

**The Influence of Rhodesia Literature Bureau on
the Shona literature in Selected Zimbabwean
Novels.**

**Submitted by:
Dr. Shaimaa Mohamed Mohamed Hassanin
Lecturer of English language and American
Literature
Horus University- Egypt (HUE)**

The Influence of Rhodesia Literature Bureau on the Shona literature in Selected Zimbabwean Novels.

Abstract

This research examines how Shona writers conceptualize and portray the African communitarian worldwide, and the role of Rhodesia Literature Bureau in publishing Zimbabwean fiction. This research depends on substance examination of selected Shona novels, basic surveys are derived from different diaries, daily papers and periodicals. The hypothetical system is guided by Afrocentricity and African womanism, which are essential to the elucidation of meaning from selected novels that constitute an essential stage of African literature. Of course, this comes with a different perspective to decide whether or not the writers' depiction of the Shona culture and literature makes a difference in Africa's socio-cultural and political freedom. In fact, Africans celebrate the central excellencies to common social obligations, common regard, believe, self-reliance, caring and other traits. National literature, especially in occupied countries, tries to document its history and expresses the feelings and heroism of its people all the time. Also, it tries to give a moral lesson to colonizers. This paper aids renew and restore the rotting socio-cultural texture of Zimbabwe. It also, reveals that the standards of humanity for all mankind might be productively grasped in charting agreement in which all people of Zimbabwe could subordinate their own private time to the country and respecting one another, consequently forging enduring peace and development while, on the same time, the leadership would be ruled by means of democratic tents espoused through humanity for mankind.

Keywords: Shona novel, Zimbabwe, African Literature, historical documents, Rhodesia Writing Bureau.

The historical approach is used in the paper to trace the history of the Shona novel and the Rhodesia Writing bureau. Also, the historical approach is needed to show the evolvement of the Shona

novel during the colonial and pre-colonial periods. The historical approach is a methodology that is used to investigate a literary work based on its chronicle events in which the author fully comprehends the message of the literary work by recalling its historical moment. This approach sees a literary work mainly, in case not only as a reflection of its author's life and times of the characters within the work. In the case of the Shona novel, the literary works deeply expresses the period of colonization and its main consequences on literature. Not only that, but the Rhodesia Writing Bureau's profound influence on literature along with its censorship on the literary works. This atmosphere created a king of unique background on the literature of Zimbabwe in general. As a result, the use of the historical approach became obligatory to trace the main history of the Shona novel and the Rhodesia Writing Bureau in Zimbabwe.

There has not truly been any serious literary appraisal, in profundity or on a comparative basis, of advanced Shona fiction writing in specific, or of Shona imaginative composing in general. All available data are collections of essays and historical documents written by local writers and novelists, which bargain with problems and standards of present days. In addition, there are many creative writings in both exposition and verse and containing some investigations of Shona lyrics, along with a few audit articles or expositions in diaries by many scholars. The publication of Kahari's idea about Chakaipa's books can be noticed as the begging of critical appreciation of the Shona literature. From that point, scholars started to think of the African author as a valuable voice in literature.

It is genuine that few books have been utilized, as authentic asserts, are exceptionally valuable in appearing the Shona literature. Past historical events in some books are not as they were related to Shona as depicted in pre-colonial, but moreover center on post-colonialism. This ambiguity gives a chance to raise many questions: Are these dependable chronicled sources? Also, how substantial are they as sources? It is therefore important to note that these questions

are ought to be replied. The next issue that ought to be inquired is whether the authors of books on Shona culture purposely composed history, or lurched over chronicled realities when they were writing about Zimbabwean culture and history. The issue of whether or not the stories contained in books meet up with the disturbed conditions of works of creative nature was, exceedingly considered valuable since it was a part of writings and political conditions handled in colonial Zimbabwe. In the light of this perception, it can be contended that these novels, historical Zimbabwean novels, contain portions of Zimbabwean history.

