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Abstract

This study is concerned with the constructions of the Tanzanian nation in the press. It has confined its focus, first, to the coverage from 2005 to 2011 on Union Day that marks the Union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar and the formation of the United Republic of Tanzania and, second, to two prominent Tanzanian newspapers, namely the state-owned Daily News, and the privately-owned The Citizen on Union Day. As the Union remains a contentious issue, the relevance of this research relates to the press’s considerable power to shape understandings and influence attitudes. The study works within a broad cultural and media studies framework and is informed by a constructionist approach to representation and to culture, and to nation in particular. It also draws of journalistic theories of agenda-setting and the normative roles of the press to probe the agendas set by the press on Union Day and to interrogate how the two newspapers construct and frame the Union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar as nation.

The research responds to the question: ‘How has the Tanganyika-Zanzibar Union been represented in The Citizen and Daily News newspapers from 2005 to 2011?’ It employs quantitative and qualitative (thematic) content analysis to investigate the coverage in the editorials and feature articles of The Citizen and Daily News newspapers on Union Day (26 April) of 2005 to 2011. This study finds that the government-owned newspaper, Daily News, publishes more articles related to Union on Union Day than the privately-owned, The Citizen and collaborates more determinedly with the state in the process of constructing the nation. However, both newspapers adopt a collaborative role consistent with the development journalism tradition that endorses an informal partnership between media and the state in the process of development (Christians et al, 2009:201). Both publications tend to emphasise the hegemonic ideology
pertaining to Union while giving limited attention to challenges to such constructions. While both newspapers do identify certain problems of the Union and thus exercise a monitorial role to varying extents, it is apparent that the press in Tanzania tends to be largely acritical, perhaps attributable to a long period under single party rule.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

In more than one way, the Tanganyika-Zanzibar union displays important contradictions and contestations of the proposed continent-wide African union: nationalism versus Pan-Africanism, racial versus cultural nationalism, historical versus political identities, diversities of race, religion, culture versus their politicisation and its results (Shivji, 2008).

This study investigates the discourses articulated about the Union\(^1\) of Tanganyika and Zanzibar (that formed the United Republic of Tanzania nation) in *The Citizen* and *Daily News* newspapers. It focuses on their coverage on Union Day from 2005 to 2011. The relevance of this research relates to the press’s considerable power to shape understandings and thus identities. With regard to the concern that questions are continuously raised by both Tanganyikans and Zanzibaris on the significance, legality, strength and areas covered by the Union (Shivji, 2009), this study sets out to investigate issues of power relations and senses of identity regarding this Union which are articulated by Tanzanians. It probes the nature of the discursive frames Tanzanians have access to through the press in order to make sense of nationhood and the Union.

As this study focuses on discourses regarding nationhood, it is informed by theories relating to collective and cultural identities inclusive of national identity. In its investigation on how a nation is constructed, this study works within a broad cultural and media studies framework and is informed by a constructionist approach to representation that conceptualises culture as a ‘constitutive’ process (Hall, 1997:2). Additionally, the study draws on theories of agenda-setting to probe the agendas set by the press on Union Day in addressing nationhood, and deploys theory of normative roles of the media (Christians et al, 2009) which interrogates the question of how the two newspapers namely *The Citizen* and *Daily News* construct and frame the Union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar as nation.

\(^1\) Union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar is referred as ‘the Union’ throughout this thesis, as this particular address is employed frequently by different literature and the press, particularly the two newspapers used in this analysis namely *The Citizen* and *Daily News*. 
1.1 The context of the study

1.1.1 Formation of the Tanganyika-Zanzibar Union

On 26 April 1964 the sovereign states of Tanganyika and Zanzibar united to form the United Republic of Tanzania when their then heads of state, Julius Kambarage Nyerere, President of Republic of Tanganyika and Abeid Amani Karume, President of People’s Republic of Zanzibar ratified this formation by signing the Articles of Union (Dourado, 2006:74-75, Shivji, 2008:86). The reasons for the two parties entering into this political formation differed in line with their histories and political concerns and thus this section details the histories of the two countries before this merger and then contextualises the subsequent Tanzania socio-political situation.

1.1.2 Historical account of Zanzibar’s path to Union

One of the compelling reasons for Zanzibar entering into this agreement related to ensuring the secure position of the new Revolutionary Government of Zanzibar (RGZ) (Duggan & Civille, 1976:77) in the wake of the Zanzibar Revolution of 1964 in which some 4,000 people (mainly Arabs and Asians) were killed. This revolution, described as a racial one and as a culmination of the struggle between the minority Arabs and the African majority (Othman, 2006:44), was indicative of the politicisation of complex lines of identity referred to ‘ethnic’ and ‘racial’ that had emerged in Zanzibar as a consequence, on one hand, of its particular history of long-time social interactions among people of different races as well as nationalities and, on the other hand, colonialism and its ‘divide and rule’ system (Killian, 2008:102,111).

