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Introduction

This paper addresses the issue of what happens after a civil war ends. In particular it traces the development of political authoritarianism from an initial multi-party democracy and military integration following a civil war through to one-party control and the breakdown of civil security following the rise of an alternative opposition. The question of what happens to former combatants has become increasingly pertinent as decisive military victory has become rarer within African conflicts (Licklider, 2008). At the same time, it is also clear that the nature of contemporary peace settlements at the end of wars may leave a risk to further violence as there are always losers in these processes (Licklider, 1995; Stedman, 1993). This creates a danger that loser groups may return to violence, but also that the coalition of the winners may be unable to create benefits that will eventually placate rejectionists of any peace agreements. At the same time, Licklider and Atlas (1999) put forward the view that whilst post-settlement tensions are often present, these frequently arise between former allies who disagree on the shares of the spoils following victory rather than between former protagonists. In particular, where one faction within the former allies believes that they have not received their due this is likely to lead to rising tensions and then violence.

Zimbabwe represents an interesting case for a number of reasons. It is a historical case that is relatively well documented. The historical nature of the Zimbabwe case allows an assessment of how the conflict and post-conflict approaches played out in the period following the peace process. In particular, the case offers a longer term perspective than many other case studies, and despite issues with some of the literature available, it provides a very rich seam of analysis in terms of the outcomes for combatants as well as institutional structures. The post-conflict situation within Zimbabwe shows clearly how one faction was able to use their position to dismantle and incorporate opposition groups into a one-party state, despite considerable violence between former allies over seven years. A narrative history of the process and its aftermath provides a valuable insight into how these processes developed and the implications of actions taken during an integration process itself for subsequent political development.

The paper begins with a brief discussion of the conceptual context of military integration following conflict and then goes on to outline the origins of the military integration process and in particular the characteristics of the different forces involved in the conflict in Zimbabwe. The Rhodesian state was a very specific type of ethnic state and the character of the different protagonists is largely drawn from this ethnic rivalry. However, ethnicity beyond the white-black tensions was further developed by Mugabe’s party after the war and

Literature on the Rhodesian war and immediate aftermath is subject to extreme bias. As Bairstow points out: “Literature on Rhodesian counterinsurgent efforts generally fits into one of three categories: a large body written by black African nationalist (and often communist) revolutionaries, an even larger body of literature by Rhodesian ex-military and government authors, and a relatively small body of objective work written for academic purposes. The first two categories show significant biases. The first leans so far towards the African insurgent that the authors downplayed any Rhodesian government successes and exaggerated insurgent successes. The second holds up the Rhodesian soldier as the pinnacle of soldierly virtue and, at times, pines for the return of white-minority rule in southern Africa.” (Bairstow 2006:12)
led to protracted black on black conflict in Matabeleland. The nature of the technical integration itself is relatively straightforward, but this political colouring of the process and manipulation of security forces is a key feature of the outcome of the process itself undermining the technical aspects of security to many citizens within Zimbabwe. In other words, the paper will trace the outcome of the integration through to the widespread insecurity experienced by many of the population in the 2000s.

The Rhodesian Bush War lasted from 1965 until 1980 with an Agreement reached at Lancaster House in London. At the time of the ceasefire, each major faction engaged had a significant military or paramilitary force at their disposal and each leader felt that they would do well in any subsequent election and therefore play a part in developing the new state (Lectuer, 1995). However, the history of independent Zimbabwe started with an election victory for Robert Mugabe and one faction, and this faction has systematically destroyed its rivals until it has reached a position, thirty years later, where the military and political elite are able to act with virtual impunity. The roots of this power are very much within the military integration process following the war and this paper traces the roots of the current political dominance of the military in contemporary Zimbabwe to Mugabe’s ability to take advantage of the process to destroy his militarily stronger opponents.

In particular, this paper contends is that Mugabe firstly isolated and then destroyed political rivals in the security services and then proceeded to politicise senior military figures. This was partly carried out outside most of the formal military, but following the departure of the British Military Advisory Training Team (BMATT) in 2000 and the increased threat of political opposition from the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC) following the presidential elections of 2000 the militarisation of Zimbabwean politics proceeded apace. What the history of the integration process shows clearly is that the ZANU-PF and military allied to isolate political opposition and that this has been a long-term programme with the seeds sown in the early years of Zimbabwe.

Dilemmas of Military integration

Until the end of the Cold War it was conventional wisdom that civil wars ended in military victories (Licklider, 2008). However, military victories have become increasingly difficult to achieve for a variety of reasons, including a shift away from ideology to identity, reduced capacity of states and increased instances of stalemate. Whilst stalemate may produce longer wars that are more likely to produce negotiated settlements, at the same time, there has been a rapid growth in international organisations aimed at negotiating peace settlements meaning that a negotiated settlement is far more likely (Sambanis, 2004; Licklider, 2008; Hartzell and Hoddie, 2007). Such negotiated settlements increasingly use the creation of a national military a feature of the peace agreement and the post-conflict security policy (Burgess, 2008; Glassmeyer and Sambanis, 2008; Licklider, 2008). This raises significant questions about the nature of that process and how previous enemies are expected to then form a collective military force.

Nevertheless, the formation of a national army has been held up as an integral element of building a new nation following a war both in terms of changing the values of individuals
through membership of a collective force or through interaction with individuals from different backgrounds (Krebs, 2004, 2005). Whilst Krebs argues that there is little actual evidence for these assumptions, what remains important is that many people believe them to be true and so they are built in to negotiated settlements (Krebs, 2005). In fact, more broadly, the data sets and accompanying analyses by Glassmeyer and Sambanis (2008) and Hartzell and Hoddie (2007) are in themselves inconclusive. Whilst Glassmeyer and Sambanis (2008) conclude that military integration does not lead to peace and that peace agreements are more likely to fail where there has been an attempt at military integration, they also suggest that this may be because poorly structured integration processes increase the risk of failure within the broader process. Hartzell and Hoddie (2007) however, take a more subtle approach, using a data set based on 29 case studies of civil wars between 1980 and 1996. They conclude that of these 29, 18 involved military integration and if these, 9 (50%) had complete implementation and no return to war. Thus the data in this area is not only difficult to come by but is also inconclusive and contradictory, which suggests that case studies have an increased importance in the analysis of military integration (Licklider, 2008).

Analysis of the extant case studies by Hartzell and Hoddie (2007), Glassmeyer and Sambanis (2008) and Knight (2009) indicates that there are a number of issues arising throughout a process of military integration that make it more or less likely to succeed. Knight points out that there are as many approaches to integration as there are contexts and, along with this, there are several different definitions of what integration actually means on the ground (2009). Licklider (2008: 5) offers the following definition of integration: ‘Integration means that individuals are brought into the new military in positions similar to the ones they occupied in prior organisations which were in combat with their own.’

At the same time, the cases suggest a number of general implications that may be drawn from the cases. Firstly, the examples of the DR Congo, South Africa and Namibia illustrates the ‘1+1=3’ thesis whereby two cultural diverse militaries are combined into a new force with the help of outside authorities. This is related to the British Military and Advisory Training Team (BMATT) model with the involvement of British military advisers helping to create a new national army out of diverse groups of combatants. There are considerable variations on this theme, particularly where the formal military has been extremely effective but has lost politically. This was the case in South Africa and also, to a lesser extent in Zimbabwe. Within South Africa the BMATT acted as much as an arbiter of fair treatment of rebels being integrated into the South African military as a creator of a new military (Aboobaker, 2008).

