politically-vulnerable President Robert Mugabe and his administration have unleashed the harshest news media crackdown in their notoriously repressive tenure. Starled by the 29 March state media results that favored the opposition, Mugabe’s government has arbitrarily detained at least 15 journalists and media workers, intimidated sources, obstructed the delivery of independent news, and tightened its grasp on state media.

“This is the worst time for journalists in Zimbabwe’s history,” Geoff Hill, an exiled Zimbabwean reporter and author, told the Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ). Several other veteran journalists, both local and foreign, offered the same characterisation during interviews conducted here and in areas bordering Zimbabwe.

The press crackdown comes as police, soldiers, and militants with the ruling Zanu-PF party have orchestrated a campaign to violence aimed at crushing the opposition and ensuring that Mugabe, 84, will remain in power as he has since 1980. This has resulted in Morgan Tsvangirai of the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC) withdrawing from the presidential runoff saying he could not ask supporters to cast a ballot when “that vote could cost them their lives”.

A strike in journalist arrests immediately after the 29 March election – among them the detention of Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter Barry Bearak – drew worldwide attention. But CPJ’s investigation has found that throughout the run-off election period, Mugabe’s government has engaged in an ongoing pattern of press harassment. Police have arrested journalists without basis and charged them under nonexistent laws. State radio has been filled with pro-Mugabe propaganda. Foreign newspapers have been subjected to onerous import charges, their staffers to outright attack. Despite the crackdown, numerous local and foreign journalists are taking risks to get the Zimbabwean story out to the world.

Independent news outlets are scarce in Zimbabwe, the product of many years of government repression. Zimbabwe today has no independent daily newspapers, no private radio news coverage, and just two prominent independent weeklies. Seven news websites and one radio station have been launched outside the country by exiled Zimbabwean journalists, although access to them is limited inside Zimbabwe’s borders. Two television stations and a small handful of newspapers from South Africa also reach into the country.

About a half-dozen international news organisations have correspondents permanently stationed in Harare, although the number grows several-fold during election periods. Many news organisations are forced to skirt restrictive entry requirements so they can report inside the country. For the 29 March vote, major outlets such as CNN, BBC, Sky News and South Africa’s e.tv were officially barred from covering the election inside the country.

Unlike some African countries where foreign journalists can work relatively freely, Zimbabwe has targeted journalists working for international media. Just one week after the election results were announced, five foreign media workers were detained across the country. Bearak, a New York Times correspondent, was arrested during this period and charged with “committing journalism”.

“One of my captors, Detective Inspector Dani Rangwani, described the offense to me as something despicable,” Bearak recounted in an interview with CPJ.

It was not, however, a crime. Zimbabwe’s parliament this year revised the country’s notorious Access to Information and Privacy Policy Act, or AIPPA, allowing journalists to work without state accreditation. That did not stop authorities from using the now-obsolete section of the law to arbitrarily arrest at least 10 journalists. “Now when the police arrest journalists they are either using trumped-up charges or laws that no longer exist,” Bearak said.

All types of media workers have been targeted, CPJ research shows. In May, three truck drivers were arrested for allegedly hauling Sky News equipment, and they are now facing six-month jail terms. In March, two technicians working for the South African media company GlobeCast were arrested while setting up cameras and other equipment for an interview with Information Minister Sikhanyiso Ndluvu. One of them, cameraman Sipho Moses Maseko, spent most of two weeks in Zimbabwean prisons, including one meant for hardened criminals, before being acquitted on obsolete accreditation charges. “The main prison was particularly dire – it’s full of sick people,” Maseko said.

A veteran newsman, he was still shocked at landing in jail “for setting up a microphone”.

The GlobeCast case was replete with irregularities, CPJ’s investigation found. One magistrate, finding no basis for the arrests of Maseko and colleague Abdullah Ismail Gaibbe, ordered their release only to see a high-ranking police inspector simply re-arrest the pair within minutes of their leaving the Harare courtroom.

