

RECLAIMING THE ZIMBABWEAN DEMOCRATIC VOICE IN MEDIA AND EDUCATION: SITUATING THE ROLE OF PUBLIC SPHERE AND CIVIL SOCIETY IN DEVELOPMENT

Erasmus Masitera

Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Great Zimbabwe University, Masvingo, Zimbabwe

ABSTRACT

The politics of domination is rampant in the Zimbabwean political and social arenas. In more definite terms, the practice is really dehumanizing in that it denies human beings the right to map and shape their own destinies in politics; that is, having a voice in policy formulation inevitably leading to underdevelopment. The dominant areas of interaction that are controlled politically are the areas of media and education. The two are the core areas of free interaction, as will be argued in the essay. In an attempt to reclaim the voice the author suggests using another realm in the public sphere, which is the civil society. Civil society offers objectivity and credibility, since it offers space for critic-creative education (C.C.E) that will be channeled through media for development (M.F.D). These concepts, objectivity, creativity, involvement, improvement, and credibility are necessary for honest and true development in Zimbabwe.

Keywords: Public Sphere; Civil Society; Freedom; Media; Education; Engagement; Development; Democracy

INTRODUCTION

Situating an issue in its historical and contemporary position is always pertinent in developing an argument and in situating the reader in the circumstance around the writer's position. As a matter of fact, this paper will assess the ways through which 'public sphere' has been dominated and abused by those in powers. In a sense, indoctrination, domination, and manipulation of some kind has been the greatest tool of political parties to subvert the general populace from being critical in own areas of interest and discussion. Such practices have resulted in disenchantment of communities and society, at large. The paper will also try to analyze how civil society can become an area that grants the general populace the much needed spot of free interaction and discussions, which are the foundations of involvement and forging a future. All this discussion will be guided to a larger extent by the ideas of contemporary political philosophers, who have written on liberal politics, democratic process, and communicative action. The arguments of the philosophers aim at suggesting ways of achieving a way to and for freedom.

UNDERSTANDING PUBLIC SPHERE AND CIVIL SOCIETY

What is Public Sphere?

A public sphere is an area or field of free interaction between members of society, regardless of social or political standing and interests. In his conception of public sphere, Habermas argues that a public sphere is, by and large, a political realm (Habermas, 1984; Habermas, 2006). Manifestation of the early public spheres was in the form of salons, clubs, and press; where groups of people, perhaps with specific interests, met and freely discussed issues of common interests. In some instances, areas of unrestricted interaction were dominated by discussions on issues affecting people, such as taxes and duties, and issues of governance as well (Habermas, 1984). Though the discussions centered on what seemingly was non-political, but to issues related to social living and economic activities, the discussions also incidentally touched upon political practice. In a sense, it is the debate around what ought to be practiced, rather than what is and was, being practiced and done which dominated the interactions of the public sphere. As such political discussions are not and no longer limited to governance, per se. It is for this reason that Habermas has argued that the public sphere became a political institution of the powerless and attempted to reorganize the existing as Kellner notes by saying that:

Public sphere was institutionalized in constitutional orders which guaranteed a wide range of political rights and which established a judicial system that was to mediate claims between various individuals or groups, or between individuals and groups and the state (Kellner: 2010).

Kellner, like Habermas, therefore, present the public sphere as closely related to the political realm and especially its unlimited-ness in the scope of issues to be discussed. Bearing in mind that politics manifests itself in all spheres of life, be it economic, legal, or social (Kaulemu, 2004).

While arguing that the public sphere is a political realm, Habermas clandestinely imply that civil society is part of the public sphere. For Habermas, civil society is also an area of exchange, exchange of commodities and social labor furthermore, an internal space for families (Habermas: 1984). This means that for him civil society is limited in scope. For Habermas', the public sphere is not an organization, but just and area of coincidental coming together. The public sphere is not an institute in other words. Basically, all this implies that public sphere is not confined in nature whereas civil society is an institute or organization with particular interests.

