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World over, the endeavour to write a full-scale national history is an intricate business. The roadmap for the independence of Zimbabwe after 1965 has been examined from various perspectives, given the contested nature of its last events in the 1970s. The roadmap was even more intricate especially when dealing with a critical historical period in which certain personalities possess vested interests in occupying the same political throne. For instance, Mugabe, Muzorewa, Sithole and Nkomo were key life-long political contestants who availed themselves for the leadership of an independent Zimbabwe. The paper argues that although Muzorewa was eventually and permanently sidelined after losing the landmark independence elections of 1980, his name would forever be encoded in the history of independent Zimbabwe. A hermeneutical re-reading of Muzorewa’s theology which is found in his autobiography reveals that he epitomised the spirit of a particular era, which was imbued with a sense of solidarity and patriotism in the backdrop of the struggle for the independence of Zimbabwe. Muzorewa served both the church and the nation as an inspiration out of his values of selfishlessness and integrity for humanity. The lessons that could be got from the study are manifold, both for contemporary Zimbabwe and even beyond. The study will show that people are always happier if society is ruled with just laws and international cooperation is the benchmark for human progress in a world that has become a global village.
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Introduction

The making of Zimbabwe as an independent nation, which came into fruition in 1980, was as a result of an arduous process and has been evaluated differently by a number of historians and political scientists. Until a full account of Zimbabwe’s making as an independent nation is comprehensively documented, it will continue to be conspicuously skeletal in scope. Whereas many blacks of every sociological profile participated in the armed struggle, it will be noted that there were certain personalities who were more intimately involved in the making of Zimbabwe as an independent country.

The likes of Ndabaningi Sithole, Robert Mugabe, Joshua Nkomo and Abel Muzorewa will continue to be luminaries in Zimbabwe’s historiography. These personalities reflected quite different backgrounds yet they were life-long political rivals who competed and contested against each other to provide the ultimate political leadership of an independent nation (Mitchell, 1980). For instance, Sithole belonged to the American Board of Foreign Missions as a Congregationalist minister with roots in the eastern Chipinge district in Zimbabwe. Nkomo was a strong and popular trade unionist from Bulawayo, the second largest city in Zimbabwe. Mugabe was a professional teacher with wide political contacts in Africa, especially in Ghana. Lastly, Muzorewa was a titanic Archbishop of the United Methodist Church in Zimbabwe, with strong American roots. The study submits that each one of these personalities played a role to bring about majority rule in Zimbabwe.

