

Review

In All Fairness, Can Truth Lead to Reconciliation of a Divided Zimbabwe?

Dorothy Goredema

Faculty of Social Sciences, Midlands State University, P.Bag 955, Gweru, Zimbabwe.

E-mail: goredemad@staff.msu.ac.zw

Accepted 28 September 2020

For the past 37 years, Zimbabwe has been trying to attain national healing and reconciliation. Reconciliation is a necessary pre-condition for sustainable peace, social, economic and political advancement the world over. For Zimbabwe, the quest for reconciliation began with the 1980 policy of racial reconciliation followed by the 1987 unity accord between ZANU PF and PF ZAPU intended to end the Gukurahundi disturbances in Matebeleland and Midlands Province. The Organ for National Healing and Reconciliation and Integration followed the violent 2008 elections but still reconciliation has remained in the distant horizon. Peace Commissions such as the Chihambakwe, Chidyausiku and the most recent National Peace and Reconciliation Commission have been set out to ensure post-conflict justices, healing and reconciliation, again with no success. The failure to realize sustainable reconciliation over the past 37 years speaks of a need to revisit past and current approaches implemented or not implemented. Academics and observers have pointed out that Zimbabwe needs “a truth commission to achieve sustainable reconciliation. However this study argues that truth alone is not sufficient to bring about sustainable reconciliation. Applying discourse analysis to draw information from related literature, interviews and focus group discussions, the study found out that acknowledgement, apology and restorative justice in the form of reparations or compensation need to accompany “truth” for true reconciliation to be realized. The study concludes that whilst past policies and approaches to reconciliation have negated truth, truth telling on its own cannot lead to reconciliation unless it is accompanied by acknowledgement, apology, and restorative justice in the form of reparations.

Keywords: Fairness, Truth, Reconciliation.

Cite this article as: Goredema D (2020). In All Fairness, Can Truth Lead to Reconciliation of a Divided Zimbabwe?.. Int. J. Polit. Sci. Develop. 8(8) 344-351

CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

The current interest in conflict resolution and reconciliation issues is driven by the realization that Zimbabwe as a nation has been trying to attain national healing, reconciliation and integration since 1980 but to date, has dismally failed to end violence and achieve peace . The country has experienced what Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2015:10) has termed a series of zvimurengas

(first chimurenga, second chimurenga, third chimurenga) . Ndlovu-Gatsheni further argues that these paradigms of war has inscribed conflicts and violence creating unending cycles for perpetrators and victims making peace and reconciliation elusive. The above scenario of unending cycles of violence speaks of a need to revisit past and current policies with a view to assessing strategies and approaches implemented and not implemented. Since 1980, policies such as national policy

of reconciliation, unity accords, amnesties, governments of national unity, organ for national healing and reconciliation and the current national peace and reconciliation commission have been implemented or adopted with the aim of bringing about peace and reconciliation. Despite all these efforts, peace and reconciliation has remained in the distant horizon for Zimbabwe. It is within this backdrop that academics and practitioners have suggested the need for a truth commission for Zimbabwe to realize healing, true reconciliation and sustainable peace.

A truth commission is a commission tasked with discovering and revealing past wrongdoing by a government or, depending on the circumstances, non-state actors also. (Hayner 2010). This is done in the hope of resolving conflict left over from the past or revealing what actually transpired during a conflict. Truth commissions investigate a pattern of events that took place over a period of time by engaging directly and broadly with the affected population, gathering information on their experiences. Proceedings of most truth commissions are marked by a high degree of openness, as perpetrators and victims come forward with their testimonies. In the South African case, the commission televised the testimonies of many victims and perpetrators for the world to see. To that extent, truth commissions constitute a form of "official truth seeking" by providing proof against historical revisionism of state terrorism, human rights abuses and other crimes. Truth commissions issue final reports which seek to provide an authoritative narrative of past events which sometimes challenge previously documented versions of the past. The reports provided by truth commissions vary in the degree to which the proceedings and findings are made public. In some cases such as the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission, the final report named individual perpetrators. (Tutu, 1999). The reports also issue recommendations on how to prevent such abuses in the future. It is within this backdrop that truth commissions are set up by states emerging from periods of internal unrest, civil war or dictatorship. Many truth commissions have been established in countries such as Chile, Chad, Sierra Leone, Guatemala and South Africa.