Secondly, following Hartzell and Hoddie (2007), the cases show how the political settlement is the critical element in the success of integration and how integration can only succeed as part of a wider peacebuilding initiative. In successful cases (Mozambique, Djibouti) former rebels transformed themselves into political parties whilst also integrating, whereas in less stable outcomes (Angola, Rwanda, Chad), political competition produced instability (Knight, 2009). At the same time, where officers were integrated across government and played an active part in the peace process (Uganda, Mali), there was likely to be more successful integration. Furthermore, in an African context the example of South Africa illustrates that
integration should be placed within a wider approach to state building that informs the military structure and its governance and promotes inclusivity (Knight, 2009).

Thirdly, and linked with this, following Glassmeyer and Sambanis (2008) poorly implemented integration processes make it more likely to return to conflict. In fact, failure of military integration appears to have a disproportionate effect on the outcome of peace processes (Knight, 2009). In addition, Burgess (2008) further finds that one of the most significant factors in the success or otherwise of the process is the management of the integration process itself. However, if managed well, integration may be a critical to provide impetus to the wider peace process. It manages this through providing confidence in the commitment of both sides to peaceful resolution and by providing credible evidence that reconciliation is likely to take place rather than further conflict. Commitment is further measured by the protagonists willingness to compromise their original war aims and managing dissent within their own groups (Knight, 2009).

Lastly, any process of integration needs to be seen as part of a broader peacebuilding initiative that recognises that individuals within combatant groups require individual security. Glassmeyer and Sambanis (2008) investigate the relationship between security, economics and integration, concluding that whilst a security guarantee is important, integration rarely happens on an equal basis and that economic incentives provide a good explanation for integration. This may be the case amongst militaries where warfare has essentially become a means of economic survival (Angola) or where there is a desire to take up previous military careers in new military structures (Congo-Brazzaville) (Knight, 2009).

One feature is common to a very wide range of cases in this area, namely that the process is an outcome itself (Knight, 2009). In other words, the process of going through military integration is a critical element of a wider peace process. Whilst it may not be a determining factor in the wider process, it certainly exercises a disproportionate influence over the process as a whole and it is a powerful symbol of intent.

What were the origins of the integration process in Zimbabwe?

Originally part of the Federation of Rhodesia(s) and Nyasaland, decolonisation had led to the independence of Northern Rhodesia (Zambia) and Nyasaland (Malawi) in 1964. However, the white settler regime in Southern Rhodesia under the Rhodesian Front issued a Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI) in 1965 in order to maintain their position. This then led to the white minority Rhodesian state creating a formidable military regime aimed at destroying African liberation movements that were threatening black majority rule and full independence from Britain. Allied to the colonial forces of Portuguese East Africa and also with the apartheid Regime of South Africa, the Rhodesian Security Forces (RSF) constructed a highly successful military that has become surrounded by something of a mythology regarding counter-insurgency (Bairstow, 2006). At the same time, the weight of international opinion was against the white minority, which numbered less than 300,000[3] at its peak, and for the black majority (then around six million). UDI, despite Rhodesia’s continued desire to

---

[3] Around 5% of the population
be loyal to the British Crown (yet independent of her Government), was viewed as an illegal act by Britain, the Commonwealth and the UN.\(^4\)

Against this state machinery were ranged three liberation movements, but these were significantly split both ideologically and ethnically. The two armed, nationalist parties switched tactics from urban protest to armed struggle following UDI. These then became Robert Mugabe’s Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU)\(^5\) and Joshua Nkomo’s Zimbabwe African Peoples Union (ZAPU). The armed wings of these movements became known as the Zimbabwe African National Army (ZANLA) and the Zimbabwe People’s Revolutionary Army (ZIPRA), respectively.\(^6\) Both groups initially hoped to insert groups of insurgents into Rhodesia, from bases in the frontline states bordering the country (primarily Zambia initially), and to foment enough violence either to force the Rhodesian government to capitulate, or more likely the British government to intervene and reassert its authority. The third group formed a political party with a wide constituency, the African National Council (ANC) eventually led by Bishop Abel Muzorewa. The ANC followed a policy of engagement with the regime and eventually formed a considerable corps of auxiliaries to support the Government, and into the late 1970s Muzorewa enjoyed far greater support within Zimbabwe than the former two movements (Stedman, 1993).

---

\(^4\) Although note that when the ‘Front Line States’ of Zambia, Nigeria and Tanzania moved for the UN to censure Rhodesia through the UN Security Council, Britain used its veto to block it.

\(^5\) The first leader of ZANU was Ndabaningi Sithole, its founder, who launched the movement in 1963. Following the government ban on the party he spent ten years in prison. A member of the Ndau, he left when ZANU split along ethnic lines in 1975.

ZIPRA in Tanzania in June 1976 and when the two met each other in the field, they met as enemies rather than allies (Alexander et al, 2000).

Whilst Rhodesia’s only real ally remained South Africa, both ZAPU and ZANU received significant foreign assistance, in both terms of equipment but more especially with the training of recruit cadres: ZIPRA from the Soviet Union, Cuba, Bulgaria, North Korea, Algeria and Zaire; ZANLA from China, Cuba, Egypt and Ghana. In ideological terms, the two guerrilla armies followed the lead of their primary sponsors: ZAPU/ZIPRA - Russia, and ZANU/ZANLA - China. As the war progressed Zimbabwean guerrilla forces also operated on a low-level in Namibia and Botswana, and particularly Mozambique. External operations by Rhodesian forces to counter this threat became common and cross border raids into Mozambique, Zambia, Botswana and Angola increased significantly between 1972-1979 (Cilliers, 1983).

Tactics were heavily influenced by the abilities of the RSF. ZIPRA, for example, divided the country into green, red and yellow zones. Red zones were RSF controlled, with green zones being largely ZIPRA controlled. The fighting would therefore take place mainly in yellow zones, where guerrillas could draw RSF away from their bases and prevent them getting to green zones. Actions along roads and other transport routes became commonplace. Whilst the RSF developed very effective counter-insurgency tactics, particularly the use of Fire Force approaches. Despite this military success, by 1977 the Rhodesian Central Intelligence Office believed that they were losing the war (Flower, 1987). Although the figures for guerrilla casualties were increasing rapidly, so were those for Rhodesian military and civilians. At the same time, the head of the RSF, General Walls estimated that guerrilla numbers had increased from around 2,350 in April 1977 to more than 8,000 ZANLA inside Rhodesia by January 1978, with a further 8,000 ZIPRA based in Zambia (Stedman, 1993). Against this the white population was falling by more than 10,000 a year and manpower was running short. Given this situation the Rhodesians operated a number of ‘dirty war’ groups designed to develop African auxiliary troops, irregulars and psyops, including ‘hunter-killer’ groups and organisations like the Selous Scouts using large numbers of ‘turned’ guerrillas. These were successful in terms of generating casualties, but in the context of the war, they failed to turn the tide.

