

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.

This chapter commences by reviewing pertinent literature in the canon of scholarship on human security and development, followed by a critique of the human security concept. A brief history of violence and non-violence in Zimbabwe will also be furnished with a view to highlighting the lack of human security in the country since the colonial period before we turn to the origin of the non-violence discourse in the modern/colonial world. The thesis then moves on to define non-violence resistance, highlighting the techniques of nonviolence which include nonviolent protest and persuasion, non-cooperation and nonviolent intervention. The key points of leverage in civil resistance movements are then explored followed by the misconceptions about nonviolent resistance. A section on nonviolent resistance in the 19th century is followed by some on nonviolent resistance against extreme dictatorships, Mahatma Gandhi, Nelson Mandela Martin L King Jr and nonviolent resistance, nonviolent resistance in the Arab World and nonviolent resistance in Zimbabwe in the period 1980-2017. The second part of this chapter focuses on the theory of nonviolent resistance, together with another section on the theory of non-violence and the will to live.

For the purposes of the study, human security refers to two issues, notably protection and empowerment. Protection requires “concerted effort to develop norms, processes and institutions that systematically addresses insecurities”, while empowerment “enables people to [fully] develop their potential and become full participants in decision-making” (MacLean *et al.*, 2006). Protection and empowerment are not exclusive but rather mutually reinforcing, and both are required in most situations. As noted by the then United Nations Secretary General Koffi Annan in 2001, “Africa must reject the ways of the past, and commit itself to building a future of democratic governance

subject to the rule of law. Such a future is only achievable on the condition that we end Africa's conflicts, without which no amount of aid or trade, assistance or advice, will make the difference" (Annan, 2001).

The concept of human security has received a fair share of criticism as some have called it hot air, however its implementation and acceptability has opened up new frontiers for development. Essentially, "the approach of human security is centred on the person and the community, and it focuses on threats and conditions to people's security that are not normally seen as threats to the state" (Abatudu, 2005: 107). Former Prime Minister Obuchi Keizo described human security as "the keyword to comprehensively seizing all of the menaces that threaten the survival, daily life, and dignity of human beings and to strengthening the efforts to confront these threats" (cited in Sen, 2000: 1). Human security is therefore about survival, daily life, and dignity of a human being. As pointed out by Chillers (2004: 11), the idea of human security has brought up new frontiers for development notably exposing those states which used to view security in state-centric instead of individual centric terms. The concept of human security (which includes overlapping systems of security at individual, national and international levels), is the security of the individual in his or her personal surroundings and within the community, the ability thus of people and communities to pursue safe livelihoods on equal terms with others.

The concept behind human security shows the intricate nexus between individuals and development in communities. Thomas (2001: 161) describes "human security as a condition of existence in which basic material needs are met, and in which human dignity, including meaningful participation in the life of the community, can be realised". Individuals and communities are no longer bystanders in socio-political and economic governance, but are key stakeholders in the

crafting and implementation of development policies and programmes. Therefore “human development contributes to human security by tackling the long-term structural causes of conflict and by strengthening the capability of societies to deal with conflict in a peaceful manner” (Lodgaard, 2000: 9). The duty of the state therefore is to facilitate development. Where violence is pervasive, development is affected such that the citizenry suffers from multiple deprivations.

Colonialism in Zimbabwe left violent indelible marks on the psyche and socio-political and economic space. The violence compromised human security. The coming of independence in 1980 perpetuated the legacies of colonialism as violence against opponents continued. In the Zimbabwean context development has been affected by the narrow approach to security which mainly focused on sovereignty and territorial integrity. The pursuit of sovereignty saw the state becoming the perpetuator of insecurity, not only through failing to fulfil its obligations towards its subjects but also threatening their very existence. Human security therefore requires the recognition of the interconnections between development, security and human rights. It is the contention of this thesis that human security in its broadest sense embraces far more than political tolerance. It encompasses in its substantive purview, human rights, good governance, access to education and health care and ensuring that everyone has opportunities and choices to fulfil and capitalise on. Alkire (2003) shows the link between human security and development by stating that “both are people-centred, they are multi-sectoral and multidimensional undertakings; both provide the “broad picture” long-term objective of human fulfilment within any society and they address chronic poverty” (Alkire, 2003: 36). This is the opposite of what has been happening in Zimbabwe, especially in Buhera South since the formation of the MDC in 1999.

Human security has attracted widespread criticism from different scholars since its first use in 1994. Human security is essentially about transformation, transparency and accountability which form the core values of development. Gómez and Gasper have captured it as the core to human development. They see it as the power behind the development of societies. Central to their argument is that “the right to live in freedom and dignity, free from poverty and despair... with an equal opportunity to enjoy all their rights and fully develop their human potential” is fundamental (UN General Assembly, 66th session 25 October 2022 cited in Gomez and Gasper 2014: 3). Musa (2012) posits that human security globally is being compromised by the neoliberal agenda and globalisation which have rendered third world governments ineffective in providing solutions to their people notably through the debt trap. Musa (2005: 108) argues that “the ideology of neo-liberalism constitutes a serious impediment to the provision of social safety nets in Africa. The way the neo-liberal agenda has played itself out in several African countries suggests a serious need to interrogate it as a factor fuelling human insecurity on the continent”.

The UN General Assembly, 66th session 25 October 2022 perhaps provides the link between human security and development. Most importantly, the report concludes by arguing that “human security recognizes the interlinkages between peace, development and human rights, and equally considers civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights;” thus human security forms part of the family of human concepts (including human rights, human needs, human development” (UN General Assembly, 66th Session “Follow-up to paragraph 143 on human security of the 2005 World Summit Outcome” A/RES/66/290, 25 October 2012). Muguruza (2018) has argued for human security to reduce poverty through a human security framework. This framework seeks to have a new paradigm of development cooperation with international financiers. The framework would identify genuine threats to human survival, and allocation of

responsibilities to duty bearers so that they become accountable. Thomas (2001: 162) contends that “the qualitative aspect of human security is about the achievement of human dignity which incorporates personal autonomy, control over one’s life and unhindered participation in the life of the community. Emancipation from oppressive power structures global, national or local in origin and scope is necessary for human security.”

However, some scholars such as Johns (2014) and Paris (2001) have opted to view the human security concept as doing more harm than good to the people it seeks to protect. It is seen as a fuzzy and hazy concept lacking a concise definition and working strategy. It leaves the individual and the state vulnerable to externalities. However, Chiller (2004) opines that both traditional state security and human security are interrelated as the goal is to protect citizens. Chiller (2004) sees the disturbances in Africa, notably wars, terrorism and coups as symptomatic of state failure and concentration on traditional security without guaranteeing the security of citizens. He cites colonialism as having created artificial borders and bunching ethnic groups into one big nation thus upon attaining independence most have ignored the security of some ethnic groups thereby rendering the countries insecure. The human security concept is therefore helpful in highlighting the development needs of Africa and Zimbabwe to be precise. Most states are for regime preservation at all costs rather than citizens’ interests. Zimbabwe, since colonialism, has been such a state prioritising regime preservation through “patronage and the associated misuse of governmental instruments of coercion to entrench political and social exclusion” (Bryden, N’Diaye, and Oloniskin, 2008: 3). A brief history of violence and non-violence in Zimbabwe confirms the above stated point.