The present study provides a hermeneutical re-interpretation of Bishop Abel Muzorewa’s theology in the light of his political career in the 1970s which culminated in the birth of Zimbabwe in February 1980. Nevertheless, Muzorewa’s contribution continues to be a conundrum amongst scholars who write on Zimbabwe’s historiography. For instance, on one hand, Muzorewa is generally described as a political sellout who ‘dined and wined’ with the white Rhodesian status quo at the expense of the suffering blacks in the 1970s. The mass bombings at Nyadzonya refugee camps in Mozambique in 1978 when he was Prime Minister of the short-lived government of Zimbabwe-Rhodesia tend to testify and confirm the label as passed by hardline nationalist guerilla fighters (Christie, 1988). On the other hand, Muzorewa is also perceived to be a latter-day turncoat politician who hijacked the African revolution in the 1970s largely on account that he was power hungry. This may tend to
sound as mainstream politicians had launched the armed struggle in the 1960s, specifically in 1966 with the battle of Chinhoyi (then, Sinoia) in the Mashonaland Central province. The revolutionary armed struggle was spearheaded by the two main liberation movements ZAPU and ZANU (Bhebe, 1999). In general, Muzorewa’s United African National Congress, which was formed in 1971, is not given the political space it deserves in the historiography of the armed struggle for Zimbabwe. Understandably, these are mere perspectives which are engrained in certain human subjective or objective influences. Perhaps, it could be accounted for through what Professor Masipula Sithole (1978) described as part of ‘struggles-within-struggles’. Nevertheless, the present study posits that there is the need to reconsider Bishop Muzorewa’s political career in view of the fact that Zimbabwe’s journey to majority rule which took 15 years was painstaking. There is the need to re-position Muzorewa’s role in the armed struggle which also shaped the nature of church-State relations in the Rhodesia of the 1970s (Linden, 1979). In fact, the thesis of the study posits that Muzorewa was invaluable in helping bring majority rule in Zimbabwe in 1980. Therefore, the study re-appraises the theology of Bishop Abel Muzorewa in the context of the struggle for the independence of Zimbabwe in light of the historical events which were linked with the independence movement between 1965 and 1980. Accordingly, the study claims that a re-reading of the theology of Muzorewa especially as advanced in his autobiography, Muzorewa: Rise Up and Walk: An Autobiography (1978) mirrors the history of a nation at large. Muzorewa was a political ‘father-figure’ who epitomised a spirit of a particular political era in the 1970s in the history of the birth of Zimbabwe. Moreover, it must be noted that the 1970s constituted an era which was imbued with a deep spirit of solidarity and an abiding sense of patriotism in the context of the armed struggle for liberation in Zimbabwe (Madambanuki & Tanton 2010). In the backdrop of his theology, it will be shown that Muzorewa played the role of the Biblical Moses in the process of leading the African blacks from the ‘bondage’ of white settlerism under colonial rule to black majority rule in Zimbabwe.

**Muzorewa’ Early Life**

Muzorewa was born on 14 April 1925 in the eastern Manicaland province and received both the primary and secondary education at Old Mutare mission (Madambanuki & Tanton 2010). Muzorewa became a lay evangelist at a tender age of 19 years before he trained into the ministry at Hartzell Theological Seminary. In 1952 Muzorewa was ordained as a deacon and pastor and served in the Rusape parishes until 1958, when he went to Missouri and Tennessee where he received both the Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees in Divinity (Rasmussen and Rubert, 1990). He returned in 1963 to become a pastor at Old Mutare mission and soon was appointed Director of the church’s Christian Youth Movement in 1964. In 1966, Muzorewa became Secretary-General of the Students Youth Movement in the whole country. It must be pointed out that his ascendency to the top of the United Methodist Church shook and shocked the white regime, for in 1968, Muzorewa was elected Bishop of the denomination at a colourful meeting which was held in Botswana. By this consecration, Muzorewa entered into the history books as the first indigenous black minister to head a major mainline church in colonial Zimbabwe (Brockman, 1994). Accordingly, it was quite inescapable that he became a central player in the politics of Rhodesia. Muzorewa’s consecration as bishop drew some battle lines with the racist colonial policies. Under these posts, Muzorewa energetically deployed his pastoral ministry into political activity for he was involved in the politics of Rhodesia from then onwards.

**Historical Milieu of Muzorewa’s Theology**

Bishop Abel Muzorewa’s theology is characteristically situational and was a response to some internal and external existential factors which surrounded him as a man, theologian and politician after 1965. In fact, three principal factors which pinched a deep impression on Muzorewa’s theology can be identified. Those factors were the Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI) by the white Rhodesian Prime Minister, Ian Smith in 1965, the inspiration of the Bible as a model of liberation and the influence of non-violent philosophy as represented by both Martin Luther King and Mahatma Gandhi. These critical issues are comprehensively traceable in his autobiography.