For the purposes of this study reconciliation is used to refer either to a process or to an outcome or goal (Bloomfield 2003:12). Reconciliation, as an outcome, is an improvement in the relations among parties formerly at odds with each other e.g individuals with themselves, between victims, between survivors and perpetrators, within families, between neighbors, between communities, within different institutions, between different racial and ethnic groups, between different political parties, between different generations or between workers and management. Bloomfield (2003:12) further defines reconciliation as

....an over-arching process which includes the search for truth, justice, forgiveness, healing...it means finding a way to live alongside former enemies. To coexist with them, to develop the degree of cooperation necessary to share our society with them...

At the micro level, the process of reconciliation deals with what happened to victims or survivors of a conflict with discussions often focuses on the reconciliation of victims and perpetrators of gross human rights violation. As such this reconciliation focuses on past human rights abuses by individuals, state and non-state actor. For the purposes of this study reconciliation at the macro level refers to improved relations and tolerance within and among various racial and ethnic groups of Zimbabwe so that social groups would learn the skills necessary to cope with the pain experienced as a group in the past. This type of reconciliation involves coming to grips with, accepting responsibility and blame for the evils perpetrated against the Shonas by the Ndebeles during the pre-colonial period, subjugation of the black majority by the small minority under colonial rule and then the torture and killings done by the Shonas against the Ndebeles during operation Gukurahundi in the 1980s, the killing of white by blacks during the FTLRP, electoral violence by both ZANU PF and MDC. Thus the goal of reconciliation is to promote inter-communal understanding, bridging the divide between political groups, various distinct and generally separate ethnic and racial communities.

Four components must result from successful reconciliation process .A successful reconciliation process must result in interracial and ethnic reconciliation, political tolerance, support for the principles of human rights and recognition and acceptance of authority. A successful reconciliation process must leave the Shonas and Ndebeles, Whites and blacks trusting each other, rejecting stereotypes about those other ethnic groups or other races, getting along with each other and even working together for the development of the country. In addition, a successful reconciliation policy should promote political tolerance, by improving relations, trust among people of different political parties. After reconciliation, the general populace should be committed to put up with each other, even those whose political ideas they thoroughly detested in the past. The reconciled society must collectively support the principles of human rights, including the strict application of the rule of law and commitment to legal universalism. Lastly, a reconciled society recognizes and accepts the authority of the major political institutions of the country. Thus a reconciled Zimbabwean is one who respects and trusts those of other ethnic groups and races, who is tolerant of those with different political views, who supports the extension of human rights to all

Zimbabweans regardless of color or creed, and, who extends legitimacy and respect to the major governing institutions of Zimbabwe's democracy.

The study observed that the previous policies and approaches of reconciliation implemented did not usher in the four components of reconciliation discussed above. This is the reason why reconciliation has remained elusive for Zimbabwe. It is argued in this study that truth commission, accompanied by acknowledgement, apologies and reparations have the potential to reconcile a racial, ethical, political and socially divide Zimbabwe. Within this backdrop it becomes relevant to assess the role that truth commission can play to promote reconciliation in Zimbabwe.

Zimbabwe the Divided Nation

Despite all efforts by government to portray an image of a united country, Zimbabwe is a deeply polarized society. The country is divided along, ethnic, racial, economic and political lines making reconciliation difficult to attain. Ethno divisions between the Shona and Ndebele groups date back to pre-colonial times with the arrival of the Ndebeles in 1839. (Cobbing, 1976). Relations between the two groups during the pre-colonial period were characterized by wars of domination between the tribal groups as each sought to establish its authority over the other. Antagonism was manifested by intermittent raids and counter raids of each other. Ndebele raids on Shona communities only stopped with the advent of colonialism in 1890. When this happened, the two sides never met thereafter to resolve their differences, heal their wounds and reconcile. Thus, technically, the two sides are still at "war" with each other, each one harboring its fears, hatred and/ or resentment of the other-however it perceived the other then-now more than hundred years on.

During the colonial period from 1890-1980, the two ethno groups became victims of the British settler government and were equally oppressed and violated. However there still was serious competition to occupy the little space for Africans which was created by successive colonial governments. The 1929 faction fights in Bulawayo between Ndebeles and Shonas urbanites, the violent clashes within intra-nationalist as well as inter-nationalist political parties in the 1960s and 1970s bear testimony to this (Msindo 2006).