---

8 See Wood Counter Strike From the Sky. Seeking to maximise their slim air assets and sparse manpower reserves the security forces developed what became known as Fire Force tactics. Using conventional reconnaissance patrols of five or six men, often drawn from national servicemen or reservists who knew their operational area intimately or from the Rhodesian African Rifles (RAR), guerrilla groups would be located. Then heliborne ‘sticks’ (usually a four man half section) would be dropped off to provide stop groups along possible lines of escape. Two types of fittings on the French manufactured Allouette III helicopters were available, configured as K-Cars (Command) and G-Cars (Gun). Essentially having deployed these troops the helicopters would orbit the area and together with ground forces, seek to acquire and engage individual targets or sweep the guerrillas towards the stop group positions of the previously dropped sticks.

9 These operations are part of the ‘mythology’ of RSF COIN operations and they are extremely daring military raids. Operation Eland, aimed to destroy a ZANU staging camp at Nyadzonya in Mozambique that housed as many as five thousand fighters. Rhodesian soldiers disguised as Mozambicans drove to the base and obtained entry from the gate guard without firing a shot. The soldiers pulled up to a morning formation of eight hundred men and announced over a loudspeaker “We have taken Zimbabwe!” As the men in the formation swarmed the vehicles in celebration of the “news,” the Rhodesians opened fire with machine guns and 81mm mortars, killing over six hundred insurgents. (Daly, Ron Reid, and Stiff, Peter, Selous Scouts Top Secret War. Alberton, South Africa: Galago Publishing, 1982. 178-222).
In the end, white flight, failing South African support and the increasing inability of the RSF to protect the civilian population meant that the war may have intensified but was unwinnable. Many of the civilian population had lost faith in the RSF’s ability to protect them and had become hostile to local paramilitaries who they regarded as little more than bullies, hence many were at least passively supporting the guerrillas (Alexander et al, 2000).

The Politics of the Peace Process

The last years of the war from 1977 to 1980 were characterised by starting and stalling peace talks. With the now United African National Council (UANC), led by Muzorewa and the former ZAPU head, Sithole as the only legal black majority party, elections were scheduled that would bring about some majority rule and the incorporation of the UANC and considerable auxiliary forces into the Rhodesian state. At the same time, Ian Smith’s preferred route to reaching negotiation with the nationalists was with Nkomo. One reason for the Smith government to favour Nkomo’s leading an independent Zimbabwe was the ZAPU leader was stronger, militarily, than his ZANU ‘ally’. ZIPRA was far better trained, armed, formatted and equipped to far higher standards than ZANLA (Wood, 1995; Alexander et al, 2000). The majority of ZIPRA’s forces were based outside Rhodesia’s borders and, most importantly, capable of fighting a conventional rather than simply insurgency war. As such Nkomo posed a significant threat to both Rhodesia and Mugabe, something not lost on the latter when he won the 1980 election. However, the shooting down of a civilian Viscount Airliner by a ZIPRA SAM missile in September 1978, the subsequent killing of the survivors and the resulting fallout, meant that Nkomo had effectively become a non-contender and Rhodesians became more wary of making any kind of deal.

With the postponed internal elections scheduled for April 1979 the international community began to take interest. The US Central Intelligence Agency noted that ZANU and ZAPU (who were unrepresented) were committed to disrupting the proceedings, with at least ten thousand guerrillas inside the country and thousands more preparing to infiltrate across the borders before polling began. The Rhodesian response was to deploy as many personnel as possible, all leave was cancelled and reservists called up to protect polling stations and other ‘soft targets.’ The memorandum states: ‘We estimate that a manpower pool totalling some 75,000 Rhodesians will be mobilized. These forces will be assisted by about 10,000 ex-guerrillas and local recruits who are loyal to the internal black leaders Bishop Muzorewa and Reverend Sithole.’ The document also notes that ‘Government pressure and intimidation by the black parties and their auxiliary forces should result in a fairly high turnout’ (CIA/FNAC, 1979: 1).

Smith had sought and secured the internal political settlement which brought in majority rule, votes for all, and Bishop Muzorewa as Prime Minister, forcing ZANU and ZAPU into an uneasy alliance and increased their presence inside the country. However, the Rhodesians suffered not only from the increased fighting but from the loss of manpower as whites began to emigrate at the rate of 2,000 a month (Wood, 1995). This led to the creation of an

---

entirely new military force to augment internal security – the Security Force Auxiliaries (SFA). The SFA were first raised in early 1978 and the deployment of their first detachments timed to coincide with the formation of the Government of National Unity following the election. The primary aim was to recruit disaffected guerrillas as part of an amnesty campaign funded through the Prime Minister’s Office, but an underlying reason for forming the SFA was to provide a powerbase for the internal black political leaders who, unlike their former allies and new colleagues, had no semi-independent armed support. The first recruits were initially drawn from Sithole’s ZANU but soon the recruiting pool was expanded to encompass in particular areas where there some support for the UANC, and this proved to be particularly effective.

When Muzorewa became the country’s first black prime minister in 1979, Nkomo and Mugabe both denounced the new government as a puppet of white Rhodesia and guerrilla operations, having briefly slackened in the period immediately following the election, increased markedly. At the same time, negotiations had continued since the Anglo-American initiative of 1978. Meetings between ZAPU, ZANU, Britain, the US and the UN had taken place throughout 1978 and into 1979. However, in March 1979 the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 445 condemning the Rhodesian elections and urging member States not to send observers, although several did so informally. The Conservative victory in British General Election of May 1979, had seemed to offer some hope for the Rhodesians. Indeed the Conservative Manifesto had said that if certain principles were met, Zimbabwe-Rhodesia would be recognised by Britain. However, expected Commonwealth support did not appear and Australia announced that was in agreement with the frontline states and opposed to any recognition of Zimbabwe-Rhodesia. Shortly after this a plan was agreed whereby Britain received a mandate to mediate, leading directly to the Lancaster House Constitutional Conference held in London, from September to December 1979. All nationalist leaders were invited, as well as being attended by other interested parties. During the course of its proceedings (which spanned fourteen weeks) the Conference reached agreement on the following issues: the summary of the Independence Constitution; arrangements for the pre-independence period; and a cease-fire agreement signed by the parties. The signatories agreed to undertake: to accept the authority of the Governor; to abide by the Independence Constitution; to comply with the pre-independence arrangements; to abide by the cease-fire agreement; to campaign peacefully and without intimidation; to renounce the use of force for political ends; and to accept the outcome of the elections and instruct any forces under their authority to do the same.\textsuperscript{11}

\textit{Transitional Arrangements}

The Lancaster House Agreement achieved its desired result only because, as was later evident, that the three major signatories: ZANU, ZAPU and Zimbabwe-Rhodesia were each convinced that they themselves would win sufficient seats to significantly influence the political direction of the new state (Lectuer, 1995). This had the effect that the three parties could move forward towards the forthcoming election when the ceasefire began on

\textsuperscript{11} A copy of the report: Southern Rhodesia - Constitutional Conference held at Lancaster House, London September – December 1979 is available for access at http://www.rhodesia.nl/lanc1.html
December 21, 1979, not only with the realistic prospect of ‘political victory’ but also with their respective armed forces intact, should things not work out as expected.