What is Civil Society?

Walzer asserts that civil society is “a space of un-coerced association and also the set of relational network” (Walzer, 1998). This further implies organizations and institutes with particular focus. In fact, Walzer’s argument is that issues pertaining to politics and social, or even economic, issues are welcome for discussion in the entities of the civil society, since this is an area and space of particular deliberations. In this sense, therefore, Walzer does confine civil society to a particular realm of discussion, but an organization. Thus, he develops on the idea that Habermas discussed about on public sphere by bringing in the institutionalized nature of civil society. This, definitely, means

that civil society is an extension of the public sphere and as such it does contain some semblance that the public sphere has.

Both civil society and the public sphere bear a number of resemblances in that the social issues that maybe brought forward for discussion end up being involved in the legal or political issues. Be it that people discuss about educational matters, sexual morality, or family debates, in the end, all these end up being additions to and/or becoming pieces of legislation; thereby rendering them as matters of politics. Additionally, the two terms have some similarities in that both civil society and public sphere are open spaces and, at times, organizations offer civilians a space, events, or occasions for free and equal deliberations (Walzer, 2002; Habermas, 1989). In definite terms, the philosophers are saying that the occasions are opened to all. They are not exclusive events that are earmarked for particular individuals (Habermas, 1989). There are a lot of associations that encourages democratization in the sense that the participants are at liberty to debate issues of common interest (Habermas, 2006). In a sense, there is a guarantee of freedoms and protection of individual members of the civil society from state and possible political interferences (Habermas, 2006). Thus a greater civility is encouraged (Carroll, 2004). When talking of civility, the idea being advanced is that of greater respect of individuals who have no political influence and consideration for interaction at whatever level without interference from powers that be, in this case, political powers.

Additionally, Walzer (2002), says that the coming together of the civil society is voluntarily and, in most cases, based upon certain motivational factors, such as interests or convictions (Walzer, 2002; Habermas, 1989). On this point, it is plausible to claim that there is inclusiveness, rather than exclusivity, in the composition of the occasions of meeting (Habermas, 1989; Chambers, 2002; Seligman, 2002) To a large extent, Walzer has further argued that the main ethos expressed in modern conception of civil society is striving for the attainment of greater equality and fairness among members of society, regardless of social standing. Thus, equality is achieved through general satisfaction, this satisfaction therefore becomes a major characteristic and aim of the civil society (Habermas, 1989). The civil society is a unifying factor in that individuals voluntarily join, come, and express interests through rational discussion in order to make meaningful decisions. Ultimately, the civil society will then act as an intermediary role between state and the people. Both civil society and public sphere aim at bridging greater accountability to people from state apparatus, thereby bringing about the missing checks and balances. They offer the much needed space for creativeness, although one area has greater risks than the other in that civil society is, in some cases, immune to prosecution.

In the discussion, rational decision making, as underlined by free communication becomes another important mark for the discussions in civil societies. The liberal attitude and intelligent communication is what Habermas identified as part of deliberative democracy (Habermas, 2006; Habermas, 1984). The term, democracy, basically means the rule of the people, which is people deciding on their own how they want to be governed without oppression (Sinclair, 1988; Matson, 1987). For this reason, Walzer calls the civil society “a space of un-coerced human association and also the seat of relational network ... (involving)... freely engaged, fully committed, decision-

making members” (Walzer, 1998). Thus, there are rational debates, suggestion of new propositions, and un-coerced decision making (Walzer, 1998).

In dealing with communication, in some sense, there is reflectiveness in that conversations and discussions expressed through language is open, resulting in refinement and confirmation of opinions without prejudice critical thinking (Habermas, 1989; Habermas, 2006). Habermas implies that cooperation and coordinated action emanate from sensible negotiations and results in the elimination of egoistic tendencies and ultimately achieve communal endorsement (Habermas: 1984, 86). All this implying that there is coordination of actions that are achieved through lucid discussions achieved through speech and consensus, rather than individual egoism, which overrides everyone else (Bolton, 2005). The main emphasis, therefore, being to promote common understanding, cooperation, and coordinated action promoted through the power of speech and, at the same time, encouraging public and mass participation.