The writers range from Solomon Mutswairo who composed (Feso 1956), who since his published work most scholars considered him as the father of the Shona novels, to Mabasa the author of Mapenzi (1999) as well as Mutasa (Sekai: Minda Tave Nayo 2005); whose works are in bolster of Zimbabwe's Arrive Change Program propelled within the millennium. The main aim of this paper is to show the evolvement of the Shona novels as historical documents of Zimbabwean culture in colonial and post-colonial era. In addition, this paper focuses on the role of Rhodesia Writing Bureau in developing the Shona novel through the main channels of censorship proclaimed by the white man on Zimbabwean authors.

The Shona novel's history may be a generally modern one. Kahari has classified the history of Shona novels into two categories: the ancient world books and the unused world books. The term "ancient world" is used to allude to those novels that have an authentic setting that occurred in 1890, particularly in the times of the British South Africa. These are books like Jekanyika (Mugugu 1968) and Mapatya (Mutasa 1978). Modern World Books on the other hand are the ones that relate the occasions taking place after September 1890 driving up to recent days. Books like Karumekangu and Chakwasha (Chimhundu 1991) drop into the Modern World category.

The first novel to be fulfilled as a real Shona novel in Zimbabwean culture is Feso by Mutswairo 1956. It is astonishing to mention that this novel and many others were released under the supervision of the Southern Rhodesia Writing Bureau. The writers of these novels were oxford college alumni. Other writers of this early period incorporate many novels as: Chakaipa (Karikoga Gumiremiseve 1959), and Bepswa (Ndakamuda Dakara Afa 1960). When these authors started to write their novels, they have taken care of topics like murder, polygamy and the effect of westernization on Africans particularly those in urban areas. It is critical to note that the Shona novel was given course by the government of Southern Rhodesia through the Writing Bureau. The extreme choice to establish the Bureau was to counter what they called “revolutionary art” and to prevent any protest movement inside the Zimbabwean society towards whites. Every novel which attacks the white was considered to be unworthy publishing and was interpreted to be hostile against the culture of the society. Ngugi comments on this grip saying:

In Rhodesia, the Literature Bureau would not publish an African novel which had but religious themes and sociological themes which were free from politics (Ngugi 69).

Many writers present the Rhodesia Literature Bureau as decision maker of the novels’ main themes. These novels, as they proclaimed, were to be free from legislative issues. According to some Zimbabwean critics, the Rhodesia Writing Bureau controlled the main structure and the topics of the Shona and Ndebele fiction in an exertion to control writings that were politically unsatisfactory to the state. The editors of the Bureau tried to energize many writers but schematic plots that managed with cherish, wrongdoing and family interest ceased its efforts. In spite of the fact that the Rhodesian pioneer administration made a difference within the development of the Shona dialect, and truly empowered Blacks to

compose in their own dialects, it moreover felt that the Black's work had to be closely observed to control the subversive potential of their composition of fiction. The white pilgrim administration that was in Rhodesia entirely controlled what the black writings as fiction is expressed by Veit-Wild (1993:246) when she states that the major part of the authors in local dialects distributed by the Writing Bureau avoided handling political issues. She goes on to cite the secretary for African instruction who in 1977, said:

In this connection, I wish to stress that the function of the Bureau is to provide popular reading material, as an adjunct to education, not to propagate political views. Proponents of the latter type of material have ready access to international publishers. (Veit-Wild 246)

In fact, the white Rhodesians dreaded that the black will write something subversive in their novels and culture. For them, the potential of such writing will, for sure, come up with subversive fabric that is genuine, and for this reason in 1956 the Southern Rhodesia Writing Bureau was set up. This Bureau was set up as a portion of the service of data; to collect data about black people and their culture in order to preserve and protect the rights of the whites. The data for any government is implied to act as that government's open relations and promoting office. It needs to depict a great image of the government and nations at the same showcase the nation and the government to its citizens and the outer world. It was not set up to enrich the development and improvement of intelligent and progressive writing, but to form a craftsmanship that was pacific and compliant. Shockingly and may be unwittingly, many scholars who participated in this frame made a picture of a cherishing white individual. The white man was emphasized as the proprietor and the bringer of equality. This image was propagated by the white Rhodesians, as they saw themselves as individuals who came to Africa to civilize blacks, and the black scholars appear to have

acknowledged this lie as it is reflected in Chakaipa's novel, *Pfumo Reropa* (1961)

During the time we are referring to, thick forests covered this country of ours, between the Zambezi and the Limpopo. There were no roads as we have today. People walked along very narrow paths or even cut their way through forests that had no paths (Chakaipa 3).

Writings of some Zimbabwean writers reflect on the pitiful history within the improvement and development of the Shona novel. For example, Chakaipa is celebrating streets and the misfortune of timberlands. He may have fizzled to figure out that the roads were not implied for the good thing about blacks, but for the abuse of work and other common asserts as well as tax-collection. Moreover, Chakaipa disregards the truth that most of the streets, if not all, in those early days were made utilizing constrained work. He is additionally celebrating the coming of the white people along with their snatching of the arrival of black people. Chiwome sums up what he has discovered in Chakaipa's novel when he states that: "The unofficial was to direct the novel along the path of least ideological resistance to the Rhodesian government". (Chiwome 23)

It is important to mention that Chakaipa composes many writings concerning the culture of Zimbabwe. He has satisfied the official reason for the setting up of the Bureau. The Bureau was basically curious about the security of the white people, not that of the black or the total development and improvement of the Shona novel. It is terrible that the security of the white was accomplished by controlling the inventive forms of yearning and subordinate scholars. The result of this "unofficial" inclusion was the underdevelopment of the Shona novel. It was driven to the advancement of written fiction that was lean and, to a great extent, was separated from social and verifiable reality. The writings always

reached most of the old subjects like: disasters of polygamy, witchcraft and the black individual being a nonnative within the western city like Salisbury and Bulawayo. What can be figured out that these subjects are the affirmation of what Boehmer has emphasized that Europe's discernment of other races, she writes:

Always with reference to the superiority of expanding Europe, colonised peoples were represented as lesser: less human, less civilised as a child or savage, wild man, animal or headless mass (Boehmer 79).

Africa and the Africans are depicted in books like Migodhi yaMambo Solomon (Muza – interpreter 1975) as having no character unless he is within the company of a white individual. The black man, additionally, appears as a fiendish that should be overcome. Generally, black people were negatively presented in Shona novel. In expansion, other writers show black people in their novels in an inconsequential way. Blacks are depicted as individuals who can mediate and confirm the existence of the white people. Without this mediation, they will continuously stay culprits of viciousness on one another. They are too portrayed as killers, miscreants, as well as lustful ones. Most of the novelists are trying to persuade the readers that the white people are not awful, on the contrary, they have come to African to develop it and teach African how to be civilized persons. What is curiously in all these books is that there are exceptions among the pre-independence novels that show black people being brutalized and killed while serving the white in production lines, homes or in ranches.

The impact of the Writing Bureau was extraordinary that the publisher might not publish the writings that have not passed through its censorship. May be the publishers did what the Bureau have asked them, since they gambled losing their writings censored and prohibited from the arena. In this case, the writers might lose their credibility which might put them in the zone of rejected novels. The

problem of the Writing Bureau censorship was clearly dealt with many writers Tsodzo whom Chiwome says: “I was in the literature section and I became curious to know what the Bureau stood for. It was strictly a censorship board” (Chiwome 2002:37).

It is critical to appreciate what happened to Mutswairo’s Feso (1956). Before the publication of this novel, at the process of writing the first chapter, it was expelled because it was considered to be disputable. At the early publication of the novel, the Writing Bureau as the official censorship of literary works rejected it among several scholarly works. Eventually, after ten years after its publication, the Writing Bureau had claimed that the novel contains ideas and theme that may seem hostile to the Zimbabwean society. The pioneers of the Zimbabwean literature, Shona novelists, considered this point to be an insult against them as they were marginalized. As a result, the novel was prohibited and the reason given for its non-availability was that it was out of print. It was not printed until 1982 when it was published by Longman Zimbabwe. These obstructions with the book industry and scholarly world like the topics of fiction carried a clear appearance of the colonial government’s desire to blur black Shona literature.

It is evident from such cases of impedances that black writing in colonial Zimbabwe was not implied to be opposing. Chidzero’s Nzvengamutsvairo (1957) is exceptionally a great illustration of such non- antagonistic writings. In other fiction, one can figure out that the main themes evolve around colossal sexual craving, sophisticated figures who try to neglect their black background and killing among friends. It is such publications, which mocked Blacks and showed them as witches, savages and sellers of other disasters known to humankind are grasped by the Bureau.

Moreover, race got to be a major element in deciding whether a novel was to be published or not. Any novel that was considered to be racial, or even related to the white, should be labeled hostile and was not allowed to be published. If the authors even tried to publish

it secretly among limited readers, the Bureau will take strict decision against those people. For example, Bepswa, the author of Ndakamuda Dakara Afa (1960); though the script of his novel was not related to any rejected theme, he had to change it. His novel was about inter-racial marriage, which was at the moment unacceptable in colonial Zimbabwe. He had to make racial alterations of the theme of his novel to publish it with another title. Ngugi comments on this grip saying:

In Rhodesia the Literature Bureau would not publish an African novel which had but religious themes and sociological themes which were free from politics (Ngugi 69).

After a while, a new kind of propaganda has come to the surface to announce the real domination of the white on Zimbabwean culture, the Shona Novel. Such propaganda includes the sociological and political ideologies which were dominated by the white people, and of course by the Bureau. For example, in Ndakamuda Dakara Afa (1960) Bepswa after its publication, he announced that it really expresses the plots of the Zimbabwean colonial administration. Ellul (1973) announces that Bepswa has fallen into a trap set by the Rhodesia Literature Bureau. This trap urges the writers to make a fallacy propaganda to increase and preserve the existence of the Bureau. Ellul says that the political purposeful publicity happens when a group of individuals or members of a government employ certain arranged strategies and give them a goal to follow in an indirect way to influence the audience. In addition, sociological propaganda is an internal sort of influence that comes obvious when a person acknowledges or acclimatizes the prevailing financial and political ideologies of his society.

Moreover, Bepswa in Ndakamuda Dakara Afa (1960) declares that the events or the data mentioned in the novels may not be accurate as represented in the society. This makes a distinctive

distinction of what Ellul (1973) says that the novels at this period clearly fall in the category of propaganda of the white or the colonial part. The Rhodesia Writing Bureau was established as a governmental office to attain the exact objective of making beyond any doubt is that all novels written by Zimbabwean scholars ought to comply with the government desires of guaranteeing that all the writings ought to be away from political issues that may create any conflicts with the white.

As a result, scholars were empowered either through governmental rules, or omit the so-called hostile parts from their literary works to give space for much sociological and political propaganda. In fact, this kind of literature may be called as an additional sociological propaganda support. Out of this propaganda definition, it is evident that the journalists were compelled by the circumstances and the rules laid down to acknowledge or absorb unwillingly the political and sociological ideologies of the colonial Zimbabwean government. Through giving a critical appreciation of every novel before its publication, the Rhodesia literature Bureau put itself in the rank of censorship in the Zimbabwean society, but the censorship was objective as it only seeks its own interests and the continuity of the colonial regime inside Zimbabwe. Lordwell Manyika, who also had a stint with the Literature Bureau in Rhodesia and Zimbabwe said:

Competition themes were decided upon within the Bureau. The approach really was to choose the most interesting and most popular subject at the time. It does not pay to surprise the writer or make him write on a subject which the institution itself wants. Themes would be social, economic or political and would be accompanied with terms of reference (Manyika 1).

The Rhodesia Literature Bureau is mostly interested in many fields, not just Literature, but also economy and industry in general. The obstructions and association of the colonial Zimbabwean government within the distributing industry significantly compromised the quality and development of the Shona novel. Moreover, Chitsike who worked for the Rhodesia Writing Bureau and is cited by Chiwome (1996) alludes to an original copy that had been submitted to the Writing Bureau by a certain individual called Molife:

I remember the writer wanted to write something like Animal Farm. It was so blatantly political and I said, "No!" In this manuscript, there were white ants and black ants. White ants ate black ants. After sometime the black ants amassed soldiers to attack white ants ... It was so obvious. He never returned the manuscript (Chiwome 27).

The Writing Bureau was conceived of as a transitional office which would encourage the exchange of a reasonable scholarly framework to the colony. The issue was caught in financial terms; i.e., once the implies of generation and dispersion had been accomplished, and sufficient, the framework would to a great extent be flourished. For instance, in 1959 UNESCO report, Bruce Roberts made a coordinate interface between financial matters and culture. In his supposition, the financial advancement required a proficient populace which in turn depended on a sound distributing industry. This marriage of financial improvement and social generation epitomizes the operations of all Writing Bureaus. Since the primary procedures of the Colonial improvement acted in 1029, Britain had been attempting to infuse life into its claimed economy by loaning cash to create the colonies. As the disappointment of improvement based on financial matters alone got to be self-evident amid the 1930s, the colonial office grudgingly set up the social administration's division

in 1938 and at that point the colonial improvement and welfare were supported.

The Rhodesia Writing Bureau's distributions were not for free. The feeling was that if people had a venture writing the distributions, they would be esteemed and perused. At the same time, the Rhodesia Writing Bureau chiefs had continually to adjust these short-term practicality measures against their long-term objectives, never knowing how long their transitory organizations would be required or financed. But, for as long as these Bureaus existed, they were to be as monetarily self-sufficient as conceivable.

The planners of the African Bureaus were exceptionally cognizant of their spearheading nature. Then, the Bureaus were to be set up where no western-style of scholarly framework existed. In any case, this spearheading part carried out with it the seeds of conundrum. Since the Bureaus were at the same time making coordinating literary movement within the colony, they might themselves end up as only commanders as to fulfill all fundamental parts of the main framework, hence usurping innate scholarly improvement. In a 1959 UNESCO report, Bruce Roberts cautioned that the literature Bureau was to motivate and energize, to supply educated counsel, and to provide specialized and monetary help.

It has been checked out that the Rhodesia Writing Bureau trials to recognize its operations from those of scholarly frameworks, was attempting to cultivate the society. Moreover, the caveat highlights the undefined nature of the Writing Bureau. It took a wide range of shapes in several colonies because it is related to the main needs of the society. the EALB, for instance, was known for its huge book generation, whereas the PNG Writing Bureau distributed as it were one book on its possess, but organized a long time of profoundly fruitful yearly national writing competitions.

For a number of writers, the Writing Bureau as a value-neutral alter organization. For them, the Writing Bureau was most successful organization that proved to be working at arm's length from its

unique mission, or organization subsidizing sources. Amid the war, the Writing Bureau started a daily paper in Hausa which got to be hugely effective. In spite of the fact that, the paper was pointed at a Muslim group of audience, they were pleased of the truth that both Muslims and Christians pursue trusting the reasonableness of its publishing. This in spite of the reality that the European and African editors shifted and summarized both remote and household news.

At the same time, Writing Bureau executives were exceptionally cognizant of their effect on dialect improvement and on scholarly fashion. As these dialects had been delivered by people who were chosen for utilize in distribution. The Rhodesia Literature Bureau influenced the advancement of writings in both the colonial and post-colonial agreements. To begin with, it was the Writing Bureau, which afterward came to be known as the Zimbabwe Writing Bureau. The Rhodesia Writing Bureau, as a government division was shaped in 1954. It was a governmental institution whose operations were totally financed by the government. Its fundamental command was to advance the distribution and improvement of writing in original dialects, especially Ndebele and Shona. Considering that the Rhodesian Writing Bureau was a governmental institution and its workers were gracious hirelings, 'good' writing was that which possessed itself with fringe and minimal issue that did not uncover Rhodesia and its approaches as supremacist and exploitative. In a meeting with Chitsike who got to be one of the oldest serving individuals of the association from 1969 to 1982 and at that point from 1986 until its disbandment in 1999, the Bureau was set up to:

teach and encourage Shona and Ndebele people to begin to write in their own languages. After its introduction, we suggested that it should be involved in the writing and assessing of manuscripts. If the manuscript was a good one, we would recommend its publication with various

publishing houses. It was a foregone conclusion that a book from the Literature Bureau was a good one (Muwati 45).

The utilize of the word ‘good in any society or setting is relative since writing does not serve the interface od all individuals at all times. It either is sweet since it encourages the entrenchment of abuse and, the disagreeable ‘fear of freedom’. It can be great since it whets a people’s awareness and increments their capacity to be basic and inventive subsequently ordering ‘the hone of freedom’. At the same time, the peril of writing is being utilize as a purposeful publicity device. The accentuation on great writing was itself one of the inconspicuous instruments of belittling inventiveness. Ordinarily such support served the interface of the reasons for setting up of the Rhodesia Literature Bureau than the journalists who were the makers of the works. Whereas the meeting of the Rhodesia Literature Bureau authorities reliably denied that the association was a censorship board, it in any case had a huge impact within the heading that fiction composing expected within the colonial period as well as after autonomy.

Whereas Chitsike’s disillusionment with researchers and journalists who discourage the Writing Bureau for censoring their works is reasonable, the reality remains that the foundation of the Bureau was simply for political and ideological reasons. In as much as the Rhodesia Writing Bureau might not have specially censored works, its role was clearly undecided. Portion of this irresoluteness is reflected within the way in which Muswario’s Feso (1956), the primary distributed Shona novel, was managed by the Rhodesia Writing Bureau.

This time witnessed the beginning of the publication of the Shona novel. After a while the main authorities of the Bureau deduced that censoring of the works must have sent an effective message to many scholars. It contributed towards the regulate of different shapes of censorship. The striking ones incorporate support as censorship, self-

ensorship/ disguised censorship as well as coordinate censorship. These shapes of censorship have been given a comprehensive discourse in many writings.

The Rhodesia Writing Bureau's guidelines were contract and confining. They tended to truncate writers' alternatives rather than expanding them. Enhancement is the hallmark of imagination. Rather than utilizing fiction intensively, journalists finished up preaching and locks in contract admonishing. Whether there's any worldview move Ndebele and Shona fiction distributed after the achievement of freedom in 1980 beneath the Tutelage of the succeeding association, the Zimbabwe Writing Bureau is worth researching for since it influenced the main literature of the society. To encourage more authors to write, according to the criteria put by the bureau, The Rhodesia Writing Bureau supported many competitions in arrange to empower scholars to compose in Ndebele and Shona. When inquired by the analyst to comment on the criteria utilized in coming up competition subjects,

Like most organizations created by progressive Rhodesian governments, such as the armed force, police, parliament and legal among others, the Writing Bureau was acquired intaglio at autonomy in 1980. Its operational command remained the same, the same individuals who had served beneath the Rhodesia Writing Bureau were the ones who presently worked for the Zimbabwe Writing Bureau. It still remains a government supporting division. In an interview with the analyst, Elvas Mari, an ex-worker of the Rhodesia and the Zimbabwe Writing Bureau expressed that, "an obvious weakness of the Literature Bureau was that it was a government department...the government of the day would not be directly challenged in the stories submitted to the Bureau...writers would attempt to project the picture of the organization..." (Chitsike 13) up to the organization, since its conception, underqualified staff kept an eye on the Writing Bureau.

Conclusion:

The research has highlighted the improvement and development of the Shona novel within the colonial as well as the post-colonial periods. It highlights the reality that the Rhodesia Writing Bureau made an awesome exertion to guarantee that the Shona novel and other related sorts were created in a way the white rulers may feel fully satisfied of this kind of literature and preserve their existence in the colony. The topics of most literary works that were affirmed as masterpieces were either devout or politically impartial. The investigation concisely captures the issue that perplexed the Shona novel for the time that sort as well as related literary works were presented among the Shona. It was implied to serve the whites' interface. The Rhodesia Writing Bureau was a censorship board that affirmed what was to be published and what was not worth publishing. Other than characterizing what history is, the research has, moreover, demonstrated that there's a connection between writing and history by highlighting that writing and history are overlapping.

Moreover, the research has highlighted the appreciation of the Shona novel and literature and spotted Zimbabwe as the main center of Rhodesia Writing Bureau. Within the case of Zimbabwe, the neighboring environment is the socio-political and financial circumstances that were winning in Zimbabwe amid the colonial days as well as what unfold after the achievement of self-rule. Whereas writing is gathered to be ageless and have a place to all universes, the research found a prove that writing truly reflects genuine life circumstances. This connection affirms that writing is authentic, and at times, it is unadulterated history. Other than taking care of the connection between scholarly feedback and its impact on how this inquiry has been carried out. The research has demonstrated that the writing of books could be a think exertion that individuals make in an endeavor to put their encounters and those of their partners.

Works Cited:

- Boehmer, E. *Colonial and Post-Colonial Literature*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Chakaipa, P. *Pfumo Reropa*. Salisbury: Longman, 1961.
- Chitsike, B. C. The Role of the Literature Bureau. Unpublished BA Honor's Dissertation. Harare: University of Zimbabwe, 1989.
- Chiwome, E.M. *A Social History of the Shona Novel*. Eiffel Flats: Juta Zimbabwe, 1996.
- *A Critical History of Shona Poetry*. Harare: University of Zimbabwe Publications, 1996.
- Manyika, Lordwell.
- <http://www.competitionbureau.gc.ca/eic/site/cb-bc.nsf/eng/04342.html>, 2019.
- Ngugi, wa Thiong'o. *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. Harare: Zimbabwe Publishing House, 1987.
- Muwati, Itai. *Interface of History and Fiction: The Zimbabwean Liberation War Novel*. University of South Africa. Ph.D. Dissertation, 2009.
- Veit-Wild, F. *Teachers, Preachers, Non-Believers: A Social History of Zimbabwean Literature*. Harare: Baobab Books, 1993.

ملخص البحث باللغة العربية:

تأثير مكتب روديسيا على ادب شونا في بعض الروايات الزيمبابوية المختارة.

يدرس هذا البحث كيف يصور مؤلفى روايات شونا المفاهيم الإفريقية في جميع أنحاء العالم ويصورون دور مكتب روديسيا الأدبي في نشر الروايات الزيمبابوية. يعتمد البحث على فحص بعض روايات شونا المختارة ، وتستمد الدراسات الاستقصائية الأساسية للبحث من مذكرات وأوراق يومية ودوريات مختلفة. ويسترشد النظام الافتراضي من قبل المجتمع الإفريقي والمرأة الإفريقية ، والتي هي ضرورية لتوضيح المعنى من الروايات المختارة التي تشكل مرحلة أساسية من الأدب الإفريقي. وبالطبع ، يأتي هذا مع منظور مختلف ليقرر ما إذا كان تصوير الروائيين لثقافة الشونا وأدائه يشكل فارقاً في الحرية الاجتماعية والثقافية والسياسية لأفريقيا. في الواقع ، يحتفل الأفارقة في روايات شونا بالمهارات المركزية للالتزامات الاجتماعية المشتركة ، والاحترام المتبادل ، و المعتقدات المختلفة ، والاعتماد على الذات ، و حماية الارث الشعبى. يحاول الأدب الوطني ، ولا سيما في البلدان المحتلة ، توثيق تاريخه و التعبير عن مشاعر وشعوب طوال الوقت. أيضاً، يحاول باستماته إعطاء درس أخلاقي للمستعمرين. تساعد هذه الورقة البحثية على تجديد واستعادة النسيج الاجتماعي والثقافي لزيمبابوي. كما أنها تعبر عن بعض معايير الإنسانية للبشرية جمعاء. و البحث يؤكد على ضرورة وجود اتفاق لجميع شعب زيمبابوى

يمكنه من احلال السلام الدائم والتنمية داخل المجتمع. و التاكيد على روح المساواه و

الديموقراطية بين اطياف الشعوب المختلفه.

الكلمات المفتاحية: رواية شونا ، زيمبابوي ، الأدب الأفريقي ، الوثائق التاريخية ، مكتب

روديسيا.