The actions of the colonial government in both legal and regulatory frameworks clearly showed a negation of the critical elements of

human security. The colonial Rhodesian government cared little about the dignity, respect and rights of Africans. To them, profits mattered more than human security. The Africans were seen as natives and savages deserving no respect. Human security is about empowerment and protection. As pointed out by Maclean (2006), "Protection shields people from dangers, it requires concerted effort to develop norms, processes and institutions that systematically address insecurities. Empowerment enables people to develop their potential and become full participants in decision-making." Colonialism itself was a violent imposition of rule on the African. Colonial conquest in 1890 was followed by a violent dispossession of Africans of their land and means of survival. Violence was institutionalised through a series of laws which if not adhered to would lead to torture, imprisonment, or death. This was to continue after the 1st Chimurenga in 1896-97 where the vanquished were left at the mercy of the victors.

Nonviolent resistance during the colonial period was mainly waged through organised labour unions. Mothibe (1996: 180) has provided the framework which guided trade unionism between 1957 and 1963. These were the watershed years in the Zimbabwean resistance movements marked by the formation of the African National Congress led by Joshua Nkomo in 1957. Mothibe (1996) disputes the widely held notion that trade unionism did not end with the formation of nationalist parties in Zimbabwe but rather the two groupings existed together, fighting for liberation using different means. He argues that "workers and nationalist politicians worked closely initially to seek accommodation in the colonial political structures, and following the 1959 emergency, they fought together to demand independence" (Mothibe, 1996: 180). This clearly shows that the workers were advocates of peaceful resistance and engagement with the government to find solution to wage disparities. The years 1897-1966 were years of peaceful resistance though with some flashes of violent protests which often suffered violent clampdown.

The coming in of colonial rule created new frontiers for resistance. Boyd (2017) has brought to the fore the fact that labour became the first frontier of resistance after the collapse of military resistance. Mostly Africans escaped labour through avoidance or migration to areas with less economic activity, crossing into neighbouring colonies or finding respite in Christian religion, feigning sickness or purposefully misunderstanding orders. The Native Commissioner report in 1904 showed that Africans only came to work to fulfil the tax obligations other than that they stayed away. He wrote "to accustom the native of this country to steady work is a task which will take years to accomplish; more particularly as they have no desire to become rich. Their one idea is to obtain money to pay tax which can be obtained in two months, and then return to their homes, and loll about in idleness and drinking beer" (Report of the Chief Native Commissioner, 1904).

Bhebe (1999) has brought to focus how the struggle for independence evolved from 1893 up to 1980. The resistance took various forms from disorganised strikes, boycotts, religious protests, expressed through the formation of indigenous churches, to mass nationalism (Bhebe, 1999: 10). This has provided a historical analysis of the development of the Zimbabwean national consciousness and violence. Thus the fight for political independence, human security and development in Zimbabwe has been a continuous struggle which has taken many turns and forms. Bhebe presents the development of national consciousness from the early years of colonial rule to armed struggle thereby moving away from nonviolent approaches to more organised political parties and mass liberation movements. While this was a welcome development, it also led to an entrenched culture of violence in Zimbabwe. Bhebe shows how even in the early years of military action the guerrillas were "carrying out acts of sabotage which were considered relevant to bring forth fear and despondency to the settlers in Rhodesia to influence the British government and the foreign

settlers in Rhodesia to accede to the popular revolutionary demands of the people of Zimbabwe" (Bhebhe, 1999: 13).

Ian Phimister and Brian Raftopoulos (2000) have articulated how the nonviolent methods used before were suddenly discarded in 1948 in favour of 'mob confrontations'. They cite the 1948 strike as a clash between the elites and the militant workers. Elitism in this instance required a more cautious approach to negotiating while militancy required a scorched earth approach in their fight for better wages. This shows the discordant relationship between leadership and the led. As the people yearned for a strike, the leaders devised various strategies:

When they addressed a large meeting in Bulawayo's Stanley Hall on the Tuesday night immediately before the strike occurred, one leader after another 'advised the workers not to strike until the Salisbury workers were also ready to strike'. This advice was not well-received by the crowd, and when the leaders left 'to consult among themselves', a young man 'clad in a raincoat' shouted out "'Kana sora ratswa ngaritswe'" (. . .if the grass is burning, let it burn). Sticks, knobkerries, hats and all floated in the air as the thousands of workers cheered the young man. The strike was on, but the leaders were still in conference. (Phimister and Raftopoulos, 2000: 292).

This analysis partly explains why the nonviolent resistance movements in earlier years were few and confined to small groupings and yielded little or no success. However, the success of the 1948 strike and the violence witnessed also spurred the formation of nationalist parties. The leadership of these parties began to drift towards militancy to fight the labour problem. One notable feature shown by Raftopoulos (2000) is the lack of cohesion among the elites in nonviolent movements. The leading organisation, Bulawayo African Workers Trade Union, split in 1947 when Benjamin Burombo launched the African Workers Voice Association 'for the benefit of the workers' (Phimister and Raftopoulos, 2000: 297).

The lessons of 1948 gave rise to the need for a united labour movement. As pointed by Mothibe (1996), unionism was regional, mostly active in Bulawayo and Harare. Burombo retreated into the rural areas. Mothibe (1996) shows that these earlier social movements lacked clarity and simple messaging to attract considerable success. Due to this lack, many turned their labour skills into political movements which the Rhodesians dealt with through several anti-terror laws. The emergence of these political movements and their turn to militarism killed the activities of social movements in the period 1966-1980 as the labour problem became a political problem. Mothibe (1996: 180) concludes by arguing that “more important, was the decision of the nationalists to embark on armed struggle. That decision basically shifted the terrain of the struggle from the urban to the rural areas and as a result labour was marginalised.”