Carroll (2004) nicely summarizes the whole issue of civil society by saying:

First, it embodies the value of civility, permitting political debate and disagreement without resorting to coercion or violence. Second, it provides a zone of at least partial autonomy from the state within which individuals and groups can pursue personal and collective interests. Third, it helps to make the state accountable to the people. Fourth, it provides a forum for input into policy issues by the public. And finally, it adds to the policy implementation capacity of the state (Carroll: 2004, 18).

The whole ethos therefore of coming together and discussing aims at achieving greater common interest. In providing the space that is not controlled by the political powers and especially the state, the civil society will be playing, in some cases, the intermediary role between the state and the society (Habermas, 2006). The civil society also attempted to offer a place for democratic deliberations that will ultimately be used to force democratization in the state (Otobo, 2002). Discussion is a process necessary in democracy and definitely a mark of liberalism realized in a public sphere – a space and place of discussion and imagination upon what people expect.

THE STIFLED AREAS OF CIVIL SOCIETY AND PUBLIC SPHERE

If a public sphere is a place or space of discussion, then what is its hallmark? Where is this place of free engagement where deliberative democracy can be realized? In modern and contemporary discourse, Habermas’ replied to these questions by saying that “...public sphere *is* rooted in networks for wild flows of messages – news, reports, commentaries, talks, scenes, images, shows, and movies with an informative, polemical, educational, or entertaining content” (Habermas, 2006). In other words, the public sphere is realized in interaction offered by the media and in educational circles. Media plays an important role in giving access to political debates for the general public. It is normatively a place where deliberation for the public should take place without interference (Habermas, 2006). In the current political and social set-up, other areas of political deliberative debates are the parliament, governmental organizations, and courts (Habermas, 2006).

However, the parliament, governmental organizations and courts are now exclusive that offer limited public deliberation except for the representative. The representatives are mere delegates who at times do not embody the general people's wills (this is particularly the case in Africa). In such cases, issues for discussion are that of delegates' interests, which probably would not be that of everyone in society. In brief, political representation and representative deliberation:

lacks the defining features of deliberation. Evident shortcomings in this regard are (a) the lack of face-to-face interaction between present participants in a shared practice of collective decision making and (b) the lack of reciprocity between the roles of speakers and addressees in an egalitarian exchange of claims and opinions. Moreover, the dynamics of mass communication are driven by the power of the media to select, and shape the presentation of messages and by the strategic use of political and social powers to influence the agendas as well as the triggering and framing of public issues (Habermas: 2006, 413-414).

By and large representative democracy is shaped by others. It does not emphasize the importance of serious interaction and discussion. In most cases, representative democracy exhorts the views of those who are present. In surmise, it stifles free exchanges and contributions.

Another important area of deliberation, that Habermas mentions but does not dwell much on, is the educational area. Education offers freedom of discussion, as Freire and Dewey noted. It is more of an area where individuals are offered the opportunity to create their own opinions without interference from the teacher and even from political power. In education, the mind of a person freed from interference in that there is liberated and open discussion without obstruction from other quarters. In media and education, therefore, there is a possibility of face-to-face (question and answer) interaction, criticism, and construction of expectations yet in contemporary society, the freedom has been abused.