“The law is only adhered to and applied when it serves the perpetuation of the state,” said Beatrice Mbetwa, a human rights lawyer who has defended a number of journalists.

Trumped-up and retaliatory charges were used in several cases, CPJ found. Frank Chikowore, a Zimbabwean journalist, was arrested on charges of “public violence” during a protest on 15 April organised by the MDC. The charge was related to the torching of a bus during the event – but local journalists said Chikowore arrived at the scene at least five hours after the bus had been set on fire. Although he was finally released on bail, Chikowore was denied medical attention for abdominal pains for days.

Chikowore’s lawyer Harrison Nkomo, was himself arrested for “insulting the president” in private remarks he is said to have made to the state prosecutor. Criticism of Mugabe is on the books as a criminal offence, and it was enforced with greater frequency during the run-off period. An article critical of Mugabe by MDC faction leader Arthur Mutambara in the independent weekly The Standard led to the arrest of Mutumbara and the paper’s editor Davison Maruziva.

Ironically, the run-up to the 29 March elections had been relatively calm for the press. In talks with the Southern Africa Development Community Mugabe’s administration agreed to amend AIPPA, which had been considered one of the most restrictive press accreditation laws in the world. The negotiations, designed to promote fair elections, also produced an agreement that election results would be posted outside polling stations.

Opposition party leaders called the initial election period the freest and fairest since the MDC’s 1999 inception. Confident of victory, Zanu-PF allowed state media to broadcast opposition campaign material. State broadcasters announced results in vernacular languages to reach a wider audience.

Those results showed the MDC had won an unprecedented majority in parliament, and that Tsvangirai appeared to have won at least a slim victory in the presidential race. The people voted for change, US Ambassador James McGee said in an interview with exile-run SW Radio, and the ruling elite were not prepared for it.

A clique of senior generals in the Joint Operations Command pushed back with a vengeance, directing widespread violence in rural areas where the MDC made unexpected electoral gains, according to news reports and CPJ interviews. The state-sponsored intimidation list has expanded daily to include civic leaders, teachers, human rights lawyers, church leaders, and even diplomats.

Mugabe has long been willing to endure political isolation from the West, but this time he has come in for regional criticism as well. Although South African President Thabo Mbeki has been guarded in his comments, African National Congress President Jacob Zuma and veteran South African cabinet minister Pallo Jordan were vocal in their criticism.

Then 40 prominent African political and civic leaders, including Mozambican President Joaquim Chissano, a once-staunch ally of Mugabe, wrote an open letter calling for free and fair elections.

CPJ’s investigation found that it has been exceptionally difficult to report the story from rural areas, where state-sponsored torture has become commonplace. The brutal tactics of pro-government militia units such as theZimbabwean Special Reserve Forces have intimidated many sources into silence, reporters told CPJ. Journalists not only risk their own safety in these areas, they said, they fear endangering those they interview.

“We can’t go to rural areas to do violence stories as we were able in early April,” said Peta Thomas, a Zimbabwean reporter for the London-based Daily Telegraph. “We would bring danger to people who are already in danger. Several contacts have sent messages to us not to come.” Even the informal network of information that once existed between rural areas and towns
is largely broken now due to deteriorating phone lines and increasingly infrequent bus routes, Thornycroft said.

Opposition sources also became scarce as they feared arrest or attack. Tsvangirai was detained at least five times in less than two weeks, and the MDC claimed that 86 supporters were killed in state-sponsored violence.

Even if the MDC could have talked freely, the opposition stopped getting airtime on state broadcast media. In May, the government dismissed Henry Muradzikwa, chief executive officer of the Zimbabwe Broadcasting Corporation, for allegedly defying orders to suppress favorable opposition coverage, according to local reports.

At least seven senior broadcasters were also suspended for failing to cast Mugabe’s campaign in a sufficiently positive light, according to the exile-run news website ZamOnline. Newly appointed ZBC chief Happion Muchechetere, a staunch Zanu-PF loyalist, began packaging news bulletins with campaign messages from the ruling party.