After independence the nonviolent resistance continued through social movements. The social organisations movements which had suffered a knock due to the liberation struggle resurfaced. The various workers' unions were grouped under the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Union (ZCTU). Mugabe had an indifferent approach to opposition and criticism during his rule especially in the early years after independence. He seemed to embrace multiparty democracy. While he embraced democracy, he targeted all those who challenged his powers. To better understand the history of violence and nonviolent resistance since 1980, there is need to properly interrogate the Mugabe policies after 1980. Mandaza (1986) argues that the Mugabe regime, since 1980, was elite driven. Mandaza accuses the new government in 1980 of failing to acknowledge wrongs of the past and focusing more on power consolidation. Consolidation in this case meant using state repressive apparatus against social democratic movements. Bond and Saunders (2005) have shown that the tentacles of elite driven politics stretched to labour until 1987 when Morgan Tsvangirai took over. Morgan Tsvangirai was a trade unionist who represented mine

workers. He assumed the leadership of the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions in 1987. The coming in of Morgan Tsvangirai brought a new dimension to nonviolent resistance as “a decade of unprecedented industrial and social action was launched, featuring a wave of public and private sector industrial actions in the mid-1990s that soon grew to include nationwide “political actions” against government intransigence, unaccountability, and mismanagement” (Bond and Saunders, 2005: 46). The coming of Tsvangirai at ZCTU brought a new wave of nonviolent resistance expressed through strikes and stay-aways. Lucien van de Walt (1999: 106) focused on analysing the ZCTU transformation as it “concentrated on building its organisational strength and linkages to organisations of students, public servants and academics.” The analysis mostly focuses on the organisational structure of the ZCTU and how it eventually transitioned to full-blown politics. However, there is evidence that the ZCTU only transitioned to politics after failure to effect desired labour goals within a ZANU-PF controlled environment. It is therefore important to note that the ZCTU and other social movements had “relatively weak shop floor base, clear relations with other popular sectors, particularly the poor peasantry, and a clear political programme, their impact on the process of change cannot but be self-limiting” (Lucien van de Walt, 1999: 111).

Masunungure (1998), Sithole (1999) and Sithole and Makumbe (1996) have written extensively about the instrumentalisation of the law as violent assault on the legal fraternity emerged. Mugabe used instruments of law and coercion against opponents. It should be noted that since assuming the reins of power in 1977 in ZANU, Mugabe has always attempted to create a one centre of power. Masunungure (1998), Sithole (1999) and Sithole and Makumbe (1996) have all shown that Mugabe chiefly deployed violence against opponents to subdue them in the initial phases of his leadership in ZANU from as early as 1977. After independence he resorted more to law fare as a strategy to subdue his political opponents. Where the use of the law failed, he

turned to the party militia to instil violence against opponents. Mandaza (1996) clearly maintains that Mugabe used any instrument at his disposal to further his hold on power.

Gwisai (2002) has brought to sharp focus how the Mugabe government distrusted social movements. He also claims that the socialist principles adopted after independence were a mere smokescreen to hoodwink workers. The new regime attempted to use such reforms to consolidate its hegemony by falsely proclaiming the state to be pursuing socialist ideals. Thus, patriotism was invented to quell the opposition against unwarranted criticism. In the same vein Brian Raftopoulos (2004) talks of the recuperation of manhood' as a tool for Mugabe's 'authoritarian nationalism that dominated the official nationalism of the state throughout the present crisis. The crisis of violence in Zimbabwe can be understood in the context of failure to uphold the principles human security. The Mugabe of 1977 who assumed ZANU leadership and the Mugabe of 1980 who assumed the leadership of Zimbabwe failed to evolve with the times. After 1980, Mugabe continued where Smith left.

Derek Matyszak (2012) interrogates the role of social movements in promoting the doctrine of nonviolent resistance in the 1990s. He shows how the Zimbabwe Human Rights NGO Forum was born with the aim of "effective monitoring of the human and civil rights terrain. When victims of rights violations and political violence approach member organizations, such as the Counselling Services Unit, or Zimbabwe Lawyers for Human Rights, for assistance and redress, qualitative and quantitative data are compiled and forwarded to the Forum for collation" (Matyszak, 2012: 135-36). This has provided a compelling account of how various NGOs have contributed to the nonviolent discourse. Matyszak shows that the nonviolent resistance in the modern world has now taken a human security approach which cannot be left to politicians alone. The NGOs, as shown by Matyszak, have

amplified the problem of violence in Zimbabwe to international audiences which have internationalised the Zimbabwean problem.

Richard Saunders (2000) has argued that the Mugabe government attempted to regulate the formation of social movements. Those that were allowed to operate were subjected to party and government patronage “the ZANU-PF government thwarted the chances of the formation of new civic structures outside party and government patronage, representing different voices in civil society that resurfaced with the end of the liberation war to assert an autonomous position” (Saunders 2000: 15-20). Melber, (2010: 4) posits that “tendencies to autocratic rule and towards the subordination of the state under the party, and politically motivated social and material favours as a reward system for loyalty or disadvantages as a form of coercion in cases of dissent are common techniques” deployed by post-independence leaders to maintain a stranglehold on power. In the same vein Rupiya (2004) has proffered the argument that violence in Zimbabwe from 1999-2004 was mainly political. He argues that “the most important causes of military intervention in politics are not military but political and reflect not the social and organizational character of the military establishment but the political and institutional structure of society” (Decalo, 1990: 3 cited in Rupiya, 2004: 82). Rupiya analyses the problematic nature of violence to military-politics matrix which has even affected various nonviolent resistance measures. In this regard, the military was the counter measure to opposition nonviolent resistance measures.

Mediel Hove’s (2016) thesis on nonviolent campaigns has focused more on effectiveness of the methods without focusing on the critical aspects of human security. He articulates that the nonviolent discourse does not yield results in political change as the findings from the research shows that violence is the solution to state sponsored violence. He

failed to go beyond strategies and methods, rather limiting his argument to a narration of events of what happened and could have happened. This thesis goes beyond that by looking at the concepts of nonviolent resistance, human security and development. The study analyses how violence and nonviolent resistance affected human security thereby affecting the development of Zimbabwe. It holds the view that the goal of politics should be to advance the interests of the people rather than those of the few rulers. Where there is use of dictatorship to govern, violence occurs and human insecurity deepens. To counter this, nonviolent resistance is proposed as the solution. The dissertation now moves on to review the origins of the non-violence discourse in the modern/colonial world.

Nonviolent struggles have occurred in widely differing cultures, periods of history, and political conditions throughout the world. Nonviolence resistance has been practiced since time immemorial in attempts to transform conflicts. Nonviolent resistance is an ideal concept to study because of its transformative role in conflict situations. Nonviolent resistance cannot be examined outside an understanding of both the nature of the structures that produce and reproduce violence and the role that it plays in either transcending or reproducing violence. Nonviolent resistance is developmental in orientation because it is anti-destruction as witnessed by those countries which have gone through years of intractable violence. Examples from countries like the Democratic Republic of Congo, Sierra Leone, Ivory Coast and Liberia have shown how violence is counterproductive as it leads to underdevelopment and human insecurity. The emergence and perpetuation of violence which continues to affect Zimbabweans in the current political situation is examined using the nonviolence theory. Nonviolence can be traced to around 527 BC when it was introduced to the world as a tool for social change.