First and foremost, the creation of the Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI) in 1965 by white Rhodesians resulted in despondency to blacks whom the white settlers generally indicted upon as, ‘Smith’s other citizens’ (Skelton, 1985:31). The result was that indigenous blacks were further politically sidelined, economically exploited and socially abused in the country of their birth. Rhodesia (as Zimbabwe was known then) was reduced to become a society of ‘two nations’ because the whites entrenched themselves as the rich minority whilst the blacks were condemned to live as the poor majority. Despite his fragile physique, Muzorewa learned a candid lesson early on in life that
the only defense mechanism he had against the
discrimination of the majority of the indigenous
Africans was to develop a ‘sharp and cutting’ tongue
against opponents. In fact, colonial repression which
was anchored in white race and racism provided the
socio-economic and political dynamics which shaped
Muzorewa’s theology. In our re-consideration, this is
why Muzorewa’s theology from the late 1960s and
onwards characteristically evolved around the themes
of liberation, justice and peace in the context of
colonialism.

Secondly, Muzorewa masterminded the ethos of
liberation as part of the divine salvific grace which was
inspired his deep understanding of the Biblical
Scriptures. Muzorewa posited that it has always been
God’s ‘business’ is to liberate people from everything
that de-humanizes them on earth (Exodus 3:7-8). In fact,
the liberation of the people is the kernel of the justice
of God. Muzorewa made a hermeneutical re-reading of
some Scriptures to configure a theology of liberation.
Beginning from the Old Testament, Muzorewa took
Moses as the archetype of a courageous and sacrificial
leader. It is in the public domain that Moses led the
Israelites from Egyptian bondage (Exodus 3:10).
Despite Pharaoh’s bitterness and hostility (Exodus 7-3-
4), but Moses was not de-flated from the one divine
agenda- the liberation of the oppressed Israelites to the
Promised Land of Canaan.

Next, and again in the Old Testament, Muzorewa’s theology was coloured up by the oracles
of such prophets like of Amos, Jeremiah and Ezekiel.
In particular, Muzorewa’s theology resonated with the
message of Ezekiel on the valley of dry bones (Ezekiel
18). Muzorewa’s fiery sermons appealed to the
Africans, especially the young men and women who
later made agonizing decisions to leave the country to
go to the neighbouring countries like Zambia,
Botswana, Tanzania and Mozambique, to fight and
sustain the armed struggle until Zimbabwe was
liberated from the yoke of colonialism. This armed
struggle was seen as vital because the majority of the
black people in Rhodesia had learnt some lessons that
there would be no peace and justice in a society which
was governed by the racist or discriminatory laws.
That Muzorewa was eventually a political threat to the
colonial status quo is seen when the white Rhodesian
government forbade him from entering or visiting the
rural communities between 1965 and 1969.

Moreover, in the New Testament, Peter’s
proclamation, thus, ‘In the name of Jesus Christ of
Nazareth, rise up and walk’ (Acts 3:6) is instructive
behind Muzorewa’s paradigm of doing theology. In
fact, it is this very Biblical citation which inspired
Muzorewa to perceive God as commanding him to
literally ‘rise up and walk’ from the colonial situation
of hopelessness to chart a roadmap towards the
liberation of Zimbabwe. The future of Zimbabwe was
to emerge from the efforts of the oppressed people
themselves. Like what the Argentine patriot, Ernesto
Che Guevara (1960:43) realised that ‘In order to
change the destinies of the people from the vice of
poverty, there is one way – cutting the evil at the
roots’. Muzorewa’s theology also affirmed in the
1970s that political emancipation was not to be given
on a silver plate. The poor people themselves were
the artisans of their own liberation and identity. Such, was
Muzorewa’s theology of liberation which emerged in
the context of colonialism in Zimbabwe.

Thirdly and lastly, Muzorewa’s theology was also
shaped by the non-violent philosophies of both Martin
Luther King (1929-1968) in the USA and Mahatma
Gandhi (1869-1948) in India. These two political
luminaries argued that peace in society can only be
realised through non-violent resistance. In particular,
Gandhi posited that satya graha (love-force) was a
strong means of doing passive resistance against the
oppressor. In the process of doing non-violent
resistance, five pertinent insights must be noted and
which Muzorewa adopted to buffer a theology of
liberation:

- Non-violence is not a cowardly action but a
  ‘revolutionary’ movement born out of love.
- Non-violence requires human sacrifice, that is, the
  willingness to suffer.
- Non-violence is not meant to humiliate anyone but
to redeem humanity.
- Non-violence is meant to reconcile contending
  forces so that harmony can prevail.
- Non-violence is a march for the victory of justice to
  create a more humane society.

