

SPECIAL COLLECTIONS  
THIS BOOK MUST NOT BE  
REMOVED FROM THE LIBRARY

RHODESIAN FILMS FOR PEASANT FARMERS:  
PROPAGANDA OR. EDUCATION ?

BY

KEDOM HUNGWE



~~S. SAVIRINGANA~~ 206  
RHODESIAN FILMS FOR PEASANT FARMERS : PROPAGANDA OR EDUCATION?

by Kedmon Hungwe

Centre for Educational Technology  
University of Zimbabwe

A paper presented at the Regional Conference On Oral Traditions

University of Zimbabwe, 11 - 14 September, 1989



This paper examines the development of film for rural audiences in Rhodesia, under colonialism, with a special focus on the years 1948 to 1955. Using a number of sources, including oral ones, it will be argued that the Colonial authorities engaged in an ambitious mass education programme, which ultimately failed, because, in typical colonial fashion, it underrated the audience and opted for propaganda, as opposed to education.

The idea of using films in the British colonies can be dated to 1939, when the Colonial Film Unit was established, as part of the British Ministry of Information. The aim of the films was to tell Britain's side of the story of the Second World war. At that time, the cinema was young, and it attracted the attention of ordinary people and governments, as a powerful tool of communication. As Smyth points out<sup>1</sup>

England's ruling elites had great faith in the power of the cinema as an instrument of persuasion when communicating with the masses, whether the working class of urban industrial England or illiterates in Britain's African colonies.

It was believed that film would be especially powerful in "seducing" the less educated members of society, and in 1930 the British Secretary of State for Colonies urged the use of film as an "instrument of culture and education..especially with primitive peoples." <sup>2</sup>



In 1948, the Central African Film Unit (CAFU) was formed. It was sponsored by the governments of Northern and Southern Rhodesia, and the government of Nyasaland. The British government expressed its support for the development of films in the colonies by contributing to the CAFU through the Colonial Development Welfare Fund.<sup>3</sup> Alan Izod, who was employed by the British government in the film section of the Central Office of Information, became the CAFU's producer. Izod recruited Stephen Peet as director/cameraman, and Denys Brown as scriptwriter. Smyth explains the administration of CAFU<sup>4</sup>

At its foundation the CAFU came under the direction of the Public Relations Committee of the Central African Council, an administrative body set up after the Second World War to facilitate co-operation in some essential services between the self-governing colony of Southern Rhodesia and the two northern territories of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland which were still under Colonial Office rule. European settlers in the three territories hoped that the Central African Council would be a prelude to a closer political association, which it proved to be when the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland was established in 1953. When the Federation was set up, the CAFU passed from under the control of the now superfluous Central African Council and became the responsibility of the Federal Department of Information; the CAFU came to an end with the dissolution of the Federation in 1963.



The aim of the Unit was, as Peet put it to make a series of films "with blacks, for blacks" and the "briefing..in the phrase of the original briefing of the Unit, in 1947 or something,..[was] to assist in Native development". Peet explains further<sup>5</sup>

Some of [the films were based on] reconstructed stories and real life people doing their actual job, but most were scripted fictional stories which had an educational message inside them..like better agriculture, but it wasn't just, this is the way to plant these crops, this is the way to plough, it was a fictional story with some kind of other interest.. and within the story there was the educational message.

Because of the nature of the films, African interpreters became necessary, and film crews travelling in the three territories were usually made up of a director/cameraman (white), an interpreter (African), and one or two other African assistants. Sometimes a learner cameraman (white) would be attached to the crew. The CAFU was clearly run by whites, with African assistants. Izod argued that there were no Africans 'capable of training as technicians'. Africans were employed in the Unit mainly as interpreters, translating action as well as speech.<sup>6</sup>

In 1956 the British financial support for CAFU was phased out and the Federal government took over this responsibility. This resulted in a marked shift in the pattern of production. The most important production of the Unit became newsreel films for both



Africans and whites, and ambitious 'propaganda films in both 35mm and 16mm were made to encourage immigration and tourism, and win a respectable image for the Federation overseas."<sup>7</sup> The productivity of CAFU was impressive. By September 1953, for instance, which was five years after the appointment of Izod as producer, 77 films had been produced for local and overseas audiences, and 17 other films were being prepared for distribution.<sup>8</sup>