Henry David Thoreau's (1849) use of the term 'civil disobedience' is quite instructive and useful in this study which sought to evaluate the nonviolence discourse and its impact in the Zimbabwean conflict since 1999 when the MDC was formed. The American author Henry David Thoreau as the pioneer of the modern theory behind this practice with his 1849 essay on Civil Disobedience argued against people being used as agents of injustice by a government which they chose. The essay had profound influence on both Martin Luther and Mahatma Gandhi. His essay on Civil Disobedience has received critical acclaim for it shaped the nonviolent resistance movement. The dissertation moves on now to define non-violence resistance.

Sharp (2013:16) defined nonviolent resistance as a "generic term covering dozens of specific methods of protest, non-cooperation, and intervention in all of which resisters conduct the conflict by doing or refusing to do- certain things without resorting to physical violence. As a technique therefore nonviolent action is not passive. It is not inaction. It is action that is nonviolent." He further postulates that "nonviolent struggle means, of course, that one does not capitulate in the face of threats. One does not run away. One also chooses to fight with superior weapons, not the oppressor's violence, but psychological, moral, social-economic and political weapons with which one's people can be strong" (Sharp (2013) cited by Cady, 2010). Gandhi pioneered the experimentation and use of the tactic claiming that "'I have nothing new to teach the world. Truth and non-violence are as old as the hills. All I have done is to try experiments in on as vast a scale as I could" (Sharp, 2013).

However, examples abound of its usage throughout history. Oftentimes it has become the choice of the weak to use the power of conscience than that of vengeance. From its wide use, it can be argued that nonviolent resistance has become a common tool for the weak against established dictatorships throughout the world. One of the

foremost thinkers in the nonviolent action, Gene Sharp (2013), defined it as “a technique of action by which the population can restrict and sever the sources of power of their rulers or other oppressors and mobilize their own power potential into effective power”. This definition aptly shows how conflicts in modern times can be transformed or contained to avoid fatalities or escalation. It suits the MDC approach since its formation in 1999 against the backdrop of potentially damaging confrontation with the ZANU-PF regime.

Ronald Regan while addressing the United Nations Assembly in 1984, said "All problems could be peacefully resolved if adversaries talked to each other on the basis of love and truth. All through history, the way of truth and love has always won. This was the belief and vision of Mahatma Gandhi and his vision remains good and true even today" (Cited in Bharati, 2003). Nonviolence provides us with tools, the positive means to oppose and stop wars and preparations for war, to resist violence, to struggle against racial, sexual and economic oppression and discrimination and to seek social justice and genuine democracy for people throughout the world (Ishu, Kamla, Singh, Neha, 2013a).

Where there is power imbalance, nonviolence is the perfect response. Gene Sharp (2013) identifies sources of power which rulers often use against opponents and which needs to be understood by those who want to wage nonviolent resistance. The sources include among others: authority, human resources, skills and knowledge, material resources and sanctions (Sharp, 2013: 7). Thus, for dictatorship to flourish and succeed it depends on the obedience of the people to these varying sources of power. For the effectiveness of nonviolence resistance, it is critical to understand these sources of power and appropriate the necessary action to avoid retribution. The non-violence approach is premised on the fact that “revolutionary change can be brought about by non-violent means; it focused on the social roots of the power of the

state and refused to challenge the state on its own terms, that is with violence (Shock cited in Hardman, 2013: 45).

Govier conceives nonviolence as constitutive of “those methods of protest, non-cooperation, and intervention in which the actors, without employing physical violence, refuse to do certain things they are expected or required to do; or do certain things they are not expected, or are forbidden, to do” (Govier, 2008: 63). Nonviolent struggle is identified by what people do, not by what they believe (Sharp, 2005: 8). The action of the people becomes the basis of its implementation. In violent regimes those weaker choose to be passive to state sponsored violence. Chenoweth & Cunningham (2013) have defined it as the application of unarmed civilian power using nonviolent methods such as protests, strikes, boycotts, and demonstrations, without using or threatening physical harm against the opponent.

Dudouet (2004a) has argued that the basic “principles of nonviolent resistance encompass an abstention from using physical force to achieve an aim, but also a full engagement in resisting oppression, domination and any other forms of injustice”. These principles can be used against direct or structural violence used by state actors. For the purposes of this study, the three approaches given by Sharp will be used, namely nonviolent protest and persuasion, non-cooperation, and nonviolent intervention. These are related to the political choices of the MDC. Nonviolent resistance covers a wide range of actions. The nonviolent approach is not a sign of weakness but rather “a response of how to act effectively in politics, especially how to wield power effectively” (Sharp, 2013: 18). This study uses the definition by Sharp which groups nonviolent action as a form of protest, resistance and intervention without physical violence which he summarised as follows:

such action may be conducted by (a) acts of omission that is, the participants refuse to perform acts that they usually perform, are expected by custom to

perform, or are required by law or regulation to perform; (b) acts of commission that is, the participants perform acts that they usually do not perform, are not expected by custom to perform, or are forbidden by law or regulation from performing; or (c) a combination of both" (Sharp, 2005: 547).

Thus, nonviolent struggle "connotes the waging of strong forms of nonviolent action against determined opponents who are prepared to impose serious repression (Sharp, 2005: 548).

The 20th Century represented an era of colonial rebellions. The creation of overseas empires provided a basis for the use of nonviolent resistance throughout the world. This type of struggle has been used to gain national independence, to generate economic gains, to resist genocide, to undermine dictatorships, to gain civil rights, to end segregation, and to resist foreign occupations and coups d'état (Sharp, 2005: 5).

The Nazi and Communist dictatorships in Germany and Russia respectively produced some of the most damaging dictatorships ever experienced in Europe. The Germans used nonviolent resistance against the Kapp Putsch in 1920 and against the French and Belgian occupation of the Ruhr in 1923 and the Nazi dictatorships under Hitler. Nonviolent resistance was used by the Norwegians, Danes and the Netherlands against Nazi occupation. It was also used to save the Jews in Berlin, Denmark and other occupied European nations (Sharp, 2005: 5). The end of communist dictatorship in Europe in 1989 also saw the adoption of the nonviolent resistance in most Russian occupied territories. Nonviolent struggle brought about the end of Communist dictatorships in Poland and Czechoslovakia in 1989 and in East Germany, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in 1991 (Sharp, 2005: 5). In East Timor "the Clandestine Front, developed a large decentralized network of activists, who planned and executed various nonviolent campaigns inside East Timor, in Indonesia, and internationally. These

included protests timed to the visits of diplomats and dignitaries, sit-ins inside foreign embassies, and international solidarity efforts that reinforced Timorese-led nonviolent activism” (Chenoweth, 2015: 4). This led to the ousting of Suharto the Indonesian dictator in 1998.