The church is an ecclesiastical institution and must
serve humanity respective of colour ‘to send people
to heaven and bring heaven to earth’. The gospel
message, if it must be relevant to its hearers, must not
remain like a ‘pie in the sky’ but rather, must gratify
the people in their mundane situatedness.

Muzorewa: Anatomy of a Nationalist

Muzorewa’s transformation into the political terrain is
not without plausibility. Firstly, Muzorewa slowly
entered into the turbulent Black Nationalist politics
when the radical white Bishop Ralph Edward Dodge,
Head of the United Methodist Church between 1956
and 1964 was deported in 1964. The deportation Order
asked Bishop Dodge to leave Rhodesia within fifteen
days as from 16 July 1964. The main reason was that
Dodge had characteristically defied ‘white Rhodesian
tradition’ by insisting on ‘eating with blacks, staying
with blacks and riding on the same buses with African
pastors, to the extent it was possible to become one
with the people and churches he had been sent to serve’ (Mungazi, 1991:vii). Accordingly, Muzorewa organized and led mass protests against the Smith’s regime for taking the high-handed action of deportation. Secondly, Muzorewa appeared as one of the principal critics of the white regime when Smith proclaimed the Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI) in November 1965. As Banana (1996:87) has commented, UDI was an immoral political philosophy because it represented a travesty of justice, bastardisation of civilisation and an irremovable erosion of Christian values, and its only claim to fame was that it opened the way for legitimate exploitation of the already oppressed Africans’. This is why Muzorewa came to identify himself with the grievances of the blacks who were experiencing oppression of worst kind under colonialism. There was no option for either or, and no neutrality to talk about but rather to embark on a political ministry head-on clash with Babylon, the enemy! Therefore, Muzorewa was banned in August 1970 from visiting the local churches of the United Methodist Church in the rural communities, especially in Mashonaland East and Manicaland provinces. These are the strongholds of the United Methodist Church in Zimbabwe.

It must be noted that Muzorewa was made an outlaw in his native country on account of his nationalist agitation when he supplied critical voice on behalf of the voiceless. Nevertheless, as Mungazi (1991:105) notes, African blacks went on to accept Muzorewa as the ‘Son of Zimbabwe…and through his efforts a new day is beginning to dawn in this land of our birth. We shall overcome’. In its annual report of 1970, the Christian Council of Rhodesia condemned Smith and warned of the deepening crisis that would ensure. In addition, certain international quarters threw weight behind Muzorewa. For instance, a seventy-member Executive Committee of the World Methodist Council met in Geneva, Switzerland on 18-21 August 1970 and expressed a profound dismay at Smith’s repressive measures against blacks. As a churchman-politician, Muzorewa expressed a theology of combat in the context of Zimbabwe’s journey to majority rule. This is how he became a national symbol of black resistance against white supremacist policies at a time when majority of the mainstream nationalists were locked up in various prisons across the country. For instance, ZANU’s Sithole and ZAPU’s Nkomo and their compatriots were languishing in various jails at Sikombela, Whahwa, and Salisbury Maximum prisons between 1964 and 1974 (Dickie and Rake, 1973). The Africans were divided and the white settlers tended to re-group to entrench colonialism despite that the country was ungovernable. As much as we can say, the ten years that the black nationalists spent in the prisons worked to delay the roadmap for majority rule for Zimbabwe. This is the scenario under which Muzorewa emerged as a politician and his principal purpose was to fill in the political chasm and keep the fire of Black Nationalism on in the 1970s.