Because of the large and varied output of the CAFU, it is clear that a paper of this nature can not do a comprehensive analysis of its work. What I intend to do, is to examine, in some detail the 'educational' agricultural films produced by CAFU, in its early years. In this, endeavour I will be guided by historical documents, and recent comments made by former CAFU employees, and in particular Stephen Peet. During a visit to Zimbabwe in January of 1988, I had the opportunity to sit together with Peet and view some of the films, made by the CAFU between 1948 and 1955. This approach, which involved holding a discussion, while viewing the films, was found quite useful. It enabled the interviewee to recall certain information, which he had otherwise forgotten. For instance, while viewing the film The New School, Peet had this to say<sup>9</sup> . . .

The District Commissioner, his name was Michael Harris, I happen to remember that, because I knew him during the war. . . Very young Michael Harris, an administrator of an area of



100,000 people, in his early twenties, it was absolutely amazing...maybe he was thirty years old. I had forgotten he was in this film. It's quite extraordinary. If anybody asked me if I had this man, Michael Harris in the film, I would have said no, but there he is. I can hear his voice now.

This is but one example of the useful information obtained, as a result of providing the interviewee with visual stimulation. As a result of these interviews, and also interviewing other former CAFU employees, and reviewing historical developments at the time the CAFU was active, I came to the conclusion that, CAFU film productions on agriculture, can best be described as propaganda, as opposed to education. Zimbardo distinguishes education from propaganda in this way<sup>10</sup>

Many educators believe that their primary task is to teach students how to think and not what to think - to encourage students to seek alternatives and learn how to evaluate them rather than accept someone else's definition of the problem or choice of solution.

Propaganda, in contrast, is [the]... widespread promotion of particular ideas, doctrines, or practices to further one's own cause or to discredit that of one's opposition.

Effective propaganda usually involves concealing both the intention to persuade and also the true source of the propaganda.



Indeed, the CAFU scriptwriter Denys Brown acknowledges the propagandist orientation of the CAFU productions for Africans.<sup>11</sup>

The method used is that of putting over propaganda points (on such subjects as agriculture, health, enterprise, and self-help, general conduct, and so on) in a story.

"Morality" films in fact. Practically all the characters are African, and the stories applicable to normal African life.

A few of the stories are traditional one, and the majority are founded on fact.

And he adds that, "propaganda is a word and a thing that is resented by white audiences. But the African wants it." In Brown's view, the Africans have a thirst for knowledge, and "a special ability to learn ( and to remember what has been learnt), by eyes, [and] a highly developed tendency for emulation." Such characteristic made film the ideal 'educational' medium. Brown concludes that

The African will see films- that is certain. By providing films showing a better way of life typified by the adventures and the achievements of his own people, the CAFU is cashing in on these assets and hopes to play a great part in the development and advancement of the African.

The first CAFU educational film on agriculture, was scripted, interestingly enough by Peet, rather than Brown, who was the official scriptwriter. It is called The Two Farmers, and was made around 1948/49. Peet got the idea for the script while working on another film in the Tanda area of the Manicaland province of



Southern Rhodesia.<sup>12</sup> The filming took place near Rusape. And as Peet recently pointed out, it became the basis for many other films. He explains the story

It's a simple story of two fictitious characters called Panganayi, who was a good farmer and Washoma, who was a lazy farmer, a theme that was used several times . . .The good [farmer] prospers and the other one doesn't.

Panganayi prospers because he listens to the Agricultural Demonstrator, and obeys instructions, such as rotating crops and making contour ridges. Washoma spends his time drinking beer and is rude to the Agricultural Demonstrator.

For the purposes of the film Peet used an Agricultural Demonstration plot, near Rusape. The produce on that plot was attributed to Panganayi's good farming. When viewing this in 1988, Peet remarked, "It's appallingly exaggerated when you think of all that, for one man, and four crop rotations."