Independence in 1980 failed to bring the much needed unity and reconciliation between the two ethnic groups. These ethnic divisions were worsened by operation Gukurahundi in Matebeleland which left an estimated 20 000 Ndebele people dead (CCJP 1997). Although the unity accord was signed in 1987 between the Zimbabwe African National Union Patriotic Front (ZANU PF) and the Patriotic Front Zimbabwe African People's Union (PF

ZAPU) to end the violence and atrocities, still the two ethnic groups have remained stuck on the edge of a politically combustible environment (Muchemwa, Ngwerume and Hove 2013). Although the signing of the Unity Accord was a commendable act, it was not sufficient to make significant changes to the polarized relationship and mistrust between the two groups (Mashingaidze 2010). The Unity Accord between PF ZAPU and ZANU PF was an agreement between the two parties which excluded the inclusion of their supporters and so did very little as far as the relations of the two ethnic groups were concerned among ordinary Ndebeles and Shonas (Murambadoro 2015).

Over the years the conflict and polarization has been in and out of violent mode, a situation which qualifies as a protracted social conflict. As observed by Muchemwa, the Shona have never really accepted the indigeneity of the Ndebeles in Zimbabwe and have perceived them as foreigners while regarding themselves as more a indigenous whose right to belong is beyond question (Muchemwa 2017:116). This situation has created complex relationship problems whose hallmarks are still present and characterized by mutual suspicion, disrespect and a general distrust of each other. This complex relationship has been continued by different generations and has been passed on through intergenerational transmissions of both trauma and antagonism (Stauffer 2009).

On the other hand, the emergence of radical secessionist groups from Matebeleland in recent years has not helped matters either. Secessionist groups such as Mthwakazi Liberation Front (MLF), Mthwakazi Republic Party (MRP), Ibeshu Likazulu, all advocating for a complete secession of Matebeleland from the rest of Zimbabwe is a clear manifestation of the advanced level of the ethnic divisions in Zimbabwe thirty-eight years after independence.

Racial polarization has also failed to usher in the much needed reconciliation within the country. The advent of colonialism in 1890 ushered in a period of colonial brutality against the black majority (Mlambo 2009:105). Colonialism was introduced through violence and was maintained through domination, repression and exploitation. Racial identities provoked the liberation struggle and colonial brutality and violence towards the black masses and the nationalist liberation armies left a hallmark of bitterness and mistrust between the blacks and whites. It was therefore under these circumstances that it was deemed necessary to invoke a process of national reconciliation immediately after 1980. However, the whites in Zimbabwe did not share a common vision of reconciliation with Mugabe's black socialist government. The Mugabe government was perceived as a threat by the white community who still owned the means of production. As such the whites remained indifferent. De Waal posits that there is no evidence that whites in

Zimbabwe shared the realization of the need for reconciliation. Furthermore they never viewed Africans as equal nor did they acknowledge any wrongdoing neither did they make any efforts to change their attitudes (De Waal 1990:122).

On their part, Africans failed to reconcile with the whites because at independence the two racial groups had not met to tell the truth about what had triggered the liberation struggle. Thus, an honest reappraisal of the real cause of the war –land hunger among the Africans was compromised and silence stifling the chances of national reconciliation. To the African majority, the 1980 policy of reconciliation was a betrayal of the ideals of the liberation struggle and this further distanced them from the whites who remained the elites and owners of the means of production. Economic and gender inequalities remained as they had been during the colonial era. The whites continued to wield economic power yet 80 000 Africans had perished during the liberation war through being shot, tortured and disappearances. At independence no platform was created for these injustices to be talked about and the blacks were expected to “reconcile “ with the whites who has already alluded to never saw the reason why they should reconcile with the blacks. Thus again, it can be said that technically the two racial groups were still at war with each other, only waiting for an opportune moment to take revenge on the other.

The opportune moment to take revenge on the land issue came in the form of Hondo Yeminda (Fast Track Land Reform Programme) in 2000. The process was characterized by chaos and violence against the white commercial farmers. Again, this poses challenges for the country to reconcile especially when the Mugabe government and the blacks did not see the Fast Track Land Reform Programme as a violation of human and property rights of the whites. No acknowledgement of the violation of rights or property, apology or compensation has been forthcoming from the government and the blacks to the whites further polarizing the society.