Accordingly, together with Canaan Banana, Muzorewa emerged to form the United African National Council (U.A.N.C) in 1971. Muzorewa plunged into the political processes only after wide consultation with the United Methodist Church. At a well-attended meeting held at Old Mutare mission in 1971, Muzorewa’s plans to deploy his energies into political action were approved by the delegates. Two issues come out. Firstly, Muzorewa did not usurp political power despite the fact that he became ambitious to lead the nationalist movement when the circumstance arose. Secondly, Muzorewa was prepared to accept political leadership, out of goodwill, when it was bestowed onto him through a unanimous vote. Like Moses of the Old Testament, Muzorewa was a willing servant-leader. He was able to ‘rise and walk’ on the turbulent political waters of Rhodesia because the stakes were too high to help lead the black people along a journey towards majority rule. As other historians concur, ZANU and ZAPU leaderships placed themselves under the umbrella of Muzorewa’s U.A.N.C in order to resist the Pearce Commission in 1971.

Muzorewa’s mandate was to oppose British proposals in which Harold Wilson wanted to strike a deal with Ian smith. Smith wanted the sanctions that were imposed on Rhodesia in 1966 to go. Britain wanted legitimate political order to prevail in Rhodesia. But the black nationalists though were in prisons, wanted majority independence based on one-man one vote (Shamuyarira, 1965:142). So, Muzorewa was mandated to declare, countrywide, that there was to be no independence before majority rule (NIBMAR). As the book narrates, Muzorewa was so successful in executing his mandate. The proposed British deal flopped as blacks shot the referendum. Lord Pearce returned to Britain empty-handed. Inside Rhodesia, two main reasons could be advanced why the referendum flopped. Firstly, Muzorewa’s UANC had succeeded in mobilising majority of black opinions (Lapsley, 1986:38). Secondly, there was a sizeable section of influential whites who rejected the referendum. For instance, the once Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia, Garfield Todd (Tindall, 1968) and his ‘noisy’ daughter Judith vehemently denied and campaigned against it (Auret, 1992; Todd, 2007). The result was that Muzorewa emerged as a populist national leader and an international diplomat.

As the armed struggle escalated in the mid-1970s, Smith capitalized on Muzorewa’s newfound image and political popularity and struck a deal with him to...
form an interim regime. Accordingly, Muzorewa, alongside Sithole and Chief Chirau, was involved in peace talks with Ian Smith. On 3 March 1978, these three personalities signed an Internal Settlement agreement at Governor’s Lodge in Salisbury under the portrait of Cecil John Rhodes. Following elections of March 1979, Muzorewa was elected Prime Minister of a country that was re-named Zimbabwe-Rhodesia. Though Smith wished away white rule, but it must be noted that he had not wished away white power. The whites were guaranteed enough seats in the legislature to block any constitutional change (Martin and Johnson, 1981). This is why patriotic hardliners like Nkomo and Mugabe failed to cooperate and so denounced the Interim regime and its internal signatories: Muzorewa, Sithole and Chirau, as the ‘three blacksmiths’. It was an indictment to show that these moderate leaders had sold out the African cause because white hegemony was still intact. Hence, the hardline black nationalists continued the armed struggle unabatedly. There was no international recognition to the Internal Settlement. Even the United Nations (UN) failed to cooperate and through the Security Council Resolution 423, the UN declared Muzorewa’s Internal Settlement as illegal (Brockman, 1994). It was largely due to the U.N’s non-cooperation and non-recognition that compelled Britain’s Margaret Thatcher to ask all major political stakeholders to come to London to negotiate and solve the Rhodesian question. Muzorewa, Smith, Nkomo and Mugabe attended the Lancaster House Conference from 10 September to 15 December 1979. It was chaired by Lord Carrington, the British Foreign Secretary. Amongst other resolutions, Muzorewa was persuaded to accept fresh elections. Those elections were held in February 1980. Mugabe won and became Prime Minister of a new independent country. It is prudent to note that international cooperation was vital in facilitating the eventual outcome on the independence of Zimbabwe. As the study posits, political goodwill and diplomatic cooperation are vital virtues for societal transformation. This insight provides a durable lesson that modern nations have to learn and take note of: nations sustainable development takes place when there is peace, human cooperation and justice. These are universal Christian values upon which societies must be founded.