In modern times nonviolent resistance has been applied by Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King Jr and Nelson Mandela, among many others. Sharp (1973) defined it as “a general technique of conducting protest, resistance, and intervention without physical force” while Martin Luther argued that “non-violence is a powerful weapon and just weapon. Indeed, it is a weapon unique in history which cuts without wounding and enables the man who wields it”. Ghandi defined it as people power (Gaur 1977). Mahatma Ghandi further advocates that non-violence is the law of our species as violence is the law of the brute.

Ghandi having been inspired by the readings of Tostoy (1867, 1878 and 1886) and Thoreau (1849) used nonviolent means in political and practical action. He also introduced a greater attention to strategy and tactics in campaigns of mass defiance (Sharp, 1973: 82). From the 1950s Martin L King jnr used it in nonviolent civil rights campaigns including bus boycotts. Nonviolence was deployed in countries including Chile in 1988, the Philippines in 1986, South Africa in 1994, Poland in 1989, Serbia in 2000, and Tunisia and Egypt in 2011. These nonviolent movements were all Ghandi inspired.

In South Africa, the African National Congress (ANC) used nonviolent resistance in their struggle against the Apartheid regime in 1952. The ANC ran a defiance campaign against apartheid rallying members with the slogan ‘Open the jail doors, we want to enter’. Leaders such as Nelson Mandela were imprisoned for openly challenging the apartheid system peacefully. While the ANC formed the military wing Umkonto we Sizwe with the idea of using military means to fight apartheid, “it

was the nonviolent strategies such as boycotts and talking to intermediaries that brought de Klerk and Mandela to the negotiating table when they realised that violence would not bring an end to the conflict" (Marks, 2006: 54-56). This was a successful attempt at defying segregatory apartheid laws in South Africa. As a result of this, membership in the ANC drastically increased. Ghandi also inspired African leaders like Kenneth Kaunda who said 'It is by the power of forgiveness we are freed from the burden of past guilt so that we can act boldly in the present' (Kaunda, 1982: 182)." As pointed out by Kaunda, nonviolent resistance has been a matter of faith and Africanism. Having hosted the Zimbabwean freedom fighters and played an active role in the formation of the frontline states, Kaunda said "there are times when revolutions are a tragic necessity because the extension of human rights to large numbers of oppressed citizens can be achieved in no other way" (Kaunda, 1982: 93). His argument was based on a dilemma between human security and resistance. This can be found in most proponents of nonviolent resistance after facing atrocities committed by the other side.

Ghandi believed in truth and love as the guiding principle for the non-violent movement to succeed. His teachings were based on the principle of satyagraha and ahimsa. Mary King explained "satyagraha as the quest for Truth, satyagraha blended the mind, body and soul for the attainment of personal and, ultimately, social transformation" (King, 1999: 15). "Satyagraha was both sophisticated and filled with moral ramifications. Nonviolent movement was construed as the means to convert the power in nonviolence, or ahimsa into political action" (King, 1999: 264). Satyagraha combined ethical and practical action to guide the daily endeavours of people. Central to satyagraha was the idea that proponents of nonviolent struggle were to commit themselves against any forms of injustice and be willing to serve and be servants of the community. "Non-violence and Satyagraha (pursuit of Truth) presuppose humility and readiness to understand even the

most unpleasant stand of the opponent. This is applicable to those in power if they want to deal with problems non-violently” (Ishu, etal 2013a).

Ahimsa was a religious teaching of love blended with political messaging. Ghandi remarked that “Literally speaking ahimsa is non-killing. But to me it has a world of meanings and takes me into realms much higher, infinitely higher than the realm to which I would go, if I merely understood ahimsa as non-killing. Ahimsa really means that you may not offend anybody; you may not harbour an uncharitable thought even in connection with one who may consider himself to be your enemy... for one who follows the doctrine of ahimsa, there is no room for an enemy, he denies the existence of an enemy. . . If we return blow for blow, we depart from the doctrine of ahimsa...” (Ghandi Cited in Mazmudar, 2002).

King developed the principles through which nonviolence can be applied. Martin Luther King’s “Letter from Birmingham Jail” laid out the philosophical basis of nonviolent resistance which became the basis of the civil rights movement in the sixties America (Shippy, 2005a). Nonviolence principles can be summarised as a way of life for courageous people, it seeks to win friendship and understanding and defeat injustice, not people. Nonviolence holds that suffering can educate and transform, it chooses love instead of hate and believes that the universe is on the side of justice (King, 2005).

These principles are used to attain peace without bloodshed. They give contrary views to what Malcom X (2005:144) advocated, “if there is to be bleeding, it should be reciprocal... bleeding on both sides.” Malcolm X encouraged people to reciprocate whenever faced with a violent organisation. The principles which King stood for show a strict adherence to truth, non-injury, commitment to love, and upholding morality. King believed that the universe serves justice to the suffering

masses. A commitment to nonviolence is a commitment to self-suffering and not cowardice. Admittedly, nonviolence in the “truest sense, is not a strategy that one uses simply because it is expedient at the moment; it is ultimately a way of life that men live by because of the sheer morality of its claim” (King, 1999: 248). He further asserted that “We must somehow confront physical force with soul force and stand up courageously for justice and freedom. And this dynamic unity, this amazing self-respect, this willingness to suffer and this refusal to hit back will cause the oppressors to become ashamed of their own methods and we will be able to transform enemies into friends” (King, 1999; 274). King (1999) remarked that “I can never be what I ought to be until you are what you ought to be. And you can never be what you ought to be until I am what I ought to be.”

The Arab spring provided a classic example of nonviolent resistance. The Palestinian resistance of Israel occupation through the intifada in 1987 shows that nonviolent resistance is a tool for successfully challenging repressive forces. However, there is need to guard against a resort to violence as it can mark a turning point in the war. As stated by Roberts (1991: 6-7) the intifada internationalised the Palestinian agenda. Despite the brute show of force by Israel, the world has put the Palestinian cause into the international arena.

In Egypt and Tunisia, the Arab spring movement helped in ousting two longstanding dictators from office. The Arab spring was a turning point in the demand for accountability and human security. Even in Sudan Al Bashir faced the same fate when the Sudanese roundly protested against his rule leading to his ouster. As pointed out by Hove (2016), “evidence from Saudi Arabia, Syria, Tunisia and Egypt shows that although nonviolence strategies face challenges, there is room for success if the strategies are well implemented.” With the exception of Tunisia, Egypt and Sudan have regressed to military rule while in Syria the Free Syria faction turned a peaceful campaign into

an all-out war. Nonviolent resistance was eclipsed and Syria became a battleground of international forces which has led to deaths and imprisonment of prominent campaigners. Hove (2016: 65) rightly pointed out that “the USA and allies supported the Free Syrian Army which was composed of fighters drawn from different countries such as Libya, Afghanistan and Chechnya among others, thereby weakening nonviolent resistance. In fact, this reduced the fighting force to a US sponsored group trying to bring about regime change in Syria”.