In Zanzibar, which lies on the east coast of Africa and is formed by two main islands namely Pemba and Unguja, with several surrounding islets (see Figure 1 below), long-time interactions among Arabs, Indians, Persians and Africans (Zanzibar's original settlers who were Bantu-speaking Africans) have resulted in complex lines of identity that are linked to ethno-racial relationships and politics (Killian, 2008:111).

There were a series of events in Zanzibar before its merger with Tanganyika (see Figure 2 below) in 1964 that inform the present context and which led to state formation in the islands (Killian, 2008, Shivji, 2008). This account is constantly traced back to the immigration of the early inhabitants to the islands. Being islands situated off the east African coast, Zanzibar
attracted many immigrants including mainland (Tanganyika) Africans, Persians, Arabs, Indians, and Comorians (from a country currently known as ‘Union of the Comoros’ which consists of four major islands that are located off the eastern coast of Africa, on the east coast of Zanzibar). The African migrants, in particular, are believed to have originated from the hinterland of the East African countries of Tanganyika, Malawi, Mozambique and Eastern Congo (Killian, 2008:103).

Figure 1: The East Africa Coast

(Source: www.songommara.rice.edu/images/e_africa_map_large)
However, Zanzibar's original settlers, different from those immigrants to the islands, were Bantu-speaking Africans. The Persians who are understood to have arrived in about the tenth century came from the Persian Gulf region². Intermarriages between the Persian and African communities led to the gradual formation of what is considered an ethnic group that identifies itself as Shirazi or Afro-Shirazi, linking their origin to the Eastern Persian region around Shiraz (Bennet, 1978:5). The Shirazi group came to be divided into three ethnic groups: the Hadimu, the Tumbatu (who both of them were later referred to as the Unguja Shirazi) as well as the Pemba Shirazi; thereby signalling their location on different islands. People were organised into small independent polities ruled largely by the Shirazi dynasties. By the sixteenth century there existed five independent dynasty rulers in Pemba and two or three in Unguja (Bennet, 1978:8).

---
² Persia is currently known as the Iran nation.
Apart from the early Persian-African interaction, Arab traders and explorers also interacted with the local population resulting in a mix of Afro-Arab people (Killian, 2008:103). Subsequently, particular lines of identity were drawn of ‘Arab’ against ‘African’. Additionally, there were lines of identity drawn along geographical lines, namely Unguja Shirazi against Pemba Shirazi. However, among the African communities (Pemba Shirazi, Unguja Shirazi and those of Tanganyika origin) the Pemba Shirazi initially dominated Zanzibar’s politics and economy (Duggan & Civille, 1976:12).

While the Persians had interacted with and married indigenous Zanzibarís since the tenth century, the Portuguese arrived and wanted to control the East African coast early in the sixteenth century. The motive of the Portuguese, which marks the earliest imperialist move or scramble for Africa, was to control the Indian Ocean trade and its route in which ivory, animals, and later on slaves were taken to China via India; and celadon porcelain were brought to East Africa (Duggan & Civille, 1976:17). The Portuguese took control over the East African coast from Mombasa (Kenya) in the north to Lindi (Tanganyika) in the south and onward to Mozambique in 1650. They also held sovereignty over parts of Zanzibar and Pemba (Duggan & Civille, 1976:17). Thus, Portugal became the first colonial power to invade Zanzibar, the sea port where traders exchanged commodities, slaves and got other needs such as fresh water (Duggan & Civille, 1976:17). However, in the early part of the seventeenth century various Arab sultanates of Oman, who were attracted by opportunities for wealth through trade in ivory, slaves and cloves in Zanzibar and other parts of the East African coast, rose in rebellion against the Portuguese and gradually overthrew the Portuguese rule (Duggan & Civille, 1976:17). In 1699 the Arabs of Oman, led by the Busaidy dynasty, came to Zanzibar. In 1832, the capital of the Busaidy dynasty was moved from Oman to Zanzibar (Bennett, 1978:28).

However, it was also during the early part of the nineteenth century Zanzibar assumed international repute as a market for both ivory and black African slaves. The coast of East Africa saw frequent visits by American clippers ships and British privateers putting into port for trade, water and supplies (Duggan & Civille, 1976:17). Thus, by the nineteenth century Zanzibar had become the main commercial centre on the East African coast, not only for Arab traders but also for merchants from the United States, Britain, France and Germany (Killian, 2008:104).
A subsequent change in rule occurred as a consequence of the Berlin Conference of 1884 that launched the partition of the continent of Africa among colonial powers and set African territories (Mazrui, 2010). Zanzibar was placed under dual rule, with the Sultan, Seyyid Sir Khalifa bin Harub as the local ruler and the British as the ultimate colonial power (Duggan & Civille, 1976:76; Bakari, 2001; Othman, 2006:36). Consistent with British colonial rule and in line with colonial policy of divide and rule, again Zanzibar’s complex lines of identity, linked to the issue of geographical and racial lines such that of ‘Pemba Shirazi’ against ‘Unguja Shirazi’ as well as ‘African’ against ‘Arab’ respectively, were deployed to ensure what has been described as the indirect rule system³ (Mamdani, 2001, Meredith, 2006:6).