NORMATIVE PRACTICE OF EDUCATION AND MEDIA

Education

To begin with, education is the creation of knowledge. Creation of knowledge emanate from the fact that there is enhanced interaction and use of sensible imagination in building a position. Noteworthy is the fact that education has three main facets attached to it and these are impacting information, space for objections of acceptance of ideas, and creativeness that emanates from critical analysis. Therefore, education restores and molds humans in that the expectations of people are revealed and this helps in guiding people's lives (Ogalo, 2009; Ojara, 2006). Dewey and Freire furthers the idea by saying education is a miniature and perhaps the epitome were democracy is practiced freely. The aim of education, according to the two, is that education should enable individuals to grow intellectually and in mutual interests with others (Dewey, 1916). Only when free interaction and exchange of ideas occur does true knowledge emerge. Through education, different individuals of different social upbringings come together and share ideas (Dewey, 1916). Thus education acts as a socializing factor because of the plurality and diversity of individuals coming together and changing ideas (Dewey, 1916). In precise terms, Dewey says that education is an area of free

interaction and an area where the master/slave relationship comes to an end (Dewey, 1916). The master/slave relationship emanates from non-equal and non-free intercourse in the process of learning since the consensus is lacking.

Freire notes that the master/slave relationship emanates from the banking concept (Freire, 1971), whereby reality is created by the teacher or someone who is not the particular student or, as Freire puts it, the oppressor's prescription (Freire, 1971). This system creates distortions and prejudices that are dehumanizing; thus, the intellectual ability of one is overshadowed by the other through passing on of ideas that are not questioned. There is no freedom of conscience and no true knowledge shared for "knowledge emerges only through invention and re-invention, through the restless impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry men pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other" (Freire, 1971). Moreover, when education lacks the shared experience, it is myopic for it lacks novelty with this in mind. Dewey says:

Diversity of stimulations means novelty, and novelty means challenge to thought. The more activity is restricted to a few definite lines – as it is when there are rigid class lines preventing adequate interplay of experience – the more action tends to become routine on the part of the class at a disadvantage, and capricious, aimless, and explosive on the part of the class having the materially fortunate position (Dewey, 1916).

All this, then, gives rise to intellectual and psychological coercion or torture, which easily results in manipulation and exploitation – a fertile ground for indoctrination. Where there is indoctrination then injury to human freedom is eminent. Thus John Stuart Mill says that without liberty, damages result and manifested in harm exposed through deceiving since liberty desires

First, the inward domain of conscience ... liberty of thought and feeling; absolute freedom of opinion and sentiment on all subjects, practical or speculative, scientific, moral or theological ... Secondly, the principle requires liberty of tastes and pursuits; of framing the plan of our life subject to such consequences as may follow: without impediment from our fellow-creatures, so long as what we do does not harm them, even though they should think our conduct foolish, perverse, or wrong. Thirdly, from this liberty of each individual, follows that liberty, within the same limits, of combinations among individuals; freedom to unite, for any purpose not involving harm to others: the persons combining being supposed to be full age, and not forced or deceived (Mill: 1996, 233).

When, therefore, true liberty exists, as Mill says, then creativeness, self-enriching, and self-analysis of ideas and concepts is missing and as such "... education is not creative and therefore only serve (*sick*) to alienate the oppressed from their conscience as beings for themselves. The oppressed are transformed into beings for others" (Moyana, 1988). When education is not interactive, it creates limitedness and the students become instruments to be used by the educated or those developing what is to be learned. It, then, does not free the mind of the student. When such a situation exists, there is a serious alienation of functionalities, including rationality (Moyana, 1988), especially the rationality of the oppressed. This is all done so as to enforce a particular thinking which is to produce

a one sided view that is productive for conformity. Education should transform lived experiences and emancipate people from any type of oppression since it involves critical analysis and creativeness. Education should really be an empowering tool rather than a disempowering tool.

Media

While education plays that important role, media, in its various forms, also has a pertinent and insurmountable role of disseminating information. By and large media is a form of communication and dissemination of information which, in real practice, should be open to all for interaction (Nyamnjoh, 2005). The main ethos of media is to “influence and shape public opinion” (Bird, 2008). The influence should not be in the negative, rather it should be positive and be aiming at imparting true knowledge and involving for the engagement of the public (Bird, 2008). However, media is now dominated by certain groups, individuals, and, at most times, by particular political ideologies. In other words, media has produced a hierarchy in that there is a lot of exclusion and marginalization through non-recognition of the poor and less powerful (Bird, 2008). In such a case, media fails to facilitate free and equal interaction, which includes question and answer. Media should play an important role in the democratization of society. As Nyamnjoh says, “thus only when they [media] empower individuals and communities to scrutinize publicly and contest decisions made in their name by the most powerful members and institutions of society ... can media promote democratization” (Nyamnjoh, 2005). When a particular ideology, controlled by others, dominates the air waves or print media it means the people behind that particular thinking have power since they can sway and control people’s thinking (Thompson, 1995). The power to control what people hear and what to think about is therefore restricted to what the media channels out. Thus, the control of information and communication becomes, in most cases, the privy of the dominating group –the rich and politically influential people.