At the same time, security was guaranteed by the appointment of a British Governor, Sir Charles (later Lord) Soames to enable free and fair campaigning and elections, provided all parties remained peaceful. A Commonwealth Observer Group (COG) was set up to assist him with this mission. There was also a Commonwealth Monitoring Force (CMF), numbering over one thousand three hundred troops, the majority from the British Army, but with detachments from Australia, New Zealand, Kenya and Fiji. The intention was to seal the border with effect from the day the ceasefire was implemented, and disallow any cross-border operations by the Rhodesian security forces. Guerrillas were then to report with their weapons to designated rendezvous (RV) points around the country from December 28th onwards prior to being escorted to assembly points (APs). The Governor’s military advisor and commander of the CMF, General Acland was responsible for managing the ceasefire and dealing with any breaches, aided by the RSF and police, the SFA or the guerrillas, representatives of which were members of the Ceasefire Commission which Acland chaired.

The CMF and the British realised the demand for a proper Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration (DDR) process early on. They would assist in the demobilisation of any guerrillas wishing to take that option and also begin training. At the same time, in the interests of fairness, guerrillas in APs received rates of pay equivalent to those of Africans in the RSF. In the event the CMF found themselves looking after a field army of around 22,000 men and women, many with tropical diseases including malaria and cholera (Stedman, 2000). Despite this, incidents were rare and for the most part relationships were positive and co-operative, particularly with ZIPRA personnel who were found to be professional to the point of combining patrols with the RSF (Kriger, 2003). Just prior to the elections Acland received agreement from all three parties to undertake combined training, with both ZANLA and ZIPRA conceding to undergo instruction under the authority of Commonwealth and Rhodesian forces. Although military integration was not a component of the settlement it was seen as a means to facilitate cooperation between all those involved. As a consequence 600 ZIPRA from Lima AP and the same number of ZANLA from Foxtrot AP began training at two separate locations.

On February 14 the white vote was held, with Smith’s RF party gaining all 20 seats reserved for whites. The elections proper with ten black parties registered, including Nkomo registered under the name of Patriotic Front, were held from February 27-29. There was a 93.6% turnout. Soames and Zimbabwe-Rhodesian officials went on television to urge the population to remain calm after it was clear that Mugabe would win and the withdrawal of Commonwealth ‘peacekeeping’ forces began. The chief threat at this time was the RSF, which had developed a plan – Operation Quartz – to overthrow a black majority government and had the ability to do so.12

12Operation Quartz was apparently based on the assumption that if Mugabe were defeated in the elections it would be necessary to carry out a strike against ZANU to prevent its forces from attempting a coup and taking over the country by force. The plan presupposed a victory by either Nkomo or Muzorewa, or, more likely, a coalition of the two. ZIPRA forces had in fact already begun joint training exercises with the Rhodesian forces,
On March 4, ZANU won the elections with 62.9% of the popular vote and Prime Minister-elect Mugabe asked General Walls, the Head of the RSF and his former opponent, to take over as army commander. ZANU guerrillas started training with the regular army the following day.

**The creation of a new military**

The situation in 1980 was complex. RSF numbers are open to some debate. The official view is that total force levels amounted to around 23,000 regulars, territorials, air force, guards and AFA (IISS, 1979). However, at least one estimate puts the estimate as high as 97,800, even if the core of the regular army amounts to around 20,000 (Lectuer, 1995). At the same time, the RSF were supported by a French Foreign Legion Company, a group of *Mozambique Resistance Nationale* and several South African units acting as independent units or integrated as volunteers (Lectuer, 1995). The UANC and Muzorewa also had around 20,000 SFA nominally under RSF control.

Mugabe and ZANLA had around 16,000 troops in the APs but an estimated one third of their strength outside (Goodwin and Hancock, 1993). These were supported by 500 Mozambican *Frelimo* regulars and an unspecified Tanzanian contingent (Johnson and Martin, 1983). At the same time, ZIPRA had 5,500 cadres in APs along with South African ANC cadres with another force of between 6-8,000 remaining in Zambia (IISS, 1979).

Immediately following the election, Mugabe embarked on a strategy designed to prevent South Africa attacking it. This consisted of disbanding ANC units attached to ZIPRA and returning them to Zambia. The continuing presence of British Military Advisory and Training Team (BMATT) also provided reassurance to the South Africans and Zimbabwe remained largely free of direct South African military activity and ANC bases even if they were to find themselves the target of South African sponsored clandestine operations for some time to come (Alexander et al, 1993; CCPJZ, 1997; Schwere, 2010). At the same time, the Government made provision for integration between ZIPRA, ZAPU and ‘acceptable’ elements of the RSF (Lectuer, 1995). The Government saw the integration exercise as a means of providing internal security but also as a means of providing employment prospects for former combatants (Lectuer, 1995).

**The initial demobilisation**

and undoubtedly their leaders had been given an idea of what Quartz would entail. Nkomo was not popular with the whites, however, and there was a distinct possibility that the white troops would ignore orders to avoid clashing with ZIPRA. Although the full details of Operation Quartz have never been made public, some aspects of the plan have been revealed by former members of the security forces. It was divided into two parts: Operation Quartz, an overt strike against the terrorists, and Operation Hectic, a covert strike to kill Mugabe and his key personnel. The plan envisaged placing Rhodesian troops at strategic points from which they could simultaneously wipe out the nationalist troops at the Assembly Points and assassinate Mugabe and other leaders at their campaign headquarters. The strike would be assisted by helicopters of the South African Air Force and would involve the participation of South African Recce Units. The formations involved in Operation Quartz were in position three hours prior to the election result being handed down. The signal to initiate the plan was never sent. The reasons for this are open to conjecture still. See Allport (Undated)

13 This increase is largely due to huge additions of conscripts (20,000) and guards (58,000) the evidence for which is difficult to verify. Even in the higher estimate, the regular army likely to be suitable for integration is around 19,800 strong.
Almost as soon as the election result was announced, various units of the RSF began to melt away. The Rhodesian Light Infantry, a largely mercenary organisation, along with South African and other foreign units left for South Africa, but the disbandment of ‘unacceptable’ white units including the SAS, Selous Scouts, the Rhodesia Defence Regiment, intelligence organisations, the officers of the Rhodesian African Rifles, much of the air force and the Guard Force led to further exodus of professional soldiers as many left for the South African border along with their equipment, regimental cash and arsenals. This was accelerated by the South Africans making known their preferential treatment for former RSF within the SADF.

In addition, many of the conscripts simply returned home, had their commitments reduced and were effectively demobilised. Tribal militia and SFA were also demobilised and the Combined Operations HQ of the RSF disbanded. ZANLA and ZIPRA cadres seeking civilian careers were also released. Within the guerrilla armies there were a number of important criteria which the government hoped to address. In particular, the new government sought to assure the fighter that their personal security was guaranteed; and second, to eventually provide employment. The first was resolved in part by declaring an amnesty for all combatants, guerrillas and RSF alike, but the second was to prove more difficult to achieve and the failure to provide a secure environment involving economic security for the former combatants has been a persistent issue throughout the Mugabe regime.