Muzorewa, a Patriot in a White Robe? A Critique

Muzorewa perceived the interrelatedness of politics and religion in such paradoxical terms, thus ‘politics has no place in Christianity but Christianity has a place in politics!’ This is how Muzorewa’s notions of church-State relation emerged in the context of the liberation of Zimbabwe. This is part of Muzorewa’s re-thinking of the role of Christian theology in terms of unique conditions that were provided by colonialism in Rhodesia. As a black patriot, Muzorewa was able to realise that to preach the gospel of Christ in the 1970s required a meaning and call to jump onto the political bandwagon. Thus, he cautiously adopted a fresh existential philosophy that was based on a theology of liberation and justice. He allowed things to happen in his career as a bishop-cum-politician in order to serve humanity in Zimbabwe. On one hand, the church was to play a prophetic voice in situations when the colonial State abused blacks. It has often been told, whether correctly or wrongly, that politics is a dirty game. Nevertheless, Muzorewa perceived the business of the church as, a divine institution, to mop up the political dirty which can make a class of people outlaws in their own country. By exploiting and repressing the majority of the black people in Zimbabwe, Smith’s nature of politics had become dirty. So, we see that Muzorewa’s point of departure of doing liberation theology was meant to challenge the colonial State that had become Babylon = sin. On the other hand, it is quite inescapable to note that Muzorewa was prepared to align the church to serve with the colonial State in the sphere of political governance. When matters came to a head in 1978, Muzorewa collaborated with the colonial State in an attempt to bring peace. Despite the fact that the Internal Settlement was painful interlude, but it must be noted that it facilitated the transitional process. In his own words, when interviewed in 1996 in Harare by the Dutch missiologist, Carl Frederick Hallencreutz, Muzorewa asserted that the Internal settlement ‘shortened the bloodbath and the struggle’ in Zimbabwe (Hallencreutz 1996). This is a personal perspective in the way Muzorewa presented his role as generally found in his autobiography.

In the light of the foregoing observations, we can advance two crucial insights. One, autobiographies are important repositories of the history of a nation. The information from such sources may be regarded as basic and primary because it comes from participants themselves. However, autobiographies contain some inherent weaknesses. An autobiographer is a unique individual who has unique human qualities, aptitudes and a whole range of personality to safeguard. This is why one can naturally blend the elements of objectivity and subjectivity. In this case, the author will sift or select information based on what needs to be communicated to the perceived public. Accordingly, objectivity in any history writing is sacrificed on the altar of human prejudice.

As part of critical reflection, let us exemplify this foregoing insight. For instance, Joshua Nkomo, another key political contestant, was very subjective in his analysis of the outcome of the landmark elections
in 1980. Nkomo alleged that the elections were not free and fair, just because ZAPU’s performance in the Mashonaland province was next to zero. Nkomo claimed that Mugabe’s overwhelming victory in the Mashonaland province in particular, and in the country in general, was helped by his ability to establish a greater political presence in areas where ZANLA, his military machinery, had operated during the armed struggle for much of the 1970s. Mugabe’s ZANU (PF) nationalist movement had operated almost in the whole of Mashonaland and Manicaland provinces, which border with Mozambique in the Eastern border. These two provinces cover two-thirds (2/3) of the total area of the country. So, it was logical that ZANU (PF) won the elections. We are citing this piece of evidence to show that autobiographies as a literary mode of communicating history in general could be subjective in the way national events are presented. So, an autobiography must be treated with some caution in any historiographical scholarship.