Nevertheless, the film appears to have been successful with rural audiences, and in districts where it was shown, the names Panganayi and Washoma, became nicknames for that kind of farmer.<sup>13</sup>

The CAFU made many other similar films. Peet recalls making one called Feniasi and Timoti, in Malawi. It is a six part film, which teaches Africans how to grow tobacco. It uses a story line which contrasts between a good tobacco farmer, Feniasi, who



follows the advice of the Agricultural Demonstrator, and a poor and lazy farmer Timoti, who does not follow instructions, and spends his time drinking, while insisting that his wife do all the work. Timoti, like Washoma in The Two Farmers, represents the stereotypical lazy, beer-drinking, African male, who does not respect colonial authority. As a result he does not prosper, and is unable to buy such things as a scotch-cart. This stereotype of African male idleness, had been questioned as early as 1909, by Native Commissioner Meredith of Makoni, who observed that the "ordinarily accepted theory that the women do all the work in the fields is gradually being contradicted." His observations were that Africans, male and female, were hardworking and enterprising and were "not averse to improvement in seed and would willingly experiment with a better class of mealies."<sup>14</sup>

While the film, Feniasi and Timoti, could be shown in Nyasaland, it was not considered suitable for Southern Rhodesia "because it breeds dissatisfaction among the natives here who are not permitted to grow tobacco".<sup>15</sup> Southern Rhodesia, dominated by whites, was not prepared to accept the challenge of an African peasantry, growing profitable cash crops. Where concessions were made, such as in cotton growing, the right to grow cash crops was only granted after individual African peasants met certain stringent conditions. The 1949/50 film by Peet called,



Marimo Finds A New Life, which was filmed near the then Salisbury demonstrates this. Peet explains<sup>16</sup>

..the story behind this [film] is what I really want to tell you. ..There was a government order, of the Agricultural Department, that Africans could grow cotton, which was a good cash crop..only, I think I'm right, if they could prove to the Agricultural Instructor, or whoever it was, [who] came inspecting, that they were doing proper farming, with crop rotation. Then they got allocation of cotton seed, and could grow cotton on a 20 or 25% of the land, so it was a kind of blackmail, which at the same time, I suppose, improved farming methods, because people wanted to get the money from the cash crop, you see. But it was rather strange business, so this film is about it.

This example indicates the propagandistic orientation of the so called CAFU educational films. A programme of education as we saw earlier, must respect the learner, promote dialogue and enhance an uninhibited development of individuals and communities. White Rhodesians were not prepared to educate Africans in this sense. The racial prejudice, at the official level is reflected in an official government publication, used for recruitment in Britain at the end of the Second World War. It describes Southern Rhodesia at the turn of the 19th the century, (for the benefit of prospective immigrant), as "trackless veld swarming with wild



life, both animal and human, a land of savagery and bloodshed." It goes on<sup>17</sup>

Rid yourself of any idea that life in Southern Rhodesia is easy. It is not easy. Continual effort is necessary if the Whites (with 82,382 Europeans to 1,600,000 Africans, they are outnumbered 20 to 1), are to justify their standard of living and maintain their intellectual and physical superiority. The African people are advancing rapidly in the scale of civilisation, though they have still a long way to go to come within measurable distance of the Europeans; the average Rhodesian is glad to see them progress since the African, when he is better educated, more efficient and consequently better paid, is capable of making incalculable contributions to the development of the country. But the European, if he is to keep ahead, cannot afford to slacken. And that means work.

It is therefore clear what education and development for the Africans meant, to the colonial authorities. The African was to be allowed to develop, but not to catch up with the European.

Initially, it does appear that the Africans were 'seduced' by the film. They were fascinated by it and by its message. Many Africans who viewed films at that time, confirm this view. The most interesting comment comes from the White owned, but African edited newspaper, The African Weekly. The paper observed that the people of Mzavavi village, in the Mhondoro African Reserves of



Southern Rhodesia, had viewed the films "with passionate interest, and commented a great deal on their message." The paper concluded that the "work of this Film Unit, which we prefer to call the Civilizing Policy, is no doubt a very great credit to the Government of Southern Rhodesia."<sup>18</sup>

David Hlazo, a former CAFU employee believes that people liked the films for a number of reasons.<sup>19</sup> One key reason was the lack of entertainment facilities in the rural areas. (In cities, such as Salisbury, people could, for instance go to cinema houses to view 'Westerns'). People walked long distances to see the marvel of the moving images. It could be argued that film succeeded, precisely because it was a novel medium. Another sign of interest was the large the number of people who wished to be actors in CAFU films, often for no pay. It perhaps worth pointing out that, an urban audience shown CAFU films, was reported by The African Weekly to be "a little skeptical, critical and somewhat unappreciative...". Maybe it was because they were not as overwhelmed by the novelty of film, as the rural audience.