The relations with the British military extended beyond facilitating training for the new Zimbabwean Army. In March 1980 Britain had promised a £75 million training and aid package to Zimbabwe. The same year, according to Mitchell (2000) ‘Mugabe turned down a deal for Soviet-built hardware that had been brokered by Joshua Nkomo, declaring that he did not want to enter into the ongoing trade relationship of buying spares and hiring Soviet instructors that this purchase would necessitate (The Guardian 11.6.1980).’ Whilst in political terms the refusal to accept Soviet aid further weakened Nkomo, Mugabe also reinforced his position as an end user of British arms as well as military assistance, especially with his 1981 purchase of jet aircraft.

A Joint High Command (JHC) was established to supervise command and control of former personnel in the APs and barracks. Comprising senior officers from all three groups and a civilian Chair, they were landed with a host of problems, largely administrative but a number disciplinary. An inadequate pay and records system was in place, there were hundreds if not thousands of ‘pseudo-guerrillas’, comprising mainly family members, friends and civilian associates of genuine guerrillas seeking free food, accommodation and an allowance.

For those who intended to remain and serve within the new army, command and control were gradually implemented, proper camps and barracks built, rations provided and payment organised. Initially the BMATT mission was not to provide a presence throughout

---

14 Much air force equipment was on loan from South Africa in any case.
15 Many former RSF special forces served for several years within SADF and South African Police units, in the FLS.
16 The following year, British Aerospace sold eight Hawk Jets to Zimbabwe for £20 million, thus cementing the relationship. The Zimbabwean military continued to buy UK planes throughout the 1980s, including six Hawk Hunters and additional Hawk jets to replace some which were destroyed in 1983 by arsonists. This arsenal was augmented in 1985 by the purchase of seven additional Hawks and 13 Hawker Hunters (Mitchell, 2000).
all the training establishments where the integration was being conducted, but to help
select and train leaders and instructors who would then carry out such training themselves
(Dennis, 1992). The original plan suffered a number of problems, partly due to ill-discipline
and in many cases mutinous PF cadres, but also because the process was very slow.

As the BMATTs began to establish themselves, the first officer selection processes began.
These were run along Rhodesian (and therefore British) Army lines, based on a series of
written tests, combined with theoretical and practical exercises, and command tasks. Early
on it was noted that to expect the written skills of an African who might never have finished
his education and had spent several years in the bush to equate to those of a young
Rhodesian who had at the very least graduated from High School was unrealistic (Kriger
2005) and such tests were adjusted to account for experience early on.

The British were the prime movers here, together with the Rhodesians initially, in how
officers would be selected at least. In terms of organisation and structure Mugabe wanted to
adopt a pseudo-Maoist Chinese militia concept with men also employed in agriculture.
However attempts to do this did not work out. Four infantry brigades each comprising three
to five battalions seems to have been the initial plan. However, integration between ZIPRA
and ZANLA did not work out as well as planned and in late 1980 and into early 1981 there
was factional inter-battalion fighting outside Bulawayo involving three newly created
battalions which were effectively destroyed. This in part led to the formation of a
‘praetorian guard’ by Mugabe and his North Koreans in the form of the notorious 5th Brigade
(5B).

Initially officers were required to sit the same entrance examination as potential officers
would take for the conventional army but too many failed due to illiteracy or lack of
education. When this did not work out they British decided to take those who were offered
up to them and train them as officers and NCOs. These men were selected from within their
own organisations and therefore had some internal credibility. There were however political
considerations and after a time it was noted that the minority ZIPRA were being under-
represented, even before ZANLA launched a purge of the security services and effectively
took over control.

The initial intake of 450 from each guerrilla group were taken off to train separately with the
ex-RSF soldiers acting as something of a balance partly due to their relative de-politicised
backgrounds but also because they were far better trained than the former ZANLA and
ZIPRA cadres. These former guerrillas had a smattering of basic insurgency tactics but were
found to learn quickly and BMATT regarded the initial results as being very positive. BMATT
also managed to devise a system for identifying and promoting good NCOs and identifying
potential officers whilst they ran the training.

One issue that did not really arise in the integration process was that of screening for human
rights violations. Although this clearly happened during the conflict both sides felt that they
were fighting each other rather than targeting civilians per se, although Mugabe certainly
felt that there should have been some revenge for the cross-border incursions by the RSF
against ZANLA camps, particularly Nyadzonya, where he felt that that RSF should be
identified as war criminals after a raid that killed more than 1,000 guerrillas and wounded more than another two thousand.

Quick yet comprehensive courses in leadership, for commanders at all levels from battalion commander to section commander were soon established and taught by BMATT personnel, and specialist courses such as tactics, administration and drill were introduced, the latter two areas being outside the normal scope of guerrilla forces. As early as July 1980 a group of twelve officers, four men from each of the three forces to be integrated, spent two weeks in country as part of a group co-operative training, assessment and hopefully bonding exercise before visiting the British military training facility at Camberley for a familiarisation course on conventional forces functions (Chitoyo and Rupiya, 2005). Also in July Parliament renewed for a further six months the state of emergency first introduced in 1964 which gave the government some much needed breathing space, and it was hoped, allow the new schemes to find jobs in the wider society for demobilising guerrillas and servicemen.

Initially the commander of the RSF Lt. Gen. Walls had overseen the implementation of the new defence policy. This appointment was made in part to assuage the fears of whites that the situation might suddenly destabilise and they become victims to all out massacres conducted by the former ‘terrorists’ from the Bush War. Walls, however, having been on the receiving end of an increasingly vehement ‘Balls to Walls!’ campaign by a section of white Rhodesians who considered him a sell-out to the new regime, resigned his post in July 1980. His departure was rapidly followed by a number of other senior commanders, including McIntyre (the head of the Airforce) which led to resignations throughout the former RSF ranks. By the end of August 1980 the white exodus prompted Ian Smith into action. Smith urged the whites to remain, whilst he himself continued to remain positive, in public at least, about the majority-rule government. Walls told the BBC in August 1980 that he estimated some sixty percent of the white officers and senior NCOs had resigned, and in September Mugabe temporarily froze white pay and promotions, whilst acceding to the demands of ZANLA and ZIPRA for pay parity.

The way was now set for rapid promotion amongst the BMATT trained African officers and NCOs. The initial intension to include a significant proportion of former RSF personnel together with the ZANLA/ZIPRA mix suffered a setback with the mass of resignations of whites.17 There were however some benefits, including funding, and the availability of near empty accommodation and training facilities, while not sufficient to meet the needs of the new army, was another bonus.

**Towards integration and the new army**

By the end of December 1980 Mugabe announced the plan for a national integrated army numbering 35,000 to comprise two specialist commando and parachute battalions and four

---

17 Not all white officers departed, indeed some, for example Lt. Col. Lionel Dyck, a former RAR commander, stayed and according to Wood (2010) created a para-commando battalion from former RAR regulars and Selous Scouts.
infantry brigades. In addition to these fighting formations there were the conventional supporting units which included signals, sapper, administration and pay, medical and logistic units required by a modern military force. There would continue to be some conflict between the agreed nature of the new force under training with Mugabe, whose ZANLA forces had been trained by the Chinese and who wish to adopt a people’s militia model on one side, and the British who wished to create a more conventional, professional army, and backed up in this by the Soviet-trained ZIPRA. In the event a compromise solution was reached.