This study adopted the theory of nonviolent resistance that was introduced by scholars such as Tolstoy, Thoreau and others. Henry David Thoreau (1849) formed the basis of nonviolent struggles against authority. He argues that “man should not be an instrument of oppression in pursuit of political correctness of the state rather man should strive to resist any movements towards enhancing oppressive rule” (Thoreau, 1849: 14). He argues that “under a government which imprisons any unjustly, the true place for a just man is also a prison” (Thoreau, 1849:14). He goes on to say “the authority of government, even such as I am willing to submit to... is still an impure one: to be strictly just, it must have the sanction and consent of the governed” (Thoreau, 1849: 27). He views man as the power behind the state thus can withdraw his powers passively when those in power start abusing it. He sacrificed his freedom by opting to go to prison rather than pay taxes which he felt were oiling an oppressive system. Many people view Mohandas K. Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr as the brains behind the nonviolent resistance movements owing to their work and practice. Mohandas K. Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr are two prominent practitioners of the discourse. There are notable examples of nonviolent resistance throughout the world. The practice has been going on even before them. Sharp (2005:4) notes that “...from the late eighteenth century to the twentieth century, the technique of nonviolent action was widely used in colonial rebellions, international

political, economic and religious conflicts and anti-slavery resistance". Various scholars have been influential in shaping the nonviolent discourse in the modern world; among them are Tolstoy, Sharp, Shock, Thoreau and others. Throughout history the campaigns of nonviolence have been done sporadically dating as far back as 449 BC when the Roman Plebs organised a general strike (Shock, 2013: 278) to the 2010 Arab Spring in Egypt, Tunisia and Syria.

The advent of the nationalist struggle for independence provides notable examples of the use of nonviolent means to ending colonialism and oppression in Africa. Shock (2013) critically enumerates some notable examples of "nationalist struggles, such as Hungarian resistance to Austrian rule from 1849 to 1867, Finnish resistance to Russian rule from 1899 to 1906, and the Egyptian general strike against British occupation in 1919, were sustained efforts to promote political transformation through collective nonviolent resistance". Nonviolent resistance was also used in some labour struggles in Italy in 1904, Spain in 1919, and Britain in 1926. General strikes were a potent weapon of working class protest (Shock, 2013: 278).

There are three main techniques used in nonviolent resistance which are nonviolent protest and persuasion, non-cooperation and nonviolent intervention. Ackerman points to the effectiveness of technique in nonviolent resistance. He asserts that:

...the skills involved in waging nonviolent conflict, the ability to plan, mobilize and maintain civic pressure on unjust power, can overcome structural conditions heretofore considered insurmountable. Why? Because strategies of civil resistance are incremental and their effects cumulative. The versatile use of nonviolent tactics can unfreeze unfavourable conditions and so raise the temperature underneath autocrats (Ackerman, 2007: 8).

Nonviolent resistance is about skill, technique and execution which contribute to its success. There is need to adhere to the principles to

achieve success failure to use these often results in the failure of nonviolent resistance.

Nonviolent protest and persuasion is a physical peaceful protest against authorities. Sharp (2013) noted that “nonviolent protest and persuasion is a class which includes a large number of methods which are mainly symbolic acts of peaceful opposition or of attempted persuasion, extending beyond verbal expressions but stopping short of non-cooperation or nonviolent intervention.” Among these methods are parades, vigils, picketing, posters, teach-ins, mourning, and protest meetings. The methods used clearly shows that those involved are against what the government is doing. The methods used avoid confrontations and allows people to protest without leading to bloodshed. This method may also include sit in, strikes, and disrobing. What informs these actions is the consciousness of the need to avoid violent confrontations. Protests and demonstrations have been identified as the most common and widely used actions in nonviolent struggle which serves as the backbone of dissent. They are symbolic in that they bring people with the same grievances to a wider audience. They help to recruit the wider populations into peaceful resistance.

Non-cooperation is a method where the people disassociate themselves from the oppressor. This method was first used in 1920 by Ghandi against the ruthless British rule in India. The method encourages people to ignore goods and services from the oppressor and those linked to the regime. This is intended to cripple the operations of those associated with the government and leading them to empathise with the people. “One of the more powerful forms of nonviolent resistance is disobedience or non-cooperation with the rules of the regime, it is also the most known form of nonviolent action, and the one mostly connected to the old state-paradigm” (Vinthagen, 2006a). People deliberately target the sources of power. The use of non-cooperation “consciously and deliberately stands to end or limit

engagement or participation in specific activities, either partially or completely. At the heart of such methods lies the reality that all political relationships and systems depend upon the cooperation of the governed, whether through consent, acquiescence, or duress" (Miller, 2006: 45).

Notable methods of non-cooperation include rejection of authority such withholding of allegiance, illegitimising a government and refusal to join a coalition government. People can choose not to cooperate with the government by rejecting government employment, rejecting government institutions and funding. For non-cooperation to be effective, in the case of Zimbabwe, there were calls for ignoring punitive government laws such as Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act (AIPPA) and Public Order and Security Act (POSA).

Nonviolent intervention involves third parties to the conflict. Boothe & Smithey (2007: 39) have argued that "the approach increasingly known as third-party nonviolent intervention... is a collection of tactics and methods used to support, rather than direct, social change work in intense conflict situations". The aim is protecting vulnerable groups by avoiding the escalation of the conflict. In cases of acute conflict, nongovernmental organisations may pressure the state actors to use civil means against protestors which might help in lessening the violent repressions. Stephan and Chenoweth (2008: 12) argues that "external actors may organize sanctions against repressive regimes that repeatedly crack down on unarmed protestors". Boothe and Smithey (2007:43) further assert that "the main methods of contemporary third-party nonviolent intervention all seek to protect vulnerable non-combatants, support local activists, confront oppressive power structures, and open space for democracy to flourish" (Boothe & Smithey, 2007: 43).

Those who advocate for nonviolent intervention use four approaches of intervention which include protective accompaniment, observing or monitoring, interposition, and presence. Protective accompaniment means putting activists in the international glare for them to be protected from harm. Those in the international glare become the focal persons of the international community and their views become internationally publicised. Observing or monitoring entails recording every activity especially during election time to counter fraudulent activities and vote rigging. This can be done through the use of both local and international observers and in some instance polling agents for political parties. In the Zimbabwean context there was the invitation of Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) and African Union (AU) observers who gave their views once elections were held. These observers become the international eyes. This is probably “the most frequently used technique of third party intervention, and it is often used by organizations, such as the United Nations or international political agencies in the United States, that are not otherwise engaged in third party intervention” (Boothe and Smithey, 2007: 43).