Due to its long history of a range of immigrants and the absence of absolute tribal groupings and chiefs in Zanzibar, the British indirect system in the islands differed somewhat. Instead, on the islands it was the Arab community (and Asians to lesser extent) that were favoured by the British. The Arabs were preferred for recruitment in government bureaucracy as well as for representation in the colonial advisory body – for instance, representation in the Protectorate Council which was formed in 1914 and constituted the Sultan, the British, Arab and Asian communities (Killian, 2008:106).

Under the dual rule of the British and the Arab Sultan, the colonial economy in Zanzibar’s economy prospered mainly through trade in ivory, slaves, and cloves. Both slaves and ivory were obtained from the hinterland of Africa with Zanzibar serving as the largest slave market from which black African slaves were shipped to America. Arab and Indian (Asian) traders, as well as merchants from the United States, France and Germany were involved in the shipping of slaves and ivory (Duggan & Civille, 1976:17). In addition to exporting slaves, it was estimated that by the end of 1850s about two-thirds of the islands’ population of 300,000 were slaves (Bennet, 1978:28).

³ The indirect rule system was deployed by the British where they ruled their colonies using the dividing lines of the ethnic or tribal systems (maintaining local chiefs’ authorities) that existed even before their arrival. While the colonisers remained strictly loyal to the colonial power, the differences and rivalry among tribal groupings (the colonised) were maintained to make it difficult for them to unite and oppose British colonial power (Mamdani, 2001, Meredith, 2006:6).
The Arabs, in particular, maintained control over the clove plantations. Consequently, the islands’ economy was controlled largely by Arabs who formed the land owners. Then, the Asians occupied the merchant class and were almost exclusively involved in the commercial sector. Their attempts to enter the plantation sector were thwarted by the Arabs in alliance with the British (Shivji, 2008:13). The working class that comprised of the Unguja Shirazi and Africans of mainland origin, who were both victims of forced labour, was struggling against the exclusion from access to resources and Arab hegemony. Thus, they wanted to restore their expropriated land and local autonomy (Killian, 2008:104). On the other hand, the Pemba Shirazi who had experienced less land alienation by the Arabs, and their livelihood system was left more or less uninterrupted, regarded the mainlanders as enemies and foreigners, accusing them of taking their jobs and promoting Christianity in a predominantly Muslim state. Consequently, these struggles between such groups or classes contributed to the division among the local populations of Unguja and Pemba. However, it is important to note that, while African-Arab relations were highly antagonistic in Unguja; they were less so in Pemba (where the hostile relations were between Pemba Shirazi and Africans of mainland origin (Killian, 2008:104)).

It was in Unguja where large-scale clove plantations were first established in the 1830s. Both the Shirazi of Unguja and the Africans of Tanganyika origin became the victims of oppression as labourers and victims of land alienation to provide for the expanded clove plantation by the Arabs. In contrast, the Shirazi in Pemba experienced less land alienation, as their livelihood system was left largely uninterrupted and many were able to own clove plantations as the Arabs did (Killian, 2008:104). There was also a higher rate of intermarriage between the Pemba Shirazi and the Arabs in Pemba than in Unguja where intermarriage was predominantly between the Unguja Shirazi and mainland Africans (Bennet, 1978:27). As a consequence of this economic and social structuring, Zanzibari society, Unguja in particular⁴, became structured into a three-tiered pyramid. The Africans, mainly the Unguja Shirazi who formed the class of agricultural and manual labourers, occupied the lowest tier. In the middle was a small Asian community,

⁴ With regard to the above account of Unguja, there is a scarcity of accounts of Pemba’s history in relation to its economy and class structure. This could be attributed to the fact that the economy (and therefore interest) flourished more in Unguja with its large clove plantations, less so in Pemba where peasantry was dominant (Shivji, 2008:14-15).
whose origin were merchants from India, engaged in commerce and in administration, especially in tax and revenue collection. The Arabs occupied top positions; they maintained the control over the plantation economy and ruled the country under the tutelage of the British colonial masters (Killian, 2008:104; Shivji, 2008:11). It is important to point out that the Africans were hardly a homogeneous group, consisting as they did of Shirazi Africans and Africans of recent arrival from the mainland, who included slaves, freed slaves, their descendants and migrant labourers whose number increased especially after the abolition of the legal status of slavery in Zanzibar in 1897 (Killian, 2008:104).