Media is like an evangelization podium which waits for the appointed preacher to What the preacher says is not questioned during the sermon, only after is it analyzed. As such, if there are individuals who cannot discern and analyze information on their own, they are bound to take what the preacher says at face value and, at times, literally. This is the part where control comes in. Information, on its own, either enlightens or blinkers people’s thinking; however, when the analysis of disseminated information lacks, then, domination and limitedness takes place (Okumu, 2002). Yet when a particular ideology dominates the deliberative and liberal practices, which should characterize the media sphere it lacks and, in its place comes indoctrination, in the sense that what the controlling and dominating power wants people to hear is what is published. In such a circumstance no alternative views are permitted since the selection of what to and what not to publish is in the hands of the few (Habermas, 2006) who, in most cases, are the rich and powerful (Henriot, 2001). All this is done in order to maintain status quo and to ensure continued control and dependence of the masses upon the rich and powerful. In a sense, this seriously advances dominance and oppression at the same time denying critical analysis.

THE EMPIRICAL

Education

In education, the victimization and torture of individuals opposed to ZANU-PF mentality is rampant. The right to express oneself is denied and, in most cases, viewed as a link with anti-governments (ZANU-PF), yet there might be a genuine reason for the student demonstrations. Censorships of the educational system exist, as well. This is evidenced from the educational syllabi that are in secondary schools, as well as in institutes of higher learning. The main objective of censoring the material that is to be learnt is to ensure that everything reflects what politicians in power want, thus, students basically become imitations of reflections of the politicians (Kaulemu, 2004). The failure of an institute or a professional within the institute to adhere or pay tribute and praise to ZANU-PF policies results in expulsion or victimization of some kind. Thus psychological, intellectual, and physical torture has crippled the growth of plurality and divergent views in the creation of a people-centered Zimbabwe. Without a doubt, the requirement of such a move is to ensure allegiance and conformity, in a way, by doing away with opposition of any kind.

Moreover, the idea of disbanding foreign academic syllabi also reveals the same aim of the stifling broadened sphere of analysis. The aim being to create a blinkered person with one way of thinking, a thinking which is linked to ZANU-PF ideologies. The new academic syllabi ('O' Level and 'A' Level Syllabuses), while noble in passing on Zimbabwean history to the students, was also, however, limited in that only ZANU-PF history and ideologies are dominant. This limitedness and uncritical, un-analytic approach to education amounts to propaganda at its best and thus deserves to be countered. As in the words of Freire (1971) and Moyana (1988) then there really is no creativity and openness in the education system as students and teachers are forced to conform to the thinking of ZANU PF. What this amounts to is dependence, suffocating creativity and ultimately a violation of human freedom (Freire: 1972, 45; Moyana: 1988, 20).

An even interesting, and not so much documented, practice of censoring education is found in the practice of ceding intelligent officers in various educational institutes of learning. At times, the officers are part of the student body and, at times, staff of institutes of higher learning (even placing party sympathizers in places of influence, such as administrators of institutes). The intelligent officers act as informers, and in a way their activities help in compromising and in influencing the dissemination of information. Such kinds of activities resonates well with what Kaulemu argues for or says when saying virtually every sphere of the society is politicized and polarized the system (Kaulemu: 2004, 83). Again, this is all an attempt at limiting creativity and bringing down anti-party ideas.