The remaining balance of 30,000 former fighters was to be demobilised. They had been patiently waiting in their APs, but with little to do and the government needed to find suitable employment for them elsewhere in the economy. In keeping with Mugabe’s Marxist bent and his people’s militia concept an attempt was made to develop a programme known as Operation SEED (Soldiers Employed in Economic Development), but this programme failed due to a combination of inadequate resourcing, poor investment and proper planning (Nyambuya, 1996). As it was agriculturally based those employed in this manner believed they were being marked out as unsuitable for military service, and being ex-combatants who had survived the war, this was resented and morale suffered.

At the same time, a second attempt at demobilisation was launched in August 1981. A Demobilisation Directorate was established beneath a Ministry to oversee the process with a budget of about Z$116m (Chitoyo and Rupiya, 2006). Three options were offered: an involuntary option under which lapsing RSF contracts were not renewed; a voluntary package of four months’ salary plus a monthly stipend of Z$185 for two years; and, a disabled rehabilitation centre for special cases. To retrain several war veterans the Zimbabwe Reconstruction and Development Conference (ZIMCORD) was established to encourage combatants to re-enter education or retrain. However, the demobilisation directorate was largely a paper exercise and failures to come to terms with these issues led, in 1991, to the formation of the War Veterans Welfare Organisation, which remains politically active (Chitoyo and Rupiya, 2006).

In August 1981, General McLean took over as Defence Force head, ZANLA’s former commander Lt Gen Rex Nhongo was appointed overall Commander of the Army, while the ex-ZIPRA military chief, Lookout Masuku became his deputy commander. By the end of the integration exercise in October 1981, 1,400 leader cadres had been trained, largely by BMATT and more than forty battalions were under instruction. Emphasis had been placed battalion formation and leader training, and staff training courses were well underway.

---

18 To be numbered one through four, the now infamous 5th Brigade was a latter addition. According to Rupiya ‘the new army was to be made up of three equal proportions of three battalions or brigade strength from the former Rhodesian army units, and nine battalions or three brigades from former ZANLA and ZIPRA units.’ Chitayo & Rupiya (2005:338)

77 Nyambuya (1996) On Operation Seed Dennis notes: this apparently excellent idea foundered due to lack of commitment and by late 1980 it had become obvious that every PF soldier would have to be integrated and the process was further speeded up to create three battalions per month, with a consequent increase in the size of BMATT.

77 Zimbabwean Defence Force (comprising Zimbabwean National Army- ZNA and the Air Force of Zimbabwe – AFZ)
Officers were divided into command and/or unit elements, with the command elements undergoing four week training courses at the Zimbabwe Military Academy which was producing platoon, company and battalion commanders. Nyambuya (1996) notes that command recommendations at all levels were referred to the JHC for ratification and arbitration, if necessary, suggesting that there remained a political element in the selection process.

The junior command elements, once qualified, were teamed up with their troops who had been trained by both BMATT and the first generation of indigenous instructors at the Infantry Training Depots to form battalions. A further four month training cycle then commenced, including exercises at platoon, company and battalion level, before each battalion could be considered operational. Additionally a start had been made at creating appropriate logistic systems to back up the fighting formations.

Dennis (1992) does go on to point out that the resulting army of 65,000 was far larger than envisaged and also far larger than any external threat warranted. He also notes that although the process of integration and training had been initially positive, discipline and training left a lot to be desired and also that the exodus of senior and middle ranking white officers, along with many professional soldiers had weakened the ZNA (Dennis, 1992). Nevertheless, by 1982 the structures of the Zimbabwe Defence Forces had been established.

**ZIPRA - ZANLA conflict and the origins of a political security policy**

Politically, however, the integration was not going so well and a conflict that had initially been white on black was to become black on black. Apart from the intense personal rivalry between Nkomo and Mugabe, Nkomo’s ZIPRA was closely associated with Matabeleland, whereas ZANLA was predominantly Shona. At the end of the war ZANLA had carried out much of the fighting and controlled around three quarters of the country, whereas ZIPRA was concentrated in Matabeleland itself. Whilst both Nkomo and Mugabe worked together during the war under the auspices of the Patriotic Front, during the 1980 elections they ran separate campaigns. Nkomo served in Mugabe’s first government, but the rivalry began to turn sour and Mugabe’s approach to emphasizing ZANLA over ZIPRA’s role in the war eventually led to violence (Ohlson and Stedman, 1994). In November 1980 following remarks at a rally in Bulawayo which warned ZIPRA that ZANU-PF ‘would deliver a few blows against them’ the first Entumbane uprising started a two day pitched battle between ZIPRA and ZANLA, but was eventually diffused by two senior commanders representing both factions.

This was followed in February 1981 with a second uprising, which spread to Glenville, Ntabayezinduna and to Connemara in the Midlands. ZIPRA troops in other parts of Matabeleland flocked to Bulawayo to reinforce their comrades. Several units, including aircraft and armoured cars, had to deploy to bring the fighting to a stop. Over 300 people were killed. In military terms it was a disaster, three of the nine integrated battalions disintegrated into faction fighting. A high proportion of former ZIPRA guerrillas both within the military and without felt threatened and insecure, many thousand deserted and
returned to their tribal homelands, where they were then seen as a political threat to the Government.

By 1983 Mugabe had managed to arrest virtually all of the senior military leadership of ZIPRA and in March 1983 all of the senior leadership of ZAPU, including Nkomo went into exile. Following this the unrelenting harassment of ZIPRA cadres led many to leave the Assembly Points (Alexander et al, 1993). This led to widespread use of violence against former ZIPRA cadres within the ZNA, coupled with segregation, disarmament and disappearance, and an overall playing down of ZIPRA’s role in the liberation struggle that continues to date (Alexander et al, 2000). These moves meant that of the initial tripartite power-sharing agreement designated in the 1980 agreement, only ZANLA senior officers remained. This effectively cleared the way for the creation of a ZANU-led politicised security policy to be created that emphasised the political role of the military on a Chinese model. A number of units then emerged out of this move that cemented this position and undermined much of the integration that had taken place.

The painting of former ZIPRA cadres as ‘dissidents’, effectively making them outlaws, led to a situation where the Government claimed that these dissidents were trying to overthrow them. At the same time, ZAPU believed (rightly) that Mugabe was trying to eliminate them and the situation within the ZNA had become so harsh that many felt they had no option other than leaving. At the same time, South Africa decided to meddle in Zimbabwean politics and provided support to ‘Super ZIPRA’, thus providing Mugabe with political ammunition (CCPJZ, 1997). This led to significant issues in Matabeleland where the Government was responsible for killing some 20,000 civilians, but also in Mashonaland where Government troops also attacked civilians despite two high profile court cases failing to prove any involvement of ZAPU or ZIPRA (CCPJZ, 1997; Alexander et al, 2000; Schwere, 2010).

The creeping politicisation coincided with the creation of two sets of security units outside the integration structure: the Fifth Brigade (5B) and the Zimbabwe People’s Militia (ZPM).