The central concepts in understanding dynamics of civil resistance are mobilization, resilience, and leverage (Shock, 2013: 282). For nonviolence to work there is need for proper education on would be practitioners otherwise without proper training some members might resort to fighting back injustice as it occurs to them during the course of the struggle. There is need to understand the underlying conflict situation so that activists are better prepared to deal with both physical and structural violence applied against them. There could be need for showing the effectiveness of the methods to be applied so that people can have confidence in their choices.

A key characteristic of nonviolent resistance is the way it is organised, coordinated, and the quality in which civilians use it for a particular

goal. It relies on the shared grievances by participants. There is convergence of factors which binds people together towards a certain goal. There is need for a multidimensional strategy to mobilise resilience against the government.

Planning of a nonviolent resistance is of critical importance especially when dealing with a ruthless and cunning opponent. Most “democratic” states co-opt the state institutions such as police, army and intelligence service to serve the functions of the party rather than the people. In such instance, there is need to plan effectively so that the movement will not be hijacked for ulterior motives. The people need to be taught about the tenets and the purposes of such a struggle in order for it not to degenerate into a violent uprising. This might defeat the purpose of the resistance.

For a nonviolent movement to gain traction it should be organised well so as not to fall into the trap of hoodlums. Lack of a well organised structure in civil resistance becomes its albatross. In China the students used an “extensive network to organise their protests often using marshals for crowd control, a telephonic network for communication, pass system for access to their command structure and a propaganda machinery going into the neighbourhood to air student grievances and drums to alert citizens of troops movement” (Sharp & Jenkins, 1990: 44). Organisation and strategy should be the key leverage points. Using the Chinese example Sharp & Jenkins (1990) found out that the students in China made a strategic blunder by physically occupying the Monument of the Peoples Heroes which played into the hands of agents’ provocateurs and was a daring challenge to the government.

The media should play a critical role in promoting and outlining the principles through which nonviolence is promoted. Media is the medium through which the message is propagated by publishing the successes and importance of nonviolence. Cases where violence has

led to disastrous consequences such as in Rwanda during the genocide in 1994, the Libyan and Syrian conflict should be highlighted in the media to show how important nonviolent resistance can be. The media should show how:

the events of the Arab Spring of 2011 have made clear the importance and potential efficacy of nonviolent resistance... In January and February 2011, nonviolent activists, protestors, and labour organizations in Tunisia and Egypt were able to accomplish what years of violent rebellion could not – fundamental regime change (Chenoweth & Cunningham, 2013: 272).

Sometimes nonviolent resistance is motivated by the practical realisation that the protesters have no real chance of armed insurrection against a heavily armed government. In China, the students who protested against the government cited “the 1986 student march which was heavily crushed as a reason for protesting non-violently” (Sharp & Jenkins, 1990: 43). The students had realised that the socio-economic contradictions of China could not be solved violently but rather through engagement. They wanted to reform rather than overthrow the government.

Participation in a nonviolent movement is key to its success. The more the people participate the higher the chances of success. Nonviolent action requires people participation, rallies, boycotts and demonstrations. Participation “shows that more people care about an issue, and sometimes can produce a bandwagon effect, winning over ever greater numbers until opponents feel outnumbered and give up. It provides a sense of mutual support, as those involved are encouraged by the fact that others are too” (Martin, 2005: 45). The more people participate, the more resources to the movement are unveiled.

Abrahams’ works delves into the correspondence inference theory as a tool for success of nonviolent resistance movement. Correspondent inference theory can help to sway neutral observers as methods used

sometimes are stronger than the goals of the protesters. The methods used are vital for the leverage of protesters. Some state actors such as police and military might choose to remain neutral while neutrals may choose to join the movement. Some might choose to fraternise their opponents which means winning them over through explaining the reasons for their actions. Martin (2005) concluded that “by explaining what they are doing, and making personal contact protesters can win over some police and soldiers. Through all these means, nonviolent activists can undermine the willingness of opponent troops to use violence, and thereby neutralise what is seen as the ultimate sanction by the regime, physical force.” In essence, “through nonviolent empowerment, the underdogs increase their acceptability as a legitimate party in the conflict, and also their range of bargaining options” (Dudouet, 2017a).

Many people fail to distinguish between a nonviolent campaign and a violent one because of the violence usually perpetrated by one group. Nonviolent activists might suffer from government violence but as long they do not violently respond, the campaign can legitimately be classified as nonviolent. Most studies focus on the successful struggles, but a critical understanding of the failed ones is valuable for deeper analysis.

There is a general misconception on the incompatibility of nonviolence and military action. Studies have shown that nonviolent activists and the military might win over each other and end up fighting the same enemy. In the 1960s, during the civil rights era, government institutions responded by addressing the concern of the protesters. In time of war nonviolent action may resort to non-cooperation and other forms of underground resistance to thwart military action. What we learn from the struggles during World War II is that nonviolent resistance at the grassroots level, and military action at the

governmental level, can pursue a common goal in their efforts to bring an end to extreme aggression and persecution (Wolfe, 2005).

The rise and evolution of the modern state has limited the significance of nonviolent resistance. Most modern states have shown the superiority of violence which has undermined efforts and importance of nonviolent action. Martin (2015) has opined that “it seems plausible to look for associations between changing social structure and the rise of nonviolent action as a distinct approach to struggle... The modern nation-state, with its bureaucracies, militaries, and police, enabled great concentration of power in the hands of rulers”. More often, history has tended to focus on the great man, mainly those who have used war as a means to an end, but those who have used nonviolent approaches have been seen as lacking both tact and results. In this regard, many are motivated by the popular culture which portrays violence as a tool for expressing hegemonic power in society.

Nonviolent action is not a method of the ‘middle class’ or a ‘bourgeois’ approach to political contention. Nonviolent action “can and has been implemented by groups from all classes and castes, from slaves to members of the upper-class” (McCarthy and Kruegler, 1993). For obvious reasons, it is used more frequently by the less-powerful, that is, those without regular access to power holders, than by the powerful.

The effectiveness of nonviolent action is not a function of the repressiveness of the oppressors. In fact, nonviolent action has been effective in brutally repressive contexts, and it has been ineffective in open democratic polities. Repression, of course, constrains the ability of challengers to organize, communicate, mobilize, and engage in collective action, and magnifies the risk of participation in collective action. Nevertheless, repression is only one of many factors that

influence the trajectories of campaigns of nonviolent action, not the sole determinant of their trajectories.