Media

Without much further ado, it will be pertinent to note that the normative is not empirically practiced in Zimbabwe. Through various pieces of legislature, such as AIPPA (Access to information and Protection of Privacy Act, 2000) and POSA (Public Order and Security Act, 2000) (Raftopoulos & Mlambo, 2009) the, then, ruling party, ZANU-PF,

attempted to control rationality, ensure conformity, and to perpetuate its hold upon the dissemination of information in Zimbabwe. Raftopoulos & Mlambo (2009) argue that AIPA and POSA were formulated so as “to restrict the activities of opposition and civic forces in the public sphere and to control independent press” (Raftopoulos & Mlambo, 2009). AIPA and POSA therefore are a sign of the increasing interest of the ruling party in controlling information so as to ensure that they create a cult centered around ZANU PF party (Moyo: 2010, 13). Additionally, patronage is encouraged through intellectually incapacitating the intelligentsia of the country.

Among other requirements of the pieces of legislature were that every broadcasting house or news production house had to be registered with a government selected panel of analysts, known as ZMC (Zimbabwe Media Commission). This panel was dominated by party sympathizers who among other things, had to make sure that the government and ZANU-PF interests were maintained and not violated in all publications that were to dawn the Zimbabwean streets. As Kaulemu says, politics has come to dominate the social sphere of Zimbabwe (Kaulemu, 2004). In order to ensure that the party maintains its hold on power, ZANU PF has made it difficult to distinguish between its politburo and the government. The party argues that the government and the party politburo are one and the same thing yet in practice these are two totally different areas of political influence.

Additionally, such a system has made journalists to view themselves as part of government instead of upholding journalist’s ethics (Nyamnjoh, 2005). In a sense, only the party’s ideology was perpetually passed on to the people of Zimbabwe through the government’s controlled media, such as Zimbabwe Broadcasting Corporation’s TV and Radio Stations. The continuous repetition of airing Chimurenga war songs and visual clips of massacred/butchered fighters of Rhodesian, ZANLA, and ZIPRA were and is always done to remind watchers of the devastating ability of ZANU’s military wing and, at the same time, to coerce people to support the party. Intimidation, thus, is conducted through the media. Furthermore, the apparent non coverage of MDC’s activities is another way of dissuading people’s attention to a particular party’s activities.

CIVIL SOCIETY AND DEVELOPMENT IN ZIMBABWEAN MEDIA AND EDUCATION

The main form in which civil society is found in Zimbabwe is in the form of civic organization, or civil society, and NGOs (Non-Governmental Organizations). These groups are, in most cases, apolitical and generally have the mandate and aim of restoring human dignity. The groups restore human dignity through providing the much needed assistance such as food, financial assistance and political education. Thus, their aim is not only providing food, but raising awareness of people’s rights. Charity is not enough as it creates perpetual beggars. Rather, they help in cultivating awareness of capabilities, a thing the ZANU-PF leadership is against. D’Engelbronner-Kolff notes that “Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), governments, and the international community are becoming increasingly concerned with human rights and fundamental freedoms” (D’Engelbronner-Kolff, 1998). The main thesis of this part of the paper is to reveal how organizations can become an alternative in offering people the much needed space to express themselves freely and experience freedom after the expression. In other words, they reaffirm the rights of human beings and, thus, offer an education for human rights. According to D’Engelbronner-

Kolff, human rights education should be encouraged for it helps social transformation that is dependent upon the pillars of democratization (D'Engelbronner-Kolff, 1998).