About the same time, Mugabe spokesman George Charamba instructed all state media outlets to block MDC campaign advertisements and pro-opposition editorials. The Media Monitoring Project cited a dramatic surge in pro-Zanu-PF music, advertisements, and programming – including 66 Zanu-PF advertisements in the first week of June. Unsurprisingly, the government media has not provided balanced or comprehensive coverage of the widespread political violence or of the Zimbabwe Electoral Commission’s run-off preparations.

As they have tightened their grasp on state media, the ruling elite have cracked down on distribution of independent news. According to The Standard, the government decided in early June to deploy soldiers to obstruct private newspaper dealers in the Masvingo district of southern Zimbabwe and in two towns in the midlands, Gweru and Kwekwe. The paper also reported cases of Zanu-PF militias assaulting people holding copies of The Standard’s sister paper, Zimbabwe Independent, in the eastern Harare suburbs of Mabvuku and Tafara. Government militias in Matabeleland ordered residents to remove satellite receivers from their homes so they could not receive “misleading reports” from South African and Botswana broadcasters, the Media Institute of Southern Africa reported.

To obstruct foreign newspapers entering Zimbabwe, the government imposed import duties and surcharges of up to 60% in June, according to local reports. SW Radio and Voice of America’s Studio 7 were periodically jammed by the government during the election period, local journalists told CPJ. SW Radio founder Gerry Jackson, an exiled Zimbabwean residing in the United Kingdom, now sends daily news bulletins to 22,000 people through ZamOnline. Newly appointed ZBC chief Happion Muchechetere, a staunch Zanu-PF loyalist, began packaging news bulletins with campaign messages from the ruling party.

Journalists based in South Africa are making quick forays of their own across the border.

“Even with this big suppression, networks still manage to smuggle cameras in and conduct hit-and-run interviews,” said GlobeCast’s Maseko, who has worked with several major television networks. “The news is still getting leaked out.”

Distrust and speculation

by Sandra Roberts

The South African media’s previous experience of Zimbabwean elections, coupled with the economic problems faced by Zimbabwe and a lack of media freedom and curtailment of civil society organisations have undoubtedly led to South African journalists distrusting Zimbabwe’s official sources. And this distrust and lack of access to alternative sources has led to speculative coverage rather than evidence- and event-based reporting.

The Media Monitoring Project monitored coverage for two weeks before and after the elections in March 2008 and found that while newspapers face a difficult job when covering elections, it is exactly then that they can best play their role as watchdog.

Reporting of elections in a situation like Zimbabwe has proved doubly challenging – as the elections were not preceded open access to information, discussion, debate and freedom of opinion. And the indicators were there before the election – with a variety of stories pointing to different concerns, such as the lack of media freedom and objective election observers, the ability to campaign freely for the opposition and vote buying and rigging.

Journalists’ suspicions seemed justified when the process of vote-counting proved unaccountably long. This led to further speculation. After the polls, there was much discussion on whether the elections were free and fair, and why the results were being delayed. There was also, in general speculation on the outcome of the elections, whether there would be a run-off, whether there would be an outbreak of violence, or whether the economy of Zimbabwe could be revived. Sadly subsequent events have shown the elections to be neither free nor fair with excessive violence being reported.

The lack of media freedom in Zimbabwe, no doubt, contributed to the amount of speculation during the election period. Firstly, it made collecting material for stories very difficult, with various media being denied access to Zimbabwe to cover the elections completely. Secondly, the clampdown of Zimbabwean media also functioned to make the Zimbabwe government seem less credible. There were only a handful of stories in the period monitored that directly quoted the Zimbabwean government.

While media in Zimbabwe faced difficulties with freedom of expression, the South African media struggled to report on a process with little information and great distrust. For some older journalists, it may have served as a reminder of what it was like to report during apartheid, when a complete lack of credibility on the part of government made reporting events very difficult.

This article is based on a longer version available from www.mediamonitoring.org.za
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