For Zimbabwe, election time has been rarely peaceful especially after the formation of a stronger opposition political party, The Movement for democratic Change (MDC) in 1999. Post 2000 power struggles pitting ZANU PF against the opposition MDC has further divided the country. In Zimbabwe belonging to a different political faction provokes hatred and violence. Pre-election and post-election violence in Zimbabwe has become a common feature of elections and the government has not made much progress to reconcile those who were involved in electoral violence a situation which has further polarized the country. The failure of Zimbabwe to realize sustainable peace and reconciliation over the last thirty-seven years has baffled observers and academics. It is within this backdrop that scholars, peace practitioners and academics speak of the need for Zimbabwe to

implement and truth and reconciliation commission if sustainable reconciliation is to be attained. As such this study aims at unpacking the potentials of truth commission in bringing about the much needed reconciliation if it is to be constituted.

In all fairness can Truth Leads to the Reconciliation of a divided Zimbabwe?

Study findings revealed that to a large extent, yes truth commissions can lead to the reconciliation of a divided nation because it creates space for victims, perpetrators and the wider society to rethink about past violations once the truth has been exposed. TC s make people understand why things are the way they are thereby transforming perceptions, views and beliefs. In the Zimbabwean case it is important not to ignore inter-ethnic atrocities perpetrated by the Ndebeles against the Shona. While this may appear to be opening a can of worms this truth is necessary in reshaping opinions about the evilness of the Shonas against the Ndebele during the Gukurahundi military campaign. In other words, a TC will create the platform where people can re-think about the evilness of others or their moral goodness. TC will promote reconciliation by exposing that both sides did horrible things and committed atrocities against each other although during different historical phases. Recognizing the legitimacy of one`s “opponents” claims to human rights abuses is a necessary condition for reconciliation.

In furtherance, TC in the Zimbabwean case will lead to the sharing of responsibility, blame and victimhood which in turn creates a common identity for the nation. A TC exposes atrocities by all parties in the liberation struggle, atrocities by the Rhodesia Front, the nationalist liberation armies, the guerrillas and civilians against each other and amongst themselves. All the violence, torture, arbitrary detentions, arrests, murder, intimidation and disappearances commissioned by the Smith or Mugabe regimes are exposed as well as the violence perpetrated by both ZANU PF and MDC against political opponents. This way TCs afford different racial, ethnic, social and political groups to share responsibility, blame and victimhood leaving the nation with a common identity. A common identity provides the basis for future dialogue where former divided groups can start on an equal clean page. In essence, if groups or individuals are no longer attached to a good versus evil view of their past, the space for reconciliation is opened up.

What is clear in Zimbabwe is that victims of the liberation struggle, Gukurahundi, FTLRP and electoral violence have not told their stories. The truth is hidden or is told from the perspective of those that have power. Thus, what the country has is a distorted one sided truth. As such the wounds of the Zimbabwean masses remain open yet Huyse (2003:36) warns that if victims in a

society do not feel that their suffering has been acknowledged, then they are not ready to put the past behind them. If they know that the horrible crimes carried out in secret will always remain buried... then they are not ready for reconciliation. In this case a TC is relevant to create social space for victims and offenders to meet and talk things over. A TC proceeding creates room for victims and perpetrators to interact with each other more, breaking down barriers among individuals, groups, across ethnic and racial groups and communicating more. This in turn leads to greater understanding and perhaps acceptance, the appreciation and exaltation of the value of racial diversity and multiculturalism in Zimbabwe and social cohesion.

Unlike other processes such as amnesia, public policies of reconciliation and unity accords, truth commission deal with victims at the micro and macro levels at the same time. In terms of national reconciliation, observers and scholars such as Zalaquart, (199)5, Dyzenhaus (2000) are of the opinion that truth telling ends ongoing suffering of victims and survivors who lack information about what happened and who was (or was not) responsible for abuses. At the individual level talking through the past is often represented as a form of catharsis, where in the trauma of the past can be re-experienced, dealt with and let go (Kiss (200). In terms of national reconciliation, truth commissions reintegrate victims in a number of ways. The very fact that victims state publicly what happened to them contributes to re-establishing their civic and political dignity as well as participatory standing (Kiss 2000). Official recording of the wrongs done to victims which were previously officially denied in the past, reinforces the equal moral standing of victims (du Toit, 2000).