NGO's in fact offers the alternative to the formal education and media that has been infiltrated by party politics and policies, the NGO's and related institutions take cognizant of the fact that development is marking by availability and provision of basic necessities, including freedom to chose, that are required by human beings. As Amartya Sen says "development is not only the absence of poverty but also free and meaningful participation in all aspects of human life" (Sen: 1999). In order to achieve this objective, therefore, there is need to realize the ideals of the role of education. Paulo Freire noted that education has a role of raising consciousness (Freire, 1972), and this involves what is and what ought to be the ideal. Since critical analysis, public innovativeness and participation is not respected in Zimbabwean public sphere, the alternative where this can be realized is in the Civil Societies and NGO's that have no governmental influence. This assertion is supported by D'Engelbronner-Kolff when she argues that "human rights education, thus, is one of the factors which establishe an environment which stimulates critical consciousness, participation, and affirmative action" (D'Engelbronner-Kolff, 1998). Additionally, when education offers such a situation, it develops into critico-creative education (C.C.E). Critico-Creative Education "implies integrating imagination and criticism in a single form of thinking so that the free flow of the imagination is controlled by criticism and criticism [is] transformed into new ways of looking at things and at possibilities" (Ogalo, 2009). Basically, this entails analyzing and suggesting ways of bettering a situation. The character of a civil society in being open, then, can offer the necessary and needed role of the media that is disseminating people's ideas. When the media acts in this way, it becomes media for development (M.F.D). M.F.D refers to a medium of channeling information that is pro-people and a system which accepts ideas that are progressive, coming from critical thinking and free interaction. All these then are characteristics and found in civil society. In effect, civil society involves education and dissemination of information.

Civil society, then, provides the fertile ground or spheres for deliberative democratization process. In most cases, the society undertakes teaching people about their rights and even highlighting areas where rights have been violated and ultimately granting people the space to decide upon what action to take (Masitera, 2009; D'Engelbronner-Kolff, 1998). Besides this, the societies also offer the people protection from persecution and victimization that might come from the government through funding for legal protection and representation in courts.

The education that emanates from the societies, therefore, can be seen as an emancipation process that can become useful in Zimbabwe, through providing awareness about abuses and laying down the real principles for human rights, bearing in mind that the organizations are found in all corners of the country. Thus, when civil societies provide awareness and educate people on human rights, they in this way become the alternative to the oppressive government controlled formal state education and media. In this way, civil society provides hope for creating a future that is based upon respect for human rights as the young and old are taught to be critical of political or social policies. Thus, in the end, creating a better future shaped around respect of people. In absence of a democratic

promoting education, the civil society will become the instrument of reorganizing and reconstructing experience in the public sphere, as Dewey would say (Dewey, 1916).

Conclusion

In the words of Sen, development is the availability of basic resources to society. In other words, Sen is, and was, arguing for defining development as improving people's lives. The improvement has to be through real engagement, involving the society, as a whole, rich and poor alike. The endeavor of improvement is not confined to the present generation, but to the preservation of the future as well, ensuring that the future can also meet its own needs (Bird, 2008). Such a scenario then, as argued before, is what Zimbabwean media and education stifles is, inversely, what the civil society (NGO as well) attempts to accord.

The tenets of civil society, such as openness, engagement, and objectivity, ought to be the new mark that has to characterize the media and educational systems. Undoubtedly, an honesty reporting that is underlined by frankness invites ingenuity and trust from the community. Furthermore, honesty and objective reporting results in independence and impartiality of the media. When objectivity exists, the chances are that exterior investors maybe attracted to a country and without doubt outside investors are important players in the development of a country since they usually inject huge amounts of capital into investments. The whole idea, then, is to advocate for true engagement that is not controlled by particular doctrines, rather marked by objectivity, which then acts as a guarantee of freedom that is needed today and in the future for shaping a generation's own life.

REFERENCES

- Bird, E., Lutz, R., & Warwick, C. (2008). *Media as Partners in Education for Sustainable Development: A Training and Resource Kit*. UNESCO Series on Journalism Education.
- Bolton, R. (2005, April). *Habermas's (sick) Theory of Communicative Action and The theory of Social Capital*. Paper presented at the meeting of Association of American Geographers, Denver, Colorado.
- Chambers S, Kymlicka W. (2002). Introduction. In *Alternative Conception of Civil Society*. (pp. 1-12). Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Carroll, B. W. (2004, June). Civil Society, Democracy, and Development. Paper presented at the Meetings of the Canadian Political Science Association, Winnipeg, Manitoba, CANADA. <http://www.cpsa-acsp.ca/papers-2004/Carroll.pdf>.
- D'Engelbronner-Kolff, M. (1998). *The Provision of Non-formal Education for Human Rights in Zimbabwe*. Harare: Sapes Books.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education*. New York: The Free Press.
- Freire, P. (1971). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- Habermas, J. (1989). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Translated into English by Thomas Burger.