The origins of 5B can be found in an attempt on Mugabe’s life in February 1981 and a meeting that suggested he develop a presidential guard unit. This was followed by an offer from North Korea in October 1981 of weapons, equipment and training worth around £12.5m and the provision of around 1,065 North Korean instructors led by a Brigadier. The 5B had been trained and was ready for deployment by 1983 and, disastrously, it was deployed in an internal security role. The ZPM was also trained by the Koreans with officers seconded from the ZNA, but was very much regarded as a paramilitary associated with rooting out opposition to the ruling ZANU-PF party rather than a national security institution (Chitoyo and Rupiya, 2005). During the conflict in Matabeleland this became a formidable force, numbering some 20,000 by 1985 (Chitoyo and Rupiya, 2005).

Both units were extensively deployed within Matabeleland against former ZIPRA cadres and civilians loyal to ZAPU. In fact fighting in Matabeleland continued until 1987 and was seen as a threat to the regime not only because they were able to continue disrupting economic development, but also because they were allegedly receiving South African support throughout the period (Licklider and Atlas, 1999). From the ZIPRA point of view, Nkomo and
confederates clearly resented their absence from Mugabe’s official version of the war, something that largely continues with an absence of analysis of ZIPRA’s role in the conflict. At the same time it is also clear that Nkomo also regarded the Mugabe regime as discriminating against ZIPRA ex-combatants and excluding them from power (Licklider and Atlas, 1999).

In the end, Nkomo and ZAPU had an interest in ending the war to prevent the further alienation of former ZIPRA combatants and Mugabe needed to end the war to ensure security but also to encourage economic development by protecting the white farmers who had been increasingly targeted by ZIPRA dissidents (Ohlson and Stedman, 1994). The Unity Accord reached between ZANU and ZAPU in December 1987 brought Nkomo back into the government and merged ZAPU into ZANU-PF. This had the effect of fully consolidating the Mugabe regime through eliminating the main black opposition to Mugabe’s rule and greatly contributed to the creation of a one party state within Zimbabwe (Licklider and Atlas, 1999). As Ohlsen and Stedman observe, the ending of the Matabeleland war was ‘resolved at the cost of multi-party democracy in the country’ (1994: 126).

The Gradual Politicisation of the Military and Militarisation of Politics

Chitoyo (2009) outlines the current situation in Zimbabwe as an attempt to ally the political elite with senior military officials in an attempt to prevent the political opposition, the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC), gaining access to real power. Zimbabwe currently scores very highly on the Failed States Index and the Index of State Weakness. Zimbabwe started from a high base in terms of food security and service provision and had been progressively degraded from within by a rapacious state increasingly allied to the military. This indicates a reducing level of legitimacy within the state coupled with the appropriation of the state machinery for the benefit of a specific group. This rather begs the question of how did we get to the current point from the initial integration process?

The answer lies in the political ruthlessness of Mugabe and the waves of politicisation that affected the ZDF following the formation of 5B and the destruction of Nkomo and the ZAPU in Matabeleland, along with the external operations against South Africa and Mozambique. Operation Gukararhundi against the suspected ‘dissidents’ ended with the eventual massacre of an estimated 20-25,000 civilians in Matabeleland and effectively destroyed internal ZANLA opposition from ZIPRA.

At the same time, the deployment into Mozambique to shore up FRELIMO forces against RENAMO troops involved the ZDF in an ideological struggle for African nationalism as well as securing the vital road and rail links to Beira and the Mozambican ports. The ZDF and other elements of the security forces, notably the intelligence organisation, the Central Intelligence Organisation (CIO), were engaged in counter-terrorism and counter-subversion against South African military and intelligence incursions aimed at the Front Line States (FLS) against apartheid.

All of these activities led to a fundamental political adherence to a series of political causes, notably an ideology of Black African liberation that chimed with the revolutionary Marxism
of the former Bush War combatants, but which led to a tightening of the relationship between military and party. A very sinister development was the conflation of national security with regime security and the identity of the state with the party and Mugabe himself. This ideology led to a progressive politicisation of the military and the ZDF throughout the 1980s.

Successive crises within Zimbabwe and the growth of political opposition in the shape of the MDC, led to a close and unhealthy tripartite relationship between the party, the military and the ‘War veterans’. The important subject of the integration of ex-combatants into the national army highlighted by Nyathi (2005) who points out that the failure not only successfully to integrate the ex-combatants but to rehabilitate them has come back to haunt ZANU(PF). This was illustrated when they forced Mugabe to offer them Z$50,000 each as compensation for their involvement in the liberation war in 2000. However, now the ruling party appears also to be benefiting from the situation, using the ex-combatants to fight its political battles and the ex-combatants who were not integrated are being made to destroy the democracy they strove for (Nyathi, 2005).

In progressive elections in 2000, 2002, 2005 and 2008 the MDC was a growing threat despite widespread political violence against ‘dissidents’. As a result the relationship between the military and the political hierarchy became explicit through the JOC and the appointment of several high ranking military officials to lucrative commercial and government positions. This has been led by the militarisation of several of the key Ministries of state including Energy, Transport, Trade, Construction, Information, Foreign Affairs, Prisons, Railways and the Commercial Bank of Zimbabwe, all of which are headed by senior military figures. Whilst there have always been close links between the Zimbabwean military, the Zimbabwe Defence Forces (ZDF), and politics, this has accelerated since 2000 with an alliance between the military and ZANU-PF designed to prevent the MDC from gaining power. All of these events led to a conflation of ideologies into national security equating to the security of the state, the party and the Mugabe regime (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2009).

The spread of politicisation has been accompanied not only by the increasing control of state institutions by military chiefs, but also the direct interference in politics by the security forces. This has been seen in a number of operations linked to the forcible appropriation of land from commercial white farmers (Operation Tsuro\(^{19}\)); attempted control of the 2002 elections including co-ordination of youth groups\(^{20}\), war veterans and intelligence actors in intimidating voters; and Operation Murumbatsvina\(^{21}\) which led to forced demolition of high density urban housing and shacks partly as collective retribution for urban support of the MDC\(^{22}\). Lastly, and indicative of the unhealthy relationship, was Operation Makovotera Papi\(^{23}\) that involved military-style operations by the ZDF, Green Bombers, and the CIO in former ZANU-PF regions of Masvingo, Mashonaland and Manicaland provinces which had
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19 Operation ‘Rabbit’  
20 The youth groups or militias have come to be known as ‘Green Bombers’ and are particularly violent, engaging in intimidation, indoctrination and even torture.  
21 Operation ‘Drive Out Rubbish’  
22 There were aspects of poetic justice here when several of those doing the destroying had their homes destroyed. Overall the social costs of this were catastrophic leaving at least 300,000 homeless.  
23 Operation ‘Who Did You Vote For?’
voted for the MDC. Camps were established where villagers were forced to attend indoctrination sessions and to humiliate and torture those who had not shown loyalty to ZANU-PF. The Joint Operations Command (JOC) of the military had effectively become a political organisation.

At the same time the economic activities of the JOC were becoming more public. Apart from the control of state institutions, the military has been engaged in diamond mining and control over the diamond trade for some time. Starting in Eastern Zimbabwe, the military have been involved in widespread abuses of diamond, gold and other mineral mining operations, most of which are small scale, but many of which, particularly around Marange, are extremely lucrative (HRW, 2009). The military’s control of the diamond fields is likely to be contested by the GNU probably through contracting security and mining to a private company but it seems likely that the military will not relinquish their control of such a lucrative source of revenue easily. In fact the military have extended their economic interests in the diamond trade through their involvement in the DRC.