Secondly, the autobiographies of Sithole, Muzorewa and Nkomo deal with power politics in the backdrop of Zimbabwe’s independence and sovereignty. Writers of political autobiographies often use the genre to legitimize their positions whilst trying to de-stabilize the power of their adversaries. Despite the fact that Sithole, Nkomo and Muzorewa had great determination to rule an independent State, they had a common political adversary looming from ZANU (PF) camp. In fact, after 1975, Muzorewa, Nkomo and Sithole had a strong political insecurity posed by the ascendancy of Robert Mugabe who eventually emerged victorious in the landmark elections of February 1980. These three key nationalists failed to cooperate at several diplomatic conferences which were convened to resolve the political and military standoffs which were escalating. The enduring lesson that could be learnt today is that goodwill is vital in the search for conflict resolution. Through their autobiographical writings, the trio (Nkomo, Sithole and Muzorewa) tried to locate themselves with certain audiences sympathetic to particular interests. In retrospect, no one issue is pertinent to point out. It will go down in the annals of Zimbabwean history that Muzorewa was a moderate and modest personality. He wielded vast amounts of political power in the nine months he was Prime Minister of Zimbabwe-Rhodesia in 1979. He could manipulate the organs (police, army, the courts and external links) of the State to cling onto power even after the post-Lancaster Conference arrangement in 1979. But that was not to be. In part, this was how Muzorewa facilitated a responsible transition to full independence based on majority rule in 1980. It is an insight which is instructive for humanity: humility is a virtuous weapon rather than the instrumentation of the ‘law of the jungle’ in the governance of modern societies.

Conclusion

In view of the hermeneutical re-appraisal of Bishop Abel Muzorewa’s book, Muzorewa: Rise Up and Walk: An Autobiography (1978), the study has established that an autobiography is a crucial document or source in the presentation of national or patriotic history. Nevertheless, it was made abundantly clear that the role and status of an autobiography continue to be paradoxical because it can be objective and subjective in the presentation and evaluation of events of history. This insight was confirmed by the fact most autobiographies have tendencies of highlighting the ‘good side’ of issues. It is a writing trait typified by Muzorewa as a particular writer who deliberately ignored to document certain events concerning certain miscalculations that could disgrace his own personality as a nationalist. The study revealed that autobiographies, as a literary genre, can be taken as important sources of national history in so far as they show how historical events affected the writer and, in the process, how those events affected others. In so far as they can complement each other to provide a holistic picture of history of the nation, an autobiography can, in that regard eliminates bias that is stark in the history of a nation.

In this particular study, the autobiography indicated that Muzorewa was a courageous politician who helped to bring majority rule in Zimbabwe in a particular unique way. Although he was heavily misunderstood by hardline African nationalist leaders who also contended with him for the leadership of Zimbabwe, the study established that Muzorewa represented a particular era in the 1970s which called for a sense of patriotic duty that went beyond narcissism. In order to execute that patriotic duty under colonial era, Muzorewa formulated a political philosophy which was anchored on a theology of liberation. It was meant to liberate blacks from colonial rule which based its justification on unjust laws. It was also made clear that the programme of liberation theology is to ensure the future of the African church itself. This new revolutionary style of doing liberation theology was to serve balancing the intricate relations of the post-colonial State and the vitality of the African Christianity in Zimbabwe. In the light of a hermeneutical re-appraisal engaged by the study, though he was surrounded by controversy as a politician, Muzorewa was a great theologian and an efficacious persona who refused to yield vision towards the emergence of a new country that emerged from the ashes of the war. This is why the study...
submitted that Bishop Abel Muzorewa’s name will continue to be engraved in the chronicles of national history of Zimbabwe. The study made it abundantly clear that people are dehumanized or perish when a clique within a class of people attempt to govern society using the unjust Machiavellian laws. Evidently, this is a poignant lesson that Zimbabweans must learn today. Nevertheless, when people work together in full faith and goodwill, under the auspices of conflict management, the divine good emerges in order to transform society. Again, this is a broad lesson that if all nations in the world work together as a family of ‘united nations’, then, the international cooperation may lead towards a durable peace and sustainable development.
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