Besides the entertainment value of the films, it also appears that the 'educational' content of agricultural films was taken seriously by peasant audiences. The interest of Africans in Agriculture has been well documented. As early as 1898, a Native Commissioner in the then Umtali, expressed surprise at the



readiness of African farmers in his area to use manure and phosphates, and to grow any grain or vegetable for which there was a market, including "potatoes, cabbage, cauliflower, onions, cucumbers, beans etc", which the Africans had not previously grown before.<sup>20</sup>

The enthusiasm for agriculture, shown by Africans supports Ranger's claim that Africans in the rural areas sought to develop agriculturally, rather than become labour migrants employed by white settlers. In other words, they sought to develop what Ranger calls the "peasant option"<sup>21</sup> The CAFU films appeared, at least in the early days, to support the peasant option, and were well received. The Land Apportionment Act, which divided the country on racial grounds had been enacted in 1930, but was not implemented seriously until in the 1950s.

Beginning in the late 1920s African Demonstrators were deployed in the African Reserves, to work with peasant farmers and encourage intensive farming methods, and promote soil conservation. As long as peasants had good, productive farming land, they welcomed the ideas from the Demonstrators. They were prepared to experiment with new ideas, while at the same time enjoying the freedom to plant as much land as they desired.<sup>22</sup> The role of African Demonstrator, who were employees of the Department of Native Affairs, was very prominent in the CAFU



agricultural films. In such films as, The Two Farmers, Feniasi and Timoti, Harneck's Cotton, Master Farmer, and many others, the Demonstrator is a key actor, who teaches African farmers new and "successful" farming methods.

While, on one hand, the CAFU was teaching new farming methods, the productivity of the Africans was seen by Europeans, as having an adverse effect on the recruitment of labour. Some urged that the purchase of maize from the African Reserves be controlled. These appeals were to lead to the Maize Control Amendment Act of 1934, "which discriminated blatantly against African maize growers."<sup>23</sup> In cases where Africans were used to getting, seven shillings to eight shillings a bag, they could now only get four shillings. Even then, many Africans were prepared to grow more to make up for the loss. However with the widespread enforcement of the Land Apportionment Act in the 1950s, and the consequent evictions, and resettlement which it entailed, the peasant option, became an impossibility.

In a recent interview,<sup>24</sup> David Hlazo, who was employed by the CAFU for about two years in the period in 1952/3, and worked with scriptwriter Denys Brown, remembered that period. He went with Brown to Essexvale (which is now Esigodini), in the Matebeleland region, to help Brown develop a script about resettlement. At



that time the government was evicting people from 'European' land in Matebeleland. He observes

We could say that was a resettlement programme, in today's language. But it was not really resettlement, because in today's resettlement, people are willing to move, and they are allocated fields, and they go with their animals, to an area which they like. In those days ..the government would select an area to settle white farmers, and people were moved, without consultation, and they were moved whether they liked it or not, they were moved. This was happening in many areas.

Hlazo went to Essexvale with Brown, where some people had been recently resettled. The aim was to make a film to show that the people who had been resettled were happy and successful. This, it was hoped, would encourage others, who were yet to be evicted. Hlazo's job was to meet the chief, the Land Development Officer, and the Headman, and to get their story. He wrote out the story, and gave it to Brown who prepared it into a filming script.

Another former African CAFU employee, Samuel Tutani, was personally affected by the Land Apportionment Act, when his family was moved from a white area.<sup>25</sup> He remembers that the peasants resisted moving until their houses and some property was destroyed. He believes the land called 'Rhodesdale' was taken over by ex-servicemen, and the peasants were moved to Sanyati and Gokwe.



The enforcement of the Land Apportionment Act, led to a rural crisis. The crisis had been foreseen by some colonial authorities.<sup>26</sup> Thus in July 1942

Native Commissioner Jowett of Inyanga had explained to the Natural Resources Board Native Enquiry that the Natural Resources Act and the Land Appointment [sic] Act "work against each other ...To carry out the terms of the Land Apportionment Act in this District I must double the population in the reserves and that is absolutely impossible."

