabians were:

"These stuck-up bourgeois who would graciously condescend to emancipate the proletariat from above if it will only be sensible enough to realise that such a raw and uneducated mass cannot free itself and can achieve nothing except by the grace of these smart lawyers, literati and sentimental females".²⁴

REFERENCES AND NOTES

- 1) Cited in A Davidson, Antonio Gramsci: Towards An Intellectual Biography. (London, Merlin Press 1977) p.96.
- 2) Eric Stokes, The Peasant and The Raj: Studies in Agrarian Society and Peasant Rebellion in Colonial India. (New York, Cambridge University Press, 1978) p. 31.
- 3) David F. Gordon, 'Development Strategy in Zimbabwe: Assessments and Prospects' in editor Michael G. Schatzberg, The Political Economy of Zimbabwe (New York, Praeger Publishers, 1984) p. 119. N.B. The book is selling for \$103 in bookshops in Harare.
- 4) Patrick Marnham, Dispatches From Africa (London, Sphere Books, 1981) p. xi.
- 5) Bill Freund, The Making of Contemporary Africa: The Development of African Society since 1800. (Bloomington, Indiana University Press 1984) p.xii.
- 6) For an earlier development of this idea see T.D. Shopo, "The Agrarian Question in The Formative Stages of The National Democratic Revolution in Colonial Zimbabwe 1945-1965: An Historiographical Essay", Zimbabwe Institute of Development Studies Research in Progress Seminar 28 February 1984.
- 7) N. Shamuyarira, Crisis in Rhodesia (London Andre Deutsch, 1965) p. 98.
- 8) Brian Raftopolous, "The Dar-es-Salaam Debate Reflections on Certain Trends in African Marxism" mimeographed paper. September, 1985.
- 9) Adrian Leftwich, Redefining Politics, People Resources and Power (London, Methuen 1983) p. 12.
- 10) Ibid. p.12.
- 11) For further elaboration see T. D. Shopo, Some Reflections On A Conceptual Framework for Legislation For The Co-operative Movement in Zimbabwe. ZIDS Mimeographed Paper September, 1985.
- 12) A good example of this is C. Van Onselen and I.R. Phimister, Studies in the History of African Mine Labour.
- 13) Hal Draper, Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution Vol. II: The Politics of Social classes (London, Monthly Review Press, 1978) p.33
- 14) Cited in Ibid Ibidem.
- 15) Ibid. p.34.
- 16) For some preliminary discussion of this see: T.D. Shopo, 'Abuses of Culture in Rhodesia'. Henderson Seminar Paper 1977, Department of History, University of Zimbabwe, (Special Collections, University of Zimbabwe Library).
- 17) For historical detail on all this vide: R.S. Roberts, 'African Cattle in Pre-Colonial Zimbabwe' in NADA Vol. 12 1979-80. J.M. Mackenzie, 'African Labour in the Chartered Company Period' in Rhodesian History Vol. I, 1970

C.F. Keyter, Maize Control in Southern Rhodesia 1931-1941
(Salisbury, Central African Historical Association, Local
Series No. 34. 1978).

For by far the most succinct economic analysis of this transformation see: S. Mahlahla, 'The Economic Transformation of Indigenous Agriculture in Zimbabwe 1900-1964' unpublished Ph.d. thesis, New School for Social Research 1982.

- 18) For a lively and racy account of these years see:
Lawrence Vambe, From Rhodesia To Zimbabwe
- 19) For a useful critique of this writing see :
Thandika Mkandawire, The Informal Sector in The Labour Reserve Economies of Southern Africa With Special Reference to Zimbabwe. Z.I.D.S. Working Paper No. I.
- 20) "Director's Introduction: The National Manpower Survey in The Context of The Political Economy of Zimbabwe" National Manpower Survey 1981 Vol. I. (Government of Zimbabwe, Ministry of Manpower Planning and Development)
- 21) Hal Draper, Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution. p. 35.
- 22) Ibid. p. 53.
- 23) P.M. Jackson, The Political Economy of Bureaucracy (London, Philip Allan 1982) p. vii.
- 24) Cited in Hal Draper, p. 524.



This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons
Attribution – NonCommercial - NoDerivs 3.0 License.

To view a copy of the license please see:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

This is a download from the BLDS Digital Library on OpenDocs
<http://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/>