One of the arguments raised against nonviolent action is that it cannot succeed against opponents willing to use violence. This argument assumes that the “willingness to use violence” cannot be affected by what the protesters do. With the right choice of tactics, police and military personnel are more likely to refuse orders and more likely to defect. In other words, willingness to use violence can be influenced by the actions of protesters. By remaining nonviolent, protesters pose no physical threat to opponents, thereby reducing their incentive to use violence. By careful choice of tactics and messages, protesters make their cause more appealing, increasing the chance of defections. By making themselves vulnerable, by protesting and putting themselves at risk of harm, protesters show themselves as human beings, as people who are like other people, and thereby harder to attack. From the perspective of empirical research, the argument that violence represents the only realistic option ignores the wide variety of documented historical experiences where nonviolent actions were able to prevent, deter, or end violence by oppressive actors (Jackson, 2017: 3).

Philosophers such as Thomas Hobbes, in his interpretation of the state of nature, proposed that “in the state of nature, first, we are roughly equal; no one is so strong that they can dominate others and overpower all resistance. Any difference of physical strength can be matched by the other person finding people to help, or by their intelligence, or by their experience. The best form of defence, the best way to get what we want, is to attack first”. This argument is buttressed by the belief that power should be used on other people to get or maintain it. Through the Law of Nature violence becomes a threat to self-preservation. The fundamental Law of Nature is “the Passions that most of all cause the differences of Wit, are principally,

the more or less Desire of Power, of Riches, of Knowledge, and of Honour. All which may be reduced to the first that is Desire of Power, For Riches, Knowledge and Honour are but several sorts of Power" (Hobbes, 1992: 53).

The theory of nonviolence emasculates various arguments given by pro-power scholars who argue and justify war as the basis of power. Frederic Nietzsche (2002) advocates the importance of war in politics christening it as a natural being. He questions the value of values? Nietzsche emphasises power retention at all costs arguing that "the world seen from inside, the world determined and described with respect to its 'intelligible character' – would be just this will to power and nothing else" (Nietzsche cited in Horstmann and Norman, 2002). In all willing, there is, first, a plurality of sensations, namely, the sensation of the state 'away from which,' the sensation of the state 'towards which,' the sensations of this 'from' and 'towards' themselves, and then also an accompanying muscular sensation that, even without our putting into motion 'arms and legs,' begins its action by force of habit as soon as we 'will' anything" (Nietzsche, 1966: 9).

This study disputes the claim that war occurrences happen naturally without the deliberate effort of people. Disastrous wars the world over are machinations of people such as the World Wars in 1914 and 1939, the liberation movements in Africa and the Civil Wars thereafter. Thus, the Ghandian and Martin Luther King approaches were after a careful realisation of people power in a peaceful way. The MDC approach to political power had the same realisation of how colonialism through brutalisation failed to stop future war, the liberation struggle from the 1960s to independence in 1980 gave peace which was wrecked by the Gukurahundi in Matabeleland from 1982-1987. Tsvangirai often stated his desire by claiming that he 'would not walk to state house on dead bodies'. The MDC first identified constitutionalism as the problem towards democratisation and vigorously campaigned for a new

constitution through the National Constitutional Assembly in 1999 followed by a series of nonviolent strikes and stayaways.

Nonviolent resistance, through its practical use, should be construed as an integral part of conflict transformation in the Zimbabwean conflict especially after the destructive effects of the 1st and 2nd Chimurenga and the Matabeleland disturbances from 1982-1987. All these wars have left lasting memories and societies divided and displaced and thousands killed. Thus, nonviolent discourse offers a “possible approach to achieving peace and justice, alongside other methods of conflict intervention focusing on dialogue, problem-solving and the restoration of cooperative relationships” (Dudouet, 2008). This thesis focuses more on ways it has been used by non-state actors in Zimbabwe since 1999 and other social movements in the civil society and grassroots organisations.

As stated by King (1957), “I never intend to adjust myself to the tragic effects of the methods of physical violence and to tragic militarism”. He goes further to buttress the fact that:

As maladjusted as Jefferson, who in the midst of an age amazingly adjusted to slavery could cry out, “All men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights and that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.” As maladjusted as Jesus of Nazareth who dreamt a dream of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. God grant that we will be so maladjusted that we will be able to go out and change our world and our civilization. And then we will be able to move from the bleak and desolate midnight of man’s inhumanity to man to the bright and glittering daybreak of freedom and justice (King, 1957).

This study argues that the typical structural conditions leading to resort to nonviolent struggle are that more conventional political and legal channels appear blocked, yet people are unwilling to abandon their goals. Out of their own creativity or, more often, through hearing of or remembering events that seem relevant, people discover a way to

act. In a very real sense, nonviolence is the leaven for the bread that is a new society freed from oppression and bloodshed, a world in which persons can fulfil their individual potentials to the fullest (Ishu *et al.*, 2013a).

Sometimes nonviolent action is used in a political crisis as an improvisation after the realisation that the opponent being faced has the entire state arsenal at their disposal making it difficult to wage violent resistance. It is very critical to carefully plan nonviolent resistance to prevail against violent opponents. Different social groups might use strikes and sit-ins to force the government to increase wages. In the case of Zimbabwe, the MDC was born out of convergence of different interest groups such as workers, lawyers and human rights defenders thus resistance often took sectoral interest.

The conventional view of power is that it is something some people have and others don't. Power resides in soldiers, authority, ownership of wealth, and institutions. The use of nonviolent means is an attempt to show that people wield enormous power which can defeat the powerful who exercise control over state repressive apparatus. The social movements after realising that they neither have control nor influence in these institutions often use the social base to air out their grievances and in some cases highlight their cause.

The widespread practice of this technique is more "often based on the undeniable capacity of human beings to be stubborn, and to do what they want to do or to refuse to do what they are ordered, whatever their beliefs about the use or non-use of violence" (Sharp, 2005:12). Due to the nature of political power, the use of nonviolence is essential as it exposes the weaknesses of most unflinching political systems which are dictatorial but rely on the people for political legitimacy. When people repudiate their opponents' authority, refuse cooperation, withhold assistance, and persist in disobedience and defiance, they are

denying to their opponents the basic human assistance and cooperation that any government or hierarchical system requires (Sharp, 2005: 12).

Zimbabwe has had a painful history of violence since colonisation. This history has created a culture of violence in Zimbabwean politics. From the violent colonisation process to the 2nd Chimurenga, violence has been amplified as a political tool. Within the liberation movement, violence was glorified as a punishing tool for 'sell outs'. After independence, Mugabe continued with this approach. The theory of nonviolence shows a shift from this violent politics to politics of reason. This chapter presented the literature review and the theory of nonviolence, what it is and what it stands for and its applicability to the Zimbabwean context. The next chapter focuses on the research methodology.