But the authorities pressed on, and more and more people were moved into fragile lands. As a result,<sup>27</sup> in such areas as Tanda and Weya, in Manicaland, where Peet had scripted his first agricultural film, The Two Farmers

yields collapsed; erosion was extensive; grazing was exhausted. The peasants and the administrators explained these disasters in diametrically opposed ways. The peasants knew that they were a result of eviction and resettlement. The administration increasingly came to explain their poverty and the degeneration of the land in terms of backward farming methods..

Countrywide, the agricultural economy of the Africans was destroyed. The scarce land resources allocated to Africans, the heavy subsidy for European agriculture beginning in 1908, the Cattle Levy Acts of 1931 and 1933, the Maize Control Amendment



Act of 1934, which discriminated against African maize growers, all these factors ensured African poverty and European prosperity.<sup>28</sup>

Faced with overcrowding in the African Reserves, Native Commissioners and other Colonial authorities introduced intensified conservation measures. Peasants were required to make drain strips, gully dams, contour ridges, and practice rotational grazing.

It is in the light of these issues that CAFU films, on better methods of farming have to be viewed. Numerous demands were made on peasants, and the peasants began to notice that these measures did not really do much to improve productivity. Ranger observes that<sup>29</sup>

By the end of 1952, there were clear signs of opposition..

It was at this time that the African Demonstrators, once the valued collaborators of entrepreneurs, came to be seen as hated agents of unjust and arbitrary authority.

In Tutani's view, some of the advice of the Demonstrators flew in the face of commonsense. Furthermore the demonstrators began to behave like the police, reporting and fining people for violating conservation rules<sup>30</sup>. Peet's film Constable Phiri on Patrol, made around 1954, is based on a story, which Peet believes to be true, of a man who poses as some kind of detective, and goes round villages, demanding fines and bribes from people who have



violated conservation rules. Eventually the man is arrested. The fact that such a story could be written as a credible script, indicates the extent to which the colonial conservation movement had gripped the country.

Massive land evictions, and other repressive government policies, left the peasants no option but to turn to radical nationalism and support for the Liberation War. One District Commissioner had foreseen this, and in 1942, felt<sup>31</sup>.

constrained to write about certain factors which bear upon the future of the political situation...I have in mind particularly the position as it occurs in the native reserves. From the agricultural side we have a dictum that 4 acres is as much as a man can cultivate thoroughly with 2 acres for each additional wife. Have we, on the other hand, an economic dictum that a man can maintain himself and his family on 4 to 6 acres? If so, at what minimum price for his products, and at what standard of living? If these and many other allied problems are not thought out and planned for, then unfortunate political trends are certain to develop. One could wish that there existed an institution in the Colony to serve as an organ of social and economic planning so that consideration could be given at this stage to problems which are certain to arise and which should be prepared for before they constitute the basis of strong political antagonism.



The Colonial authorities were not interested in productive African Reserves, but in a pool of cheap labour. Grain surplus would be produced by white commercial farmers. The African men would provide a migrant labour force necessary for the development of white enterprise, and the African women would produce subsistence crops.

The Land Husbandry Act of 1951 brought additional unpopular reforms. It made sweeping changes in terms of land tenure and land allocation in the African Reserves. The Act involved the allocation of small plots of land to registered owners in the African Reserves, and the enforcement of agricultural rules. This act aroused great opposition and was finally suspended in 1964. A leading critic of the Act was Chief Mangwende, who incidentally had participated in the making of a CAFU film in 1949/50. The film, in which Peet participated, was called Mangwende and the Trees, and is based on the true story, of a tree planting project which the Chief had initiated.<sup>32</sup> Because of Chief Mangwende's opposition to the Land Husbandry Act, the colonial government deposed him.

Active opposition to the CAFU productions in Southern Rhodesia, if it existed, is not well documented. But there are signs that Africans were sometimes critical of the "educational content" of the CAFU productions. As early as 1949, at a showing of Mujenji Builds a Bridge, which is supposed to promote self-help, one



member of the audience, who were employees of the Department of Native Affairs, queried why some of the Africans working on the bridge-building project had not been paid.<sup>33</sup> He argued that "to work without pay appeared unjust, especially in these hard times." Another member of the audience "deplored" the fact that the films "looked down" on Africans as "dirty, lazy, and foolish people -after all these qualities are not peculiar to their particular breed". More research is needed to assess the reaction of audiences, in the late 1950s and early 1960s.

As has already been pointed out, with the termination of funding from the Colonial Welfare Development Fund, the focus of the CAFU productions, shifted more and more towards the production of Federal propaganda, for home and overseas audiences.<sup>34</sup>

'Educational' films for rural audiences became less and less important. The Rhodesia Nvasaland News films, which were a form of a newsreel for Africans became more important. But Africans were opposed to the Federation, because they saw it as a way of strengthening white domination across the region. It is perhaps for this reasons that Tutani,<sup>35</sup> who worked with the CAFU in both Northern and Southern Rhodesia, reports that during the Federation, Africans in Zambia became increasingly hostile to the CAFU and its film crews. This meant that members of the Unit based in Zambia did not always feel free to reveal that they were Federal employees. Sometimes they pretended to be a foreign



crew, such as the BBC, in order to get their work done without resistance.

The above review of the activities of the CAFU leads to a number of conclusions. There is evidence that, in the period 1948 to 1955, the CAFU "educational" films were well received by the intended rural audience. Clearly they provided entertainment, but they also provided information on new methods of farming, which was appreciated by peasant farmers, who as we have seen were always keen to experiment with new ideas.

It is also clear that the typical CAFU educational film story, which attributed success to hard work, and the following of instructions from Demonstrators, did not address the root of the problem of the rural crisis, which was the blatant discrimination against peasant farmers. According to the typical CAFU film script, poverty was a result of laziness and refusal to follow instructions from the Native agricultural officials. For the peasants, the issue was first and foremost the racial land distribution policy, which resulted in allocation to Africans, of marginal and crowded land. The economic plight of the African could not be solved by better farming methods, but by a more just land distribution system. It was for this reason that the peasants threw their weight behind the Liberation War<sup>36</sup>, which culminated in the surrender of the white minority government in 1980. And, as the President of Zimbabwe said in a recent speech,



"Our freedom struggle always recognised the question of land as the principal grievance." But Zimbabwe has yet to solve the rural problem. This year, President Mugabe, called for a "revolutionary land reform programme", which would ensure "uninhibited land redistribution". He added<sup>37</sup>

It makes no sense of our liberation struggle that the majority of our peasant families have remained the outcasts of our land tenure system. True, we have provided price incentives and extension services to them, but what real land resources are available to the rural peasant families for both cropping and cattle ranching?

Clearly the government realises, as the peasants have known over the last decades, that the African Reserves are overcrowded, and unless more land is made available, the quality of rural life can not be expected to improve.

To conclude, this paper has reviewed the films produced by the CAFU, beginning in 1948, whose aim was to promote Native Development. It has been shown that the idea of using film as a propaganda tool for mass audiences, originated from Britain, where it was actively promoted by the British Secretary of State for Colonies in the 1930s.

Key personnel in CAFU were recruited from Britain, soon after the Second World War, when Southern Rhodesia was actively encouraging immigration of white skilled personnel. This group of men



recruited local assistants who helped them in making films for Africans.

It has been argued that CAFU films were appreciated, in the rural areas, at least before the widespread enforcement of the Land Apportionment Act. However, with the enforcement of the Act, the films became more and more an arm of government propaganda, urging Africans to conserve soil in the overcrowded rural areas, engage in intensive farming methods, and listen to the authoritarian, and sometimes corrupt Agricultural officials.<sup>38</sup> Native Development which the Unit claimed to be promoting, came more and more to mean separate and unequal development between the races. Peet recalls that film materials which he shot in an attempt to promote racial partnership were considered unsuitable, and never used.<sup>39</sup>

It is therefore, in my view, inappropriate to label the CAFU films on agriculture, as educational. It is perhaps be too much to expect a Unit dominated by whites, and sponsored by a racist establishment, to have been sensitive enough to create truly educational films. The more liberal members of CAFU like Peet felt that they were making a positive contribution. And perhaps, in some limited way they did. But the Unit as a whole appeared to have become increasingly insensitive to the real issues facing the peasants, as articulated by Africans. In the end, the CAFU produced films about the European's view of the African



condition. For this reason, using the criteria outlined earlier, about the difference between propaganda and education, I consider the so called educational films on agriculture to be propaganda. This is a conclusion, which I'm sure Brown, the CAFU scriptwriter would not query; because, as we saw earlier he argues that the African appreciates propaganda. However the success of the Liberation War raises doubts about his assessment of African judgement, and political maturity.