- Habermas, J. (1984). *Reason and the Rationalization of Society Volume 1 of the Theory of Communicative Action*. English Translation by Thomas MacCathy. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (2006). Political Communication in Media Society: Does Democracy Still Enjoy Epistemic Dimension? The Impact of Normative Theory on Empirical Research. *Communication Theory Journal*, 16, 411 - 426.
- Henriot, P. (2001). Africa in the Age of Globalization: What is Our Future? *Chiedza: Journal of Arrupe College*, 48 - 61.
- Kaulemu, D. (2004). The Culture of Party Politics and the Concept of the State. In *Zimbabwe: The Past is the Future*. (pp. 147-192). Harare: Weaver Press.
- Killner, D. (2010). Habermas, the Public Sphere, and Democracy: A Critical Intervention. Retrieved from <http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner.html> accessed on 12/03/2010.
- Masitera, E. (2009). Confronting Impunity: Zimbabwean Civil Society arch for True Justice. *Chiedza: Journal for Arrupe College*, 12(1), 41 - 50.
- Masunungure, E. (2004). Travails of Opposition Politics in Zimbabwe since Independence. In D. Harrold-Barry (Eds.), *Zimbabwe: The Past is the Future*. (pp. 77-86). Harare: Weaver Press.
- Matson, I. W. (1987). *A New History of Philosophy: Ancient and Mediaval Volume 1*. Berkley: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Mill, J. S. (1996). On Liberty. In W.H. Shaw (Eds.), *Social and Personal Ethics*. Belmont: Wadworth Publishing.
- Moyana, T. T. (1988). *Education, liberation and the Creative Art*. Zimbabwe Publishing House.
- Moyo, J. (2010). The father of the Nation. In *Mail and Guardian*, (pp. 13).
- Nyamnjoh, F. (2005). *Africa's Media, Democracy and the Politics of Belonging*. London: Zed Books.
- Ogalo, P. T. (2009). The Role of Critico-Creative education in Building a Positive African Image? *Chiedza: Journal of Arrupe College*, 12(1), 15 - 19.
- Ojara, P. (2006). *Towards a Fuller Human Identity: A Phenomenology of Family Life, Social Harmony, and the Recovery of the Black Self*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Okumu, A. J. W. (2002). *The African Renaissance: History, Significance and Strategy*. Trenton: Africa World Press.
- Otobo E. E. (2002). Policy Process in a Democratic Context: A Glimpse at Nigeria's Privatization Program. In *Better Governance and Public Policy: Capacity Building for Democratic Renewal in Africa*. (pp. 159-172). Cape Town: Kumarian Press.
- Raftopoulos, B. and Mlambo, A editors. (2009). *A History from the Pre-Colonial Period to 2008: Becoming Zimbabwe*. Harare: Weaver Press.
- Seligman, A. B. (2002). Civil Society as Idea and Ideal. In *Alternative Conception of Civil Society*. (pp. 13-33). Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Sinclair, R. K. (1988). *Democracy and Participation in Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P.

Thompson, J B. (1995). *The Media and Modernity: A Social Theory of the Media*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Walzer, M. (1998). The Civil Society Argument. In S. Gershon (Eds.), *The Citizenship Debates: A Reader*. (pp. 291-308). Amazon.

Walzer, M. (2002). Equality and Civil Society. In *Alternative Conception of Civil Society*. (pp. 34-49). Princeton: Princeton UP.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS:

Erasmus Masitera: Great Zimbabwe University, Faculty of Arts, Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies