📘 **Series Title**
Reclaiming the Republic: A Civic Reckoning Against Constitutional Distortion

🏛️ **Published By**
Springfield Center for Défense, National Security and Intelligence (MI9)
Ezulwini, Eswatini

✍️ **Authored By**
Dr. Godfrey Gandawa
President, Springfield Research University
Former Deputy Minister of Higher & Tertiary Education, Science & Technology Development
Architect of Education 6.0

📜 **Series Overview**

This six-paper series interrogates the constitutional distortion surrounding the proposed extension of President Mnangagwa's term and its continental echoes. It exposes the collapse of intellectual integrity, the weaponization of liberation credentials, and the entrenchment of military-political power. Each paper offers a sovereign counter-narrative—anchored in civic resistance, generational clarity, and continental dignity. The final paper expands the scope beyond Zimbabwe, diagnosing the regional spread of repression and the complicity of ceremonial institutions.

📚 **Paper Titles and Sequence**

1. **The Constitution Is Not a Canvas**
   Diagnosing the Mnangagwa Extension Agenda
2. **From Critique to Complicity**
   The Intellectual Collapse Behind Zimbabwe's Constitutional Amendments
3. **Liberation Without Guns**
   Reclaiming Civic Resistance in Zimbabwe
4. **The Military Mandate Is Not a Mandate**
   Diagnosing the ZANU–Army Nexus
5. **The People Are Not Passive**
   Reawakening Zimbabwe's Civic Imagination
6. **The Zanufication of Africa**
   Diagnosing the Spread of Repressive Governance and the Normalization of Coups, Protests, and Black-on-Black Oppression

The Military Mandate Is Not a Mandate

Diagnosing the ZANU–Army Nexus

Section 1: The Coup That Never Ended

The events of November 2017 were not a democratic breakthrough—they were a military transfer. The uniform did not step back—it stepped forward, cloaked in civilian costume. What was framed as a people's victory was, in truth, a barracks rehearsal. The coup did not end with Mugabe's fall—it was normalized in the choreography that followed.

1.1 November 2017 as a Military Transfer, Not a Democratic Transition

The removal of President Robert Mugabe was not a rupture from militarized politics—it was its rebranding. Tanks on the streets were not symbols of liberation—they were instruments of succession. The generals did not dismantle the system—they inherited it. And the people, desperate for change, were invited to cheer their own disenfranchisement.

This was not a transition—it was a transfer. The military did not return to the barracks—it moved into boardrooms, ministries, and party structures. The language of "restoration" masked the reality of reinforcement. The coup was not a moment—it was a model. And that model has since become the architecture of governance.

1.2 The Myth of Civilian Restoration

After the coup, the regime was dressed in civilian attire—but its choreography remained unmistakably military. Cabinet appointments were drawn from the barracks. Campaigns were coordinated with military precision. Dissent was met with tactical suppression. The language of democracy was spoken—but the logic of command prevailed.

This is not civilian rule—it is civilian camouflage. The constitution was not restored—it was repurposed. The ballot was not empowered—it was managed. The presidency was not reclaimed by the people—it was reassigned by the generals. And the myth of restoration became the mask of regression.

1.3 The Normalization of Barracks Politics

What began as an "exceptional intervention" has become institutionalized. Military figures now occupy key positions in cabinet, parastatals, and party hierarchies. The line between soldier and statesman has been erased. The barracks are no longer a reserve—they are a reservoir of political power.

This normalization is not accidental—it is strategic. It ensures that the military is not just a guarantor of regime survival, but a stakeholder in its continuity. It embeds the logic of command into the heart of civilian governance. It transforms the state into a security project, and the citizen into a subject of surveillance. This is not stability—it is stagnation. It is not order—it is orchestration. And it must be named—not as a personal grievance, but as a structural crisis.

Section 2: The Structural Crisis of Military Backing

The crisis in Zimbabwe is not episodic—it is architectural. It is not the presence of generals in politics—it is the redesign of politics around generals. Military endorsement has become the

currency of legitimacy. The vote has been subordinated to the gun. And the institutions meant to restrain this distortion have either collapsed—or joined the rehearsal.

2.1 When the Gun Replaces the Vote

In a constitutional democracy, legitimacy flows from the ballot. In Zimbabwe, it flows from the barracks. Elections are no longer contests of ideas—they are contests of allegiance. The ruling party does not campaign—it coordinates. It does not persuade—it deploys. And the presence of military endorsement transforms the vote from a civic ritual into a managed rehearsal.

This is not electoral politics—it is electoral choreography. The citizen is not a voter—they are a spectator. The opposition is not a competitor—they are a target. And dissent is not democratic—it is treated as destabilizing.

When the gun replaces the vote, the Republic is no longer governed—it is guarded. And the constitution becomes a costume—worn for ceremony, discarded for succession.

2.2 The Barracks as a Political Actor

The army in Zimbabwe is no longer a neutral institution—it is a political actor. It does not merely defend borders—it defends incumbency. It does not merely protect sovereignty—it protects succession. It is not summoned by law—it is summoned by loyalty.

This transformation is not accidental—it is strategic. The barracks have become a stakeholder in power. Generals are no longer guardians—they are guarantors. Their silence is not discipline—it is alignment. Their presence in party structures is not incidental—it is intentional.

The army has become a shareholder in the state. And the constitution has become a shareholder agreement—negotiated not in Parliament, but in proximity.

2.3 The Collapse of Civilian Oversight

Parliament was designed to restrain power. The courts were designed to interpret law. Commissions were designed to protect the citizen. But in the face of military influence, these institutions have collapsed—not in structure, but in spirit.

Parliament does not interrogate military presence—it rehearses it. The courts do not challenge unconstitutional appointments—they delay them. The Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission does not investigate military abuses—it deflects them. The Anti-Corruption Commission does not expose barracks-linked tender fraud—it targets opposition-linked whistleblowers.

This is not oversight—it is orchestration. It is the transformation of civilian institutions into ceremonial instruments. It is the collapse of mandate into mimicry. The Republic cannot survive this choreography. The constitution cannot endure this silence. And the citizen cannot remain a spectator to this distortion.

Section 3: Reframing the Crisis—Not Personal, But Structural

Zimbabwe's crisis is not the fault of one general or one president—it is the product of a system. A choreography of mutual reinforcement between party and barracks, loyalty and legality, silence and succession. To resolve it, we must move beyond personalities and interrogate the architecture. The problem is not who wears the uniform—it is how the uniform is positioned.

3.1 Beyond Personalities: Diagnosing the System

It is tempting to name names. To isolate one general, one appointment, one moment. But the distortion is deeper. It is structural. It is the normalization of military presence in civilian governance. It is the quiet redesign of the Republic around command logic, not constitutional mandate.

This is not a personal betrayal—it is a systemic rehearsal. The generals are not rogue—they are embedded. The presidency is not captured—it is choreographed. And the institutions meant to restrain this choreography have become its stage.

To resolve this crisis, we must diagnose the system—not just the symptoms. We must interrogate the architecture—not just the actors.

3.2 The Danger of Dynastic Militarism

The military is no longer positioned to protect incumbency—it is being positioned to protect inheritance. The barracks are not just defending the present—they are rehearsing the future. Succession is no longer a political process—it is a security project. The uniform is no longer summoned by law—it is choreographed by lineage.

This is the danger of dynastic militarism. It transforms the army from a guardian of sovereignty into a guarantor of legacy. It repurposes the uniform from a symbol of service into a seal of succession. It converts the oath from a covenant of protection into a contract of proximity. And it erodes the Republic—not with tanks, but with silence.

Dynastic militarism is not stability—it is stagnation. It is not patriotism—it is performance. It is not constitutional—it is choreographed. And it must be named—not to provoke, but to prevent. Not to incite rebellion, but to summon reform.

The dismantling of dynastic militarism must be constitutional, ceremonial, and courageous. It must involve the recalibration of civil-military relations, the restoration of institutional oversight, and the reaffirmation of the oath—not to a family, but to the Republic. If the covenant is to survive, the uniform must return to its rightful place—not as a throne bearer, but as a constitutional shield.

3.3 The Need for Constitutional Realignment

The solution is not rebellion—it is realignment. The Republic does not need another rupture—it needs restoration. Civil-military relations must be recalibrated through law, not loyalty. The constitution must be restored as the supreme covenant—not as a costume for choreography. The barracks must be returned to their rightful place—not above the Republic, but beneath its law.

This realignment requires courage. It demands that Parliament legislate with clarity. That courts rule with fidelity. That commissions act with independence. And that the uniform remember its oath—not to a party, not to a president, but to the people and the constitution that binds them.

The Republic cannot be inherited. It must be governed. And governance must be constitutional—not choreographed. The uniform must stand—not to dominate, but to defend. And if the current guardians falter, a new generation must rise. If need be, a new uniform must emerge—worn not by generals of proximity, but by Gen Z stewards of principle. Their allegiance must be to the covenant, not to choreography. Their mandate must be constitutional, not ceremonial.

This is not a generational rebellion—it is a generational recalibration. The oath must be reclaimed. The Republic must be restored. And the uniform—old or new—must stand.

Section 4: The Uniform Must Return to the Covenant

The uniform is not a mandate. It is not a throne. It is not a shortcut to power. It is a covenant—sworn not to a regime, but to a Republic. In moments of distortion, the armed forces must not retreat into silence. They must rise into fidelity. The barracks must not become a throne room. They must remain a sanctuary of constitutional guardianship.

4.1 The Oath Is to the Republic, Not the Regime

The oath of service is not a pledge to a party—it is a covenant with the people. It is not a rehearsal for succession—it is a vow to defend the constitution. The armed forces were not created to sanctify incumbency. They were created to shield sovereignty.

To wear the uniform is to protect the law—not the choreography of power. It is to stand between the citizen and distortion. It is to remember that legitimacy flows from the constitution—not from command. And in moments of civic rehearsal, that oath must be recalled—not as ceremony, but as mandate.

The Republic does not belong to generals. It belongs to the governed. And the uniform must never forget that its authority is derived—not imposed.

4.2 The Barracks Must Not Become a Throne Room

When the barracks fall silent in the face of constitutional erosion, they do not preserve peace—they permit betrayal. When generals allow the law to be rewritten without referendum, they are not neutral—they are complicit. When the uniform is used to intimidate rather than to protect, it ceases to be a symbol of service—it becomes a seal of succession.

The barracks must not become a throne room. They must not host the rehearsal of dynasty. They must not sanctify distortion with silence. The oath must not be rewritten by proximity. The uniform must not be worn as camouflage for cowardice.

This is not a call to rebellion—it is a call to remembrance. The armed forces must remember their constitutional mandate. They must remember that silence is not discipline—it is dereliction. And when the uniform is used not to shield the citizen, but to suppress them, it ceases to be a symbol of service—it becomes a tool of betrayal.

The killing of civilians on 1 August 2018 was not a moment of confusion—it was a moment of covenantal collapse. The uniform was deployed not to defend the Republic, but to protect incumbency. That act was not lawful—it was sacrilegious. It violated the oath. It desecrated the covenant. And it must be remembered—not to provoke vengeance, but to summon vigilance.

The barracks must never again become a throne room. The uniform must never again be used to silence the people it swore to protect. The oath must be reclaimed. The Republic must be restored. And the memory of that day must remain—not as a wound, but as a warning.

4.3 Ceremonial Recalibration and the Path Forward

The path forward is not rupture—it is recalibration. Zimbabwe does not need another coup—it needs a covenant. The armed forces must be ceremonially and constitutionally realigned. Their doctrine must be rewritten—not to protect power, but to protect the people.

This recalibration must be public, principled, and generational. It must involve a new doctrine of service—where the uniform is not a guarantor of incumbency, but a guardian of law. Where the oath is not ceremonial, but sovereign. Where the barracks are not political, but constitutional.

And if the current guardians falter, a new generation must rise. A new uniform must emerge—not stitched in proximity, but woven in principle. Gen Z must not inherit distortion—they must dismantle it. Their service must be lawful. Their allegiance must be constitutional. Their courage must be ceremonial.

"The uniform must return to the covenant. The oath must be reclaimed. And the Republic must be defended—not by choreography, but by constitutional clarity."

Conclusion: The Gun Must Step Back So the Vote Can Speak

The Republic is not a barracks. It is not a rehearsal for succession. It is not a stage for proximity. It is a covenant—anchored in law, sustained by the vote, and guarded by institutions that serve the people, not the choreography of power.

The uniform is not a mandate. It is not a shortcut to legitimacy. It is not a seal of succession. It is a symbol of service—sworn to protect the constitution, not to sanctify distortion. And when the gun speaks louder than the ballot, the Republic falls silent.

The coup is not a constitution. It is not a transition. It is not a restoration. It is a rupture—a moment when the oath is rewritten, when the citizen is sidelined, and when the future is inherited by force, not chosen by vote.

This paper does not call for rebellion. It calls for remembrance. It calls for recalibration. It calls for a new doctrine of service—where the uniform steps back so the vote can speak. Where the barracks return to their rightful place beneath the law. Where the Republic is governed not by loyalty, not by lineage, and not by the barrel of a gun—but by the will of the people, expressed through lawful process.

"The uniform is not a mandate. The coup is not a constitution. The Republic must be governed by law—not by loyalty, not by lineage, and not by the barrel of a gun."