---

I wish to acknowledge the invaluable assistance given me by Ann Derges, Ian Johnstone, and K. Manungo of the National Archives of Zimbabwe, and by Rosalyn Smyth of Australia. I am particularly grateful to K. Manungo for assisting me in recording oral interviews. I am deeply indebted to Stephen Peet from England, Samuel Tutani, and David Hlazo, from Harare, who generously shared their experiences in the CAFU.

#### N O T E S

1. See Smyth, R., "The British Colonial Film Unit and Sub-Saharan Africa, 1939-1945", *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 8, 3 (1988), 285-286.
2. Ibid.
3. Izod to Director of Information 30th July 1957, Denys Brown collection. British support for the CAFU ended in March, 1956
4. See Smyth, R., "The Central African Film Unit's Images of Empire, 1948-1963", *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 3, 2 (1983), 133
5. Interview with Stephen Peet, Harare, 14 January, 1988.
6. Izod, -A., "History of the Central African Film Unit", July 1960. Denys Brown collection.
7. See Smyth, R., "The British Colonial Film Unit and Sub-Saharan Africa, 1939-1945", 133



8. The estimate is given in the "Final Half-Yearly Report of Operations", 1953. Denys Brown collection.
9. Interview with Stephen Peet, Harare, 18 January, 1988.
10. See Zimbardo, P., Essentials of Psychology and Life, (London, Scott, Foresman and Co., 1980), 490.
11. Brown, D., "A view of Development in Central Africa". Undated Denys Brown collection.
12. Interview with Stephen Peet, Harare, 14 January, 1988.
13. Ibid.
14. Ranger, T., Peasant Consciousness and Guerrilla War in Zimbabwe: A comparative study (Harare, Zimbabwe Publishing House, 1985), 36
15. See Naminesuh [sic]., G. "Report on Film Shows at Matopos 26-27th September 1949." Stephen Peet Collection.
16. Interview with Stephen Peet, Harare, 18 January, 1988.
17. See "Southern Rhodesia: Facts and Figures for the Immigrant", which was prepared by the Public Relations Department of Southern Rhodesia, October 1945. This pamphlet was distributed by the Southern Rhodesia High Commissioner in London.
18. "Civilising Policy", African Weekly, 15 March 1950.
19. Interview with David Hlazo, 17 December 1987.
20. Ranger, T., Peasant Consciousness and Guerrilla War in Zimbabwe: A comparative study, 37
21. See Ranger, T., "Peasant Consciousness and Guerrilla Warfare in Zimbabwe". The book provides a useful insight into the dilemmas facing the peasants during the period under discussion.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid., 55. Ranger gives a useful account of the impact of discriminatory practices on African peasant farmers.
24. Interview with David Hlazo, 17 December, 1987
25. Interview with Samuel Tutani, 11 February, 1988
26. see Ranger's Peasant Consciousness and Guerrilla Warfare in Zimbabwe, p. 105



27. Ibid., 152
28. Ibid., 55
29. Ibid., 154
30. Ibid.
31. Ibid., 146. The District Commissioner was Stead, based in the Manicaland province of Southern Rhodesia. He oversaw the movement of many African families from 'white' areas into the Chiduku Reserves. Ranger points out that Stead pioneered the use of compulsion to make Africans carry out conservation projects (see pages 142-43)
32. Interview with Stephen Peet, Harare, 14 January, 1988.
33. "Report on Film Shows at Matopos 26-27th September, 1949." Stephen Peet Collection.
34. Izod, A., "History of the Central African Film Unit".
35. Interview with Samuel Tutani, 11 February, 1988.
36. See for instance T. Ranger's, Peasant Consciousness and Guerrilla Warfare in Zimbabwe, for a discussion of this.
37. "President Calls for Revolutionary Land Reform Programme", The Herald, 12 August 1989.
38. See Ranger, T., Peasant Consciousness and Guerrilla Warfare in Zimbabwe, p. 155
39. Interview with Stephen Peet, 22 January, 1988.