In addition truth telling can counter and prevent certain forms of denial e,g about how cruel the Smith regime was to the Africans ,how the Ndebeles also raided the Shonas and subjected them to untold sufferings in the pre-colonial era , how Gukurahundi subjected the Ndebeles to torture and suffering in the post-independence era, how ZANU PF political elites ordered the youths to beat, torture and made political opponents during election time. Thus truth telling is the best option to take especially in countries like Zimbabwe where wrong doing is frequently officially denied with governments actually refusing to acknowledge that violations of rights occurred and or that the ruling party or the state was responsible for the violations of its own citizens.

In addition, truth telling may also serve as a form of reparation for those not actually implicated in crimes. Efforts to record and archive this information, as well as to distribute it in the form of educational materials, aim at ensuring that future generations will not repeat the past.

In addition, the report issued by a commission, especially when made public, can cultivate collective

reconciliation by aiding a community to alter its self-understanding. A narrative is produced of how a community could at once have a past full of abuses as well as a present and ideal future in which those abuses are rejected (Dwyer 1999).The report can also challenge stereo types that dehumanized members of the community in the past (Murphy 2010) and foster sympathy (Eisikovits 2009).Gibson (2004) posits that the proceedings and report of a truth commission can foster trust in institutions. By condemning actions of the past, truth commissions reassert the force of normative standards that have been violated, or establish new normative standards for conduct when the extant terms for a relationship are unjust or immoral (Walker 2010). It is within this backdrop that truth commissions are considered a vital tool in reconciling divide societies.

Truth commissions issues final reports which seek to provide an authoritative narrative of past events which sometimes challenge previously documented versions of the past. To that extent, truth commissions constitute a form of "official truth seeking" by providing proof against historical revisionism of state terrorism, human rights abuses and other crimes. Thus by building and certifying a collective memory of a troubled past TCs free a society from its obsession with past injustices, redirecting political debate to contemporary issues. Thus TCs bring closure to trouble past promoting a reconciled future.

According to Gibson (2000) truth makes an independent contribution to democratic consolidation by changing or transforming society, changing how people think about their own side and about their opponents. The outcome of transforming how people think about themselves and their opponents reduces intergroup prejudice increasing intergroup trust and cooperation. In addition changing a people's negative perception reduces political intolerance leading to the expansion of individual freedom and unrestricted market place of ideas. In addition political tolerance encourages the extension of the rights of political competition whose denial has resulted in untold sufferings for most Zimbabwean.

The contributory role of Acknowledgements, Apologies and Reparations to Reconciling a Divided Nation

However truth telling on its own cannot lead to reconciliation unless it is accompanied by acknowledgement, apology, and restorative justice in the form of reparations. According to Wechsler (1998) acknowledgement of wrongdoing is very crucial to successful reconciliation. Acknowledgement refers to the official, public recognition of what happened. Acknowledgement is often needed to counter official denial of wrong doing or responsibility for wrongdoing. The assumption is that often unspoken, suppressed

traumas will inevitably reemerge in destructive ways. Van Ness and Strong (2002) posit that acknowledgement of wrongs and of victims helps heal psychic wounds at the same time enabling trust (Gibson 2004). In essence the acknowledgement of past atrocities by a government promotes reconciliation by reestablishing normative standards for behavior (Walker 2006) in addition to reasserting that the victims are indeed members of the moral or political community who need the protection of the government (Llewellyn and Howse 1999, du Toit 2000). In the Zimbabwean case there is need to acknowledge economic, ethnic and cultural violations in addition to political and civil rights violations.

Apologies can also contribute towards the reconciliation of a community or nation. In addition, an apology can be a form of acknowledgement. According to Tavuchis (1991), a well-formed apology requires at least acknowledgement of both the fact of wrongdoing and responsibility by the wrongdoer, as well as an expression of regret or remorse. De Greiff (2008) observed that apologies are valued, not merely as acknowledgements of past wrongdoing and gestures of respect to victims, but also as providing evidence of a positive change in the wrongdoer or in the wrongdoer's group. In addition, apologies are aimed at restoring a sense of dignity and inclusion to formerly mistreated or disempowered parties. The role of apologies in reconciliation and in the inclusion of formerly disempowered or mistreated parties may be magnified if those parties also have a say, for example in determining the form reparations should take or in playing an active role in determining the manner in which the offender will make up for their crime.

Reparations are also necessary in the promotion of reconciliation. Reparations refer to efforts to repair the harm that results from a wrong or a conflict (Torpey 2003). This could be a transfer of goods and wealth that is intended to directly compensate for goods that were taken, damaged or destroyed. The payment is made either by the party who was responsible for the harm, by the wrongdoers' descendants or other beneficiaries, acting on the wrongdoers' behalf. Transfers made in response to losses that are not literally replaceable or monetizable, such as deaths or injuries, are also referred to as restitution or reparation. These payments are meant to send a conciliatory message of some sort rather than to suggest that the wrong or harm is being paid back. McGary (2010) posits that restitutions or reparations have both a back-ward and forward-ward looking goal. The back-ward goal in paying reparation is aimed at promoting reconciliation. The reconciliatory power of material reparations is that such payments serve as acknowledgements of responsibility, expressions of respect for the moral status of the victims, acts of remorse or caring, evidence of increased trustworthiness or a commitment to the norms of justice. (McGary 2010,

Thompson 2002, Gray 2010). The forward looking goal of reparations is to secure better future relations with the victims after 'clearing the air' and making amends. In Brooks' opinion (1999) when combined with truth-telling, acknowledgements, apologies reparations have the potential to improve relations and contribute towards reconciliation. In fact leaving identifiable harms uncompensated may undermine the effectiveness of acknowledgements and apologies.

Reparations can promote reconciliation especially if the process creates social space for the victims to participate. Victims may be allowed to determine the forms reparations should take or the manner in which the offender will make up for his or her crime. In this way, the victim has a greater chance of receiving a form of satisfaction that he will value more. The victim's active participation may also provide him with the opportunity to exorcise his resentments or fears, restore his sense of control over his life, and reaffirm his status as a valued member (s) of the community who should not have been mistreated (Johnstone 2002).

In addition, reparation has the potential to contribute towards reconciliation because it has social spaces for the offender to actively participate in finding a resolution to their wrong doing (Zehr 1990). Offenders may be asked to propose forms of reparations they could offer to victims. In being allowed an opportunity to play a role in building a better future, the offender may avoid a dangerous rage-shame spiral and regain a sense of self-worth (Braithwaite 2000).

In cases of political violence, the Zimbabwean government can incorporate input from the various parties to the conflict in designing reconciliation processes. This will increase the chances that those measures will be viewed as legitimate across the entire community (Barsalou and Baxter 2007). Inclusive deliberative processes for the selection of reconciliation efforts can also provide a valuable model for the future of the community. Although the future will never be free of conflict, an appropriate goal of reconciliation processes should be aimed at establishing norms for resolving disagreements in a peaceful, just and equitable manner.

CONCLUSION

The study argues that Zimbabwe needs a truth commission to achieve sustainable reconciliation. Whilst Zimbabwe needs a truth commission to achieve sustainable reconciliation the processes has to be accompanied by the official acknowledgement of political, economic and cultural violations. In terms of reconciliation, acknowledgements of wrongs and public recognition of what happened helps heal victims' psychic wounds at the same time reasserting that the victims are indeed members of the wider political or social

community. This enables trust contributing to the improvement of relationships. , The acknowledgement of past wrongs also needs to be accompanied by an apology. Apologies acknowledge past wrongdoing and serve as gestures of respect, restoring a sense of dignity to victims, at the same time providing evidence of a positive change in the wrongdoer or in the wrongdoer's group .All these outcomes promote cessation of hatred, rage, anger, violence, the prevention of future violence and social cohesion may be promoted. Lastly, the study argues that leaving identifiable harms uncompensated may undermine the effectiveness of truth commissions acknowledgements and apologies in achieving long lasting reconciliation Reparations serve as acknowledgements of responsibility, expressions of respect for the moral status of the victims, acts of remorse or caring, evidence of increased trustworthiness or a commitment to the norms of justice .In the long –run, reparations secure better future relations with the victims after 'clearing the air' and making amends.