The ZDF initially deployed to the DRC to support President Kabila in 1997 and, along with several other African militaries the ZDF intervened to defend the President against other rival countries, notably Rwanda and Uganda. However, the nature of the later 2002 agreement with the DRC Government effectively changed the ZDF into a conflict entrepreneur. The deployment into the mineral rich Mbuji Mayi region of the DRC has catapulted the military-political class of Zimbabwe into the global diamond trade with firstly the mining of diamonds and then the development of Harare as a major source of and processing centre for blood diamonds from the DRC. This huge revenue boost has led to the accumulation of huge personal fortunes for military and political leaders in Zimbabwe, but also the need to cling on to power to maintain the ability to milk the system even more. The military is inextricably entwined with both ZANU-PF and also this illicit trade in mineral wealth, thus the nature of state fragility in Zimbabwe is not one of lack of control, rather it is one of a kleptocratic autocracy run by a military-political elite to the detriment of most of the population.

The nature of the autocratic control effectively means that the main organs of state security – the CIO, the Zimbabwe Republic Police, the ZDF and the Zimbabwe Prison Service (ZPS) – are all paramilitary or military organs of state repression. There have been numerous and well-documented instances of human rights abuses and an increasingly militarised methodology of repression involving effectively turning Zimbabwe into an operational zone. These formal state institutions are supplemented by state-sanctioned militias, notably the Zimbabwe National Liberation War Veterans Association (ZNLWVA) and the Youth Brigades, both of which are effectively politicised militias that work in concert with the formal security services in perpetrating political violence. In fact, as Chitiyo (2009) points out, the youth militias have frequently been accused of both employing child soldiers and also acting as recruitment vehicles for the ZDF.

---

24 Chitiyo, 2009
Conclusions – implications for integration

The story of military integration in Zimbabwe is one of initial success in avoiding both civil war and also invasion by South Africa, followed by consolidation of power by one group of political actors allied to senior military figures. Firstly, ZANLA were able to neutralise elements of the former RSF, many of whom left for South Africa and, secondly, they were able to successfully purge their former political rivals in the African liberation movement, ZIPRA and their political wing, ZAPU. The initial 1980-83 ‘white flight’ created the conditions for ZANLA to colonise the newly formed ZNA even though a BMATT remained in place until 2000. At the same time, internal harassment of ZIPRA cadres within the ZNA and then full-scale civil war until 1987 against ZIPRA ‘dissidents’ meant that by 1987 Mugabe was in complete control of the security forces, and only ZANLA remained from the initial tripartite power sharing structure.

In terms of political control, ZANU/ZANLA control has been reinforced by the use of the ZNA and auxiliary and intelligence units as internal political enforcers backed up by control over natural resources both in Zimbabwe and also the DRC. The relative effectiveness of the core of the ZNA, trained and at least partially integrated by BMATT is currently being undermined by the political and economic control exercised by a rapacious political elite who have turned most of Zimbabwe into an operational zone. The ZNA performed well in overseas postings in Mozambique and in technical terms they remain a formidable force. However, domestically they have engaged in widespread purges of the opposition groups, including rival nationalists in ZIPRA, and the use of force internally has been largely political with the aim of regime protection. This regime protection has been bought by an increasing ownership and control of the means of production within the economy by senior military figures and made sustainable by access to diamonds, effectively fuelling regime security. The eventual outcome of the integration process that began thirty years ago is therefore a capable but politically biased force that excludes those initially integrated.

In practice what this has developed into is a capability to deploy as a conflict entrepreneur, which it has done in the gold and diamond fields of Eastern Zimbabwe and also in the DRC, where control over diamond mining and diamond trading has provided the resources to support the military as a political-military elite within Zimbabwe. Unfortunately this has developed into a system whereby the military tend to treat large parts of their own country as an operational zone and, along with auxiliary and intelligence units practice counter-insurgency operations on Mugabe’s political opposition.

The Zimbabwe example raises a number of questions about the nature of integration processes. Following the long-term intervention of BMATT, up until 2000, the ZNA became an effective force that has engaged in external activities including peacekeeping in Angola and the DRC. It has also developed counter-insurgency capability that has been used against the local population in Eastern Zimbabwe. However, the capability is somewhat compromised by a lack of accountability and a creeping politicisation that started with the demolition of the tripartite military command structure by ZANLA. It also raises questions about the role of BMATT in a context of increasing politicisation of the military and the development of a rapacious regime constructed around senior officers trained by the UK.
Clearly the presence of a BMATT failed to deter politicisation within the ZNA, a lesson that needs to be learned by ongoing BMATT-style interventions in other contexts.

One of the critical questions regarding BMATT is at what stage should an external actor withdraw once the troops they have been training have been used for political purposes? BMATT stayed until 2000, which was long after the use of security services to suppress dissent. It is clear that BMATT did not train many of the paramilitary troops involved, but it is also clear that elements of the ZDF were becoming increasingly implicated in political activities and also in diamond production in the DRC.

In addition, the Zimbabwe example is a very clear lesson in terms of who is likely to win in the long term following a settlement. Whilst the history of Zimbabwe tends to support the Stedman (1993) assertion that losers are likely to challenge a settlement that they feel they have no interest in, it strongly supports the Licklider and Atlas (1999) conclusion that violence is sometimes more likely between former allies when one of those allies feels that it is being excluded from its due (as it sees it). In addition, the Licklider (1995) proposition that settlements are more stable when one side wins may also be held up in the Zimbabwe case since although this was not the case immediately at the end of the Rhodesian war, it was the case following the internal war between ZAPU and ZANU-PF when the following settlement effectively incorporated the opposition into Mugabe’s system and ended multi-party democracy for a number of years. This generated stability and made domestic conflict less likely, but it also produced a situation within Zimbabwe whereby the security of many civilians became compromised and subject to political suppression and economic greed.

Furthermore, the political power of Mugabe rests on his historical ability to dominate the security services through his management of the integration process. The placement of high ranking ZANLA officers and the subsequent purging of both RSF and then ZIPRA cadres from the security services has led to the situation whereby Mugabe and the military is effectively allied against the rest of the population. Technically, whilst the white Rhodesians were the ‘losers’ in the conflict, the former ZIPRA nationalists also lost. Without the economic power wielded by the whites who remained in Zimbabwe, the ZIPRA cadres found themselves subject to a strengthening ZANU-PF hegemony in which they were marginalised both in terms of their contribution to the war and also access to positions of power in both politics and also the military.

In terms of long term stability then, the net effects of the integration were to contribute to the empire building of Mugabe at the expense of former enemies and allies. This created the position where the Zimbabwean regime has been able to create a system that benefitted former ZANLA cadres economically and politically. Even the much-vaunted land reforms of the 1990s primarily benefitted the political elite rather than the masses of the Zimbabwean people (Meldrum, 1995). Where this has left the regime, is with an increasingly vociferous opposition and, eventually a power-sharing government. This is clearly preferable to another

---

25 For example, Sierra Leone where continuation of an IMATT (International Military Advisory training Team) is frequently based on a desire to prevent politicisation of the military (Jackson and Albrecht, 2010).
conflict but with the regime increasingly relying on the security services to enforce its own rule, the basic security of the population remains in doubt.
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