REFERENCES

- Bennett, C, 2008, *The Apology Ritual: A Philosophical Theory of Punishment*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bloomfield, D, T. Barnes and L. Huyse (eds) 2003. *Reconciliation after a violent Conflict: A Handbook*, Stockholm, International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA).
- Braithwaite, J.2000, "Repentance Rituals and Restorative Justice", *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 8(1), pp 115-131.
- Brooks, Roy, (ed) 1999, *When Sorry Isn't Enough: The Controversy over Apologies and Reparations for Human Injustices*, New York: New York University Press
- Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace (CCJP) 1997. *Report on the 1980's Disturbances in Matebeleland and the Midlands*, March 1997.
- Chandler, D, 2003, "Coming to Terms with the Terror and History of Pol Pot's Cambodia (1975-79)", in *Dilemmas of Reconciliation: Cases and Concepts*, A.A.L Prager and T.Govier (eds), Waterloo, Ontario,: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, pp307-26.
- Crocker, D, 1999, "Reckoning with Past Wrongs: A Normative Framework," *Ethics and International Affairs*, 13 (1): 43-64.
- Cobbing, J.R.D, 1976.*The Ndebele Under the Khumalo , 1820-1896*.PhD Thesis, University of Lancaster.
- De Waal, V. 1990*The Politics of Reconciliation: Zimbabwe's Decade*. London, Hurst and Company, Cape Town, David Phillip.
- De Greiff, P, (ed), 2006, *The Handbook on Reparations*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- De Greiff, P, 2008, "The Role of Apologies in National Reconciliation Processes: On Making Trustworthy Institutions Trust in The Age of Apology: Facing Up to the Past, M. Gibney, J.M ,
- Gibson, J. 2004.*Overcoming apartheid: Can Truth Reconcile a Divided Nation?* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Dyzenhaus, D, 2000, "Justifying the Truth and Reconciliation Commission," *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 8 (4): 470-496.
- Gutmann, A and D. Thompson, 2000, "The Moral Foundations of Truth Commissions," in *Truth v Justice: The Morality of Truth Commissions*, R. Rortberg and D. Thompson, Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp22-44.
- R.E Howard-Hassmann, J.M Coicaud and N. Steiner, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, pp120-36.
- Hamber, B, 2009, *Transforming Societies after Political Violence, Truth, Reconciliation and Mental Health*, Dordrecht: Springer.
- Huyse , L 2003. *Zimbabwe: Why reconciliation failed*, in: Bloomfield, Barnes and Huyse pp,34-39.
- Johnstone. G, 2002 *Restorative Justice: Ideas, Values, And Debates*, Cullompton, UK: Willan Publishing
- Kiss, E, 2000, "Moral Ambition Within and Beyond Political Constraints: Reflections on Restorative Justice," in *Truth vs Justice: The Morality of Truth Commission*, R. Rotberg and D. Thompson, Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp, 68-98.
- Mashingaidze, T, 2010 *Zimbabwe's Illusive National Healing and Reconciliation Process: From Independence to the Inclusive Government 1980-2009*, *Conflict Trends*, 2010 (1) pp 19-28.
- Mlambo A. 2009, *From the Second World War to UDI, 1940-1965*.In Raftopolous, B and S. Mlambo (eds) *Becoming Zimbabwean: A History from the pre-colonial period to 2008*, Harare, Weaver Press.
- Mc Gary, H.2010, 'Reconciliation and Reparations,' *Metaphilosophy*, 41(4): 546-562.
- Msindo, E.2006. *Ethnicity, not class? The 1929 Bulwayo Faction Fights reconsidered*, *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 32 (3) :430-447.
- Muchemwa, C. Ngwerume, E.T and Hove, M 2013. *When will the long nightmare come to an end? Challenges to National Healing and Reconciliation in Post-colonial Zimbabwe*. *African Security Review*, 22(3): 145-159.
- Murambadoro, R. 2015. "We cannot reconcile until the past has been acknowledged: Perspectives on Gukurahundi for Matebeleland, Zimbabwe, *African Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 15(1):33-57.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. 2015. *Towards a Framework for Resolving the Justice and Reconciliation Question in Zimbabwe*, *African Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 15(2) 2015.
- Torpey, J, (ed), 2003, *Politics and the Past: On Repairing*

- Historical Injustices, Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Tutu, D, 1999, No Future without forgiveness, New York: Image/Doubleday.
- Zalaquart ,J. 1995, ' Confronting Human Rights Violations Committed by Former Governments: Principles Applicable and Political Constraints," Transitional Justice, Neil. J, Zehr, Howard, (ed), Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, pp.3-31
- Zehr, H, 1990, Changing Lenses: A New Focus for Crime and Justice, Scottsdale, P.A: Herald Press.