Unsurprisingly then with these waves of migration linked to a struggle over economic and political power, intense enmity in terms of lines of identity has existed between ‘Africans’ (particularly the Unguja Shirazi and Africans of mainland origin) and ‘Arabs’ (Arabs of Oman origin and those born in the intermarriages between Pemba Shirazi and Arabs of Oman origin) in Zanzibar which was further fuelled by the favour shown by the British administration of Zanzibar from the end of 1880s to 1963 toward the feudal Arab administration (Duggan & Civille, 1976:26,78). Thus, this contestation has developed historically along complex lines of identity linked to geographical lines and racial divides. Before the arrival of the Portuguese colonialism, the Shirazi dominated Zanzibar’s politics and economy (Duggan & Civille, 1976:12). Presently, the Shirazi tend to continue its domination over other groups (such as Africans of mainland origin) in the Zanzibar islands even after the Revolution and the Union of 1964 (Killian, 2008:105). Consequently, the racial labels of ‘African’ and ‘Arab’ continue to be widely used in the context of political contestation for power (Killian, 2008:99-100). At the same time, this binary division has also been complicated as a consequence of the long-time social interactions among people of different races and nationalities (Persians, Arabs, Africans-Bantu speaking Zanzibaris and those of Tanganyika origins), and the resulting ethno-racial mix in Zanzibar. This intermingling had two consequences. It has led, first, to questioning what counts as being indigenous to Zanzibar and, second, who a ‘true’ representative of Africans might be, whether the Shirazi (an ethnic group formed as a result of intermarriages between the Persians from the Persian Gulf region and African communities-Bantu speaking Zanzibaris) or the Africans of (mainland) Tanganyika origin (Killian, 2008:105). For instance, while the original settlers of Zanzibar are said to have been the Bantu-speaking Africans, many Africans from
Tanganyika were brought to Zanzibar as slaves (Bennet, 1978:28); and being a slave became synonymous with having no identity. Thus few Zanzibaris trace their origins to the mainland to avoid being recognised as slaves (Bakari, 2001:67).

In addition, the British colonial practice in Zanzibar typically fuelled the contestation among the existing complex lines of identity linked to racial and geographical lines such as ‘Arabs’ against ‘Africans’ as it highly favoured some groupings in political representation and economic opportunities. For instance, during the time of food scarcity in the Second World War, a formula based on identity lines was employed whereby Europeans, Arabs and Indians were given preferential treatment over Africans (Unguja and Pemba Shirazi, and those of mainland origin). Europeans received bread, rice and meat and sugar, Arabs and Indians received rice while Africans received maize meal and beans (Mbwiliza, 2000:4-5). Moreover, with regard to education, Arabs were favoured more than any other group (Asians, Shirazi, and Africans of mainland origin) in admission to schools and scholarships, creating wide education inequalities among the population (Killian, 2008:106).

Therefore, the dividing lines of identification in Zanzibar include ‘Arab’ against ‘African’ as well as ‘Pembas’ against ‘Ungujas’ and these continue to be the most defining element for political mobilisation and claims to legitimacy of rule. This is in spite of racial intermarriages between Arabs, Persians and Africans, and to a certain degree, Indians (Killian, 2008:101).

In line with these lines of divisions, from the late 1920s to the early 1950s several ‘racially’ based associations were formed around religious and cultural concerns. These included the African Association, which was originally founded in Tanganyika in 1929, mostly as a social and cultural organisation of the African elite in Dar es Salaam and other urban areas. A branch of this Association was established in Zanzibar in 1934 with its membership consisting mostly of Zanzibaris of mainland (Tanganyika) – whose enemies were the Pemba Shirazi who accused these Zanzibaris of mainland origin of taking their jobs and promoting Christianity in a predominately Muslim state origin (Othman, 2006:36, Killian, 2008:104). Other associations included the Shirazi Association for the Shirazi who were a result of the intermarriages between Persians and Africans; the Arab Association for the Arabs, and the Comorian Association whose
members were the Africans of Comoro islands’ origin (Comoro islands, a country currently known as ‘Union of the Comoros’ which consists of four major islands that are located off the eastern coast of Africa, are on the east coast of Zanzibar islands within the Indian Ocean) (Othman, 2006:36). In the late 1950s, following various nationalist movements in other parts of East Africa such as Tanganyika and Kenya, these Zanzibari associations were succeeded by political parties such as the Zanzibar Nationalist Party (ZNP) whose concern was the protection of the Arab minority and its members included Arabs, the Pemba Shirazi and the Tumbatu (a small segment of Unguja Shirazi). Other parties included the Muslim Association Party, whose members were mostly Asians; and the Afro-Shirazi Party (ASP) – which became the largest political party, that attracted the majority of Africans such as the Unguja Shirazi, Pemba Shirazi and those of Tanganyika origin (Duggan & Civille, 1976:76).

The inherent complex lines of identity tension within the African community (Unguja Shirazi, Pemba Shirazi and those of Tanganyika origin) could not keep the Afro-Shirazi Party unified. Whereas the Tumbatu (a segment of the Unguja Shirazi) and Pemba Shirazi allied themselves more with the Arabs, the Hadimu (majority Unguja Shirazi) allied with the Africans of Tanganyika origin (mainlanders). Consequently, in 1959, a segment of the Pemba Shirazi broke away from the ASP and formed the Zanzibar and Pemba People’s Party (ZPPP) (Killian, 2008:107). It is important to note that, ever since such political parties were formed, these complex lines of identity which are linked to racial and geographical lines that emerged historically have remained a determining factor in party membership. In this way, a political party also served as a vehicle or platform for a particular ‘geographical’ or ‘racial’ group’s claim to entitlement to rule (Killian, 2008:105).

By 1956 there was a considerable pressure by Zanzibaris on the colonial authorities to conduct popular elections and to move towards independence. Consequently, while under British rule in 1957 Zanzibar held its first election in which 6 members for the Zanzibar Legislative Council (LEGICO) were elected. It was the Afro-Shirazi’s in the form of the ASP that won 5 seats while the Muslim Association Party, with its largely Asian following winning one seat (Duggan & Civille, 1976:76). In the subsequent election in 1961 the political parties that participated included the Afro-Shirazi Party (ASP) (whose members were the majority Africans); the
Zanzibar Nationalist Party (ZNP) that drew membership from the Arabs, the Pemba Shirazi and the Tumbatu; and the Zanzibar and Pemba People’s Party (ZPPP) of the Pemba Shirazi. In this election, of the 22 seats contested the Afro-Shirazi Party (ASP) got 10 seats, Zanzibar Nationalist Party (ZNP) got 9 and 3 went to Zanzibar and Pemba People’s Party (ZPPP) (Mwakyembe, 2007:21). The third elections in Zanzibar were held in July 1963, in which, the Legislature was expanded and 8 more seats were to be contested. In these 1963 elections, the coalition of the Zanzibar Nationalist Party (ZNP) and Zanzibar and Pemba People’s Party (ZPPP) claimed 18 seats with the ASP taking 13 seats (see Table 1 below). So the Zanzibar Nationalist Party (ZNP) and the Zanzibar and Pemba People’s Party (ZPPP) formed the internal self-government in July 1963 (Mwakyembe, 2007:23). This government started to operate in preparation for the independence to be attained in the end of 1963 (Othman, 2006:44).

**Table 1: Pre-independence elections in Zanzibar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election Year</th>
<th>Political parties that participated &amp; number of seats won</th>
<th>Total number of seats contested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>ASP : 5, ZNP : 0, Muslim Association : 1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>ASP : 10, ZNP : 9, ZPPP : 3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>ASP : 13, Coalition of ZNP and ZPPP : 18</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When Zanzibar achieved its Independence on December 10, 1963 which marked the end of British rule, the political situation was characterised by deep divisions, largely along racial-ethnic lines (Killian, 2008:107). This independence was not a victory for all Zanzibaris. While Zanzibar Nationalist Party (ZNP) with its Arab following and Zanzibar and Pemba People’s Party (ZPPP) with its Pemba Shirazi followers were celebrating victory, followers of Afro-Shirazi Party did not rejoice. Their followers, the dominant African majority that comprised of the Unguja Shirazi and those of Tanganyika origin, felt that the independence was not real, as the Sultan was still the Head of the state. As a consequence of the coalition, they also felt cheated out of power and some trade union leaders angrily claimed Afro-Shirazi Party’s right to rule on the basis of securing a majority of votes in the pre-independence elections of 1957, 1961 and 1963 (the Afro-Shirazi Party (ASP) got more seats, 13, comparing to the average 9 seats for each
of the two opponent parties, Zanzibar Nationalist Party (ZNP) and the Zanzibar and Pemba People’s Party (ZPPP) whose coalition had secured 18 seats) (see Table 1 above); thus, they demanded revenge (Shivji, 2008:42).

The new government did not survive long. Only a month after independence, on 12 January 1964, a bloody revolution dubbed ‘the Night of the Long Knives’, spearheaded by Afro Shirazi Party (ASP), took place. The fury of the revolution was directed against Arabs and Asians. Many were killed by African militants using machetes. The Sultan was overthrown and ASP, led by Abeid Karume, took power and formed the Revolutionary Government of Zanzibar (RGZ) (Shivji, 2008:42, Jumbe, 1994). On 26 April 1964, just four months after the revolution, the RGZ merged with the Republic of Tanganyika to form the United Republic of Tanzania.

The reasons given for Zanzibar entering into the Union agreement relate to issues of the security of her new Revolutionary Government (RGZ) after the Zanzibar Revolution of 1964 according to Duggan & Civille (1976:77). As mentioned, this revolution, described as a racial one and as a culmination of the struggle between the minority Arabs and the African majority (Othman, 2006:44), was indicative of the politicisation of ethnic and racial identity that had emerged in Zanzibar as a consequence, on one hand, of its particular history of long-time social interactions among people of different races and nationalities and, on the other hand, colonialism and its ‘divide and rule’ or indirect rule system as explained earlier (Killian, 2008:106).

In addition, then President of Zanzibar, Karume favoured the idea of Union as a bolster against a potential counter coup on the part of the deposed government (Shivji, 2008). He also felt the need for the Union for he was apprehensive of leftists and intellectual elements, some of whom were his colleagues and ministers within the government that was formed after the Revolution of 1964, the Revolutionary Government of Zanzibar (RGZ) (Othman, 2006:47, Miskiry, 2001). These were described as radical nationalists and many of them were trained in Cuba, and therefore acquainted with Marxist ideas. Such leftists included Kassim Hanga – a communist-leaning leader in the ASP, and Abdulrahman Babu, who was described as ‘a clear Marxist thinker who belonged to that first generation of African Marxists who were as much radical nationalists as Marxists’ (Shivji, 2008:63-64). It has been suggested that for Karume a Union
with Tanganyika would serve to ward off the threat to his power posed by these Marxist and left wing radical nationalists (Othman, 2006:47; Shivji, 2008:64, 84-85).

However, Karume, who was assassinated in 1972, was criticised for ‘forgetting’ (Shivji, 2008:104) all about the Union as soon as it was formed and setting about consolidating his power in Zanzibar. In the process he used the Union umbrella when it suited him (Shivji, 2008:104). After his death, the government’s Revolutionary Council of Zanzibar elected Aboud Jumbe as the President of Zanzibar. Jumbe, who was a long-serving Minister for Union Affairs before, was said to depend heavily on Nyerere’s and mainland support (Othman, 2006:62).

It has been necessary to plot this complex history in order to establish the politicisation of complex lines of identity (that has existed before independence and during Karume’s leadership onwards as noted earlier) in Zanzibar, whose impacts extend to issues of the Union between Zanzibar and Tanganyika that was formed in April 1964, particularly regarding the autonomy and sovereignty of the Zanzibar islands. For Zanzibar, the politicisation of racial identity remains salient not merely because certain groups, notably the Shirazi, are perceived to be threatened, but also because the state identity and sovereignty of Zanzibar are perceived to be at stake (Killian, 2008:102). Hence, among some Zanzibari groupings, there is the impression that the larger populous Tanganyika has swallowed Zanzibar (Nyerere, 1984; Othman, 2006:60). It is argued that the Union has never been as popular in Zanzibar as on the mainland and suggested that ‘it was only Tanganyika’s steam-roller tactics that forced the issue’ (Shivji, 2008:88-89). Yet, in contrast Nyerere strongly defended the existence and importance of Union even after his retirement from presidency in 1985 until his death in 1999. He argued that the dissolution from the Union would result in disintegration along racial and ethnic lines for all Tanzanians, but for Zanzibaris in particular (Nyerere, 1995:9-12).

1.1.3 Historical account of Tanganyika until Union
Tanganyika, the mainland part of United Republic of Tanzania, similarly had a colonial past. Consequent to the Berlin Conference of 1884, Tanganyika was declared a German Colony. With the outbreak of First World War marking the end of German colonial rule, Tanganyika came under British colonial rule under the trusteeship of the Council of League of Nations in 1920, a rule that lasted until independence (Duggan & Civille, 1976:24). However, while racial and
ethnic animosity persisted in Zanzibar before and after the Revolution and Union of 1964, Tanganyika experienced a different history.

In their ethnologic origins, the many (approximately 120) indigenous black African tribes of Tanganyika (present day Tanzania mainland) stem from five main sources: the Aboriginal Bushmen, the Nilotic, the Hamitic, the Nilo-Hamitic, and the loose-knit conglomerate known as Bantu. The differing ethnic strains at times are evident in physical characteristics, language, customs, lifestyles and forms of economy, whether agricultural or pastoral, or a combination thereof (Duggan & Civille, 1976:11). Tribal groupings in Tanganyika ranged from the largest tribe, the Sukuma, with more than 1 million persons in the 1960s to 1970s, to the small but distinct Sonjo, with less than 4,000 (Duggan & Civille, 1976:10). Other large tribes include the Nyamwezi, Hehe, Haya, Chagga, Masai, and Nyakyusa.

Unlike other African countries, the first President, Julius Nyerere, and his government strategised to unify this country with more than 120 ethnic groups, and cement their national political party’s hold over the whole country before and after independence in 1961 (Duggan & Civille, 1976:71, Mfumbusa, 2010:156). Shepherd (1962) makes this observation about this feature as exceptional:

A unique feature of Tanganyika is the good feeling between tribes. There is certainly rivalry, as between the Masai and Chagga, but nothing to compare with the distrust between tribes in neighbouring Uganda and Kenya. One reason for this is the great number of tribes – approximately 120 – none of which has ever been dominant (1962:56).

Also, it has been argued that Nyerere and his government learned from the West African experiences of clashes between traditionalists and modernists around independence in 1960s, and consequently, in order to promote unity, they made conscious efforts to suppress religious and tribal antagonisms (Shepherd, 1962:56).

Prior to independence and consistent with the waves of nationalism which were then sweeping over Africa during the 1940s and 1950s, three political parties were formed in Tanganyika: Tanganyika African Association (TAA), United Tanganyika Party (UTP) and African National
Congress (ANC) (Duggan & Civille, 1976:32). In 1954, TAA was transformed to Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) (Were and Wilson, 1968:18). Of the three parties, only TANU under Nyerere advanced a determined, but peaceful nationalist movement for demanding the nation’s independence (Duggan & Civille, 1976:35). Unlike TANU, the other two political parties, United Tanganyika Party (UTP) and African National Congress (ANC), did not win majority support because of their failure to express clearly if they stood on the African majority’s position of eliminating the colonial power. Also, the UTP was favoured and given support by British officials, and was thus known as ‘the Government Party’. ANC under Zuberi Mtemvu, a disgruntled former member of TANU, was viewed as racist (it only accepted African members and was against collaborating with people of other races such as British and Indians even if they supported its objectives) and tried to whip up feeling against Nyerere’s intention to collaborate with other race groups in government (Shepherd, 1962:55).

Subsequently, although the British governor in Tanganyika, Sir Edward Twinning, made the claim before the United Nations in 1954 that TANU did not represent the views of all Africans, the party successfully attracted many Tanganyikans with its expressed intention of preparing the people of Tanganyika for self-government and independence (Duggan & Civille, 1976:34-35). Thus, unlike in Zanzibar where three major political parties had almost even support, TANU enjoyed overwhelming support among the population in Tanganyika (Othman, 2006:41). Under the leadership of Julius Nyerere, TANU mobilised the Tanganyikans to demand independence. The road to independence started in December 1958 when the first election for the new Legislative Council was held. TANU won all the seats. The second election was held in February 1959 and again TANU gained all but one of the 71 elective seats in the Legislative Council. In a further election held in August 1960 TANU again won 70 seats out of the 71 elective seats in the Legislative Council (Duggan & Civille, 1976:39-40). In the light of TANU’s resounding victory in the 1960 elections, consistent with the recommendations made by the United Nations Visiting Mission to Tanganyika earlier in 1954 and aided by the fact that British rule in Tanganyika was under the trusteeship of the Council of the United Nations, Tanganyika obtained her Independence on 9 December 1961 when Nyerere became the first Prime Minister (Duggan & Civille, 1976; Miskry, 2001).
Three years after her independence, in April 1964, Tanganyika united with Zanzibar. Like Zanzibar, Tanganyika had security concerns that led the leaders to consider this Union. They were concerned that, if independent, Zanzibar with its historical links to the Arab world could pose a threat to Tanganyikan security (Bakary, 2006). (This presently takes the form of a concern with emerging allegiance to radical Islam particularly among the youth (Killian, 2008:121)).

1.1.4 Nyerere’s TANU and Karume’s ASP ideological positions

The two political parties, Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) and Afro-Shirazi Party (ASP) had particular distinguishable features which led to the attainment of independence and self-government in Tanganyika and Zanzibar respectively and they are relevant in terms of the subsequent formation of Union.

Prior to independence of Tanganyika and the Revolution in Zanzibar, both parties embraced an ideology of African nationalism affirming African culture and African self-government (Shivji, 2008:70) and were consequently supportive of each other in elections (Killian, 2008:99). However, unlike TANU whose African nationalism included people of all races as long as they supported its objective, ASP espoused a black African nationalist ideology in reaction to the hostile racial relations in Zanzibar that were signalled by the terms of ‘Arab’ in opposition to ‘African’, and which became the factors that determine claims of political and economic power (Shivji, 2008:19). Additionally, the common language of Kiswahili shored up the connection between Tanganyika and Zanzibar (Killian, 2008:99)

It is striking that in spite of these very different histories in 1964 Tanzania adopted single party rule (for both mainland and Zanzibar). Zanzibar adopted single party rule by passing a decree in May, 1964 which declared ASP ‘the sole political party and supreme authority’. Two months later, the government of the United Republic declared Tanzania a de jure one-party state (Shivji, 2008:108). From 1964 when Tanzania (both Tanganyika and Zanzibar) was under the single-party rule and explicitly adopted a form of socialist ideology, there was massive state control in both political and economic spheres. The ruling parties, TANU and ASP respectively, exercised an authoritarian form of rule of the country (Mukandala & Killian, 2010:79, Mfumbusa, 2010:157).
Another common feature the two parties shared was that both their leaders, Julius Nyerere of TANU and Abeid Karume of ASP, were seen as ‘friends’ of the British as far as the cold war rivalry between the Communist bloc (USSR, China, Cuba and their allies) and the Western bloc (United States of America, Britain and their allies) is concerned. It is asserted that the British utilised their advantage as the former colonial power of both Zanzibar and Tanganyika and encouraged both Karume and Nyerere to resist communism which was argued to pose a threat to their power. A Union was argued as necessary for strengthening security (Shivji, 2008:74).

In spite of their socialist positioning (that resisted Soviet and Cuba communism) – a seeming contradiction however is that, Nyerere and TANU recognised a kind of (Tanzanian) socialism as a continuation of ancient tribal socialism (which maintained that the richness or poverty of individuals and families corresponds to the well-being or relative wealth of the whole society). This form of socialism is termed *Ujamaa* (Duggan & Civille, 1976:171). In 1967, three years after the Union, Nyerere and TANU announced the official government policy in what is known as the Arusha Declaration that declared *Ujamaa*, this form of socialist philosophy, as Tanzania’s political ideology. *Ujamaa*, a Swahili word for ‘family-hood’ signifies the idea of an extended family and presumes a form of ‘Africaness’ in which there is no place for racialism, tribalism and religious intolerance or discrimination. *Ujamaa* policy, which was built on the twin principles of socioeconomic egalitarianism and self-reliance, involved wholesale nationalisation of banks, industries, commercial farms, commercial buildings, and schools (Mfumbusa, 2010:157, Duggan & Civille, 1976:169). Consequently, in 1972, following the Arusha Declaration of 1967, the government also redefined the roles of the media in the country to suit socialist principles which had been outlined in the Declaration (Rioba, 2008:11). While the brainchild of Nyerere, *Ujamaa* was not embraced by Karume in Zanzibar (Duggan & Civille, 1976:169-183).

It is important to point out that the two political parties, TANU and ASP merged in 1977 (five years after the death of Karume in 1972) to form a single ruling party, *Chama cha Mapinduzi* (Revolutionary Party) through which the country continued with single party rule (Shivji, 2008:212). This was the situation in 1992 when the multiparty system was introduced in
Tanzania (both in Tanganyika and Zanzibar) and which has allowed the introduction of different political parties espousing different ideologies (Mukandala & Killian, 2010:80).

1.1.5 A summary of factors leading to the Union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar

The Union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar then can be understood as a response to several factors which are briefly summarised here. The extensive historical connections between Tanganyikans and Zanzibarис, the ‘mainlanders’ and ‘islanders’ respectively, include blood, trade and cultural ties among many inhabitants as a consequence of the interactions and intermarriages between the people of Tanganyika and Zanzibar over centuries (Bennet, 1978:27). The common language of Kiswahili has additionally shored up the connection between Tanganyikans and Zanzibarис (Killian, 2008:99). Importantly too, there was close political co-operation between the two political parties of the Afro-Shirazi Party (ASP) of Zanzibar and the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU), a relationship that was supportive of Union. Both parties embraced ideologies of African nationalism and Pan-Africanism (which advocated for unity and racial equality), and provided support to each other in elections prior to independence (Killian, 2008:99, Shivji, 2008:70). As noted earlier, after Union the two political parties merged in February 1977 to form the single ruling party, Chama cha Mapinduzi (Revolutionary Party) (Shivji, 2008:212).

In terms of the global politics of the period and linked to the Cold War contestation between the rival power blocs of the United States of America and the Soviet Union, this position (Union) was endorsed by the Western countries of Britain and United States (Othman, 2006:47, Wilson, 1989:75, Shivji, 2008:74), as strategic in preventing Zanzibar from consolidating a radical leftist or communist orientation sympathetic to the Soviet Union and her allies such as China and Cuba (Karume, 2004:4). The international press had already started to characterise Zanzibar as the ‘Cuba of Africa’ (The Guardian newspaper, London 13 January 1964, quoted in Othman, 2006:47).

Following those forces, Tanganyika and Zanzibar united to form the United Republic of Tanzania (URT) where the two countries’ Presidents, Nyerere and Karume respectively signed the Articles of the Union as an international treaty (Bakary, 2006:3, Shivji, 2008:82).
1.1.6 Structure of the Union

The particular form the union has taken has led to particular tensions. Tanzania, while a unitary state, has a dual government structure, consisting of the Union government and the Zanzibari government. This duality was evident in the decisions made by the leadership from its inception when Nyerere became the first president of the Republic of Tanzania with Karume the first vice president (while he also remained the president of Zanzibar) and Rashid Kawawa (from the mainland) as the second vice-president (Shivji, 2008:84; Karume, 2004:4). The Union government, with executive, legislature and judiciary responsibilities, is additionally mandated to address the issues of government of mainland Tanzania (Killian, 2008:111). The Articles of the Union consists of ‘Union matters’ (the original 11 have increased over the years to 22) (Killian, 2008:111) which include, among others, the constitution and government of the URT; external affairs; defence; police; emergency powers; citizenship; immigration; external trade and borrowing; and registration of political parties (Dourado, 2006:80).

In accordance with the United Republic Constitution, both countries surrendered sovereignty over the above matters to the Parliament and Executive of the United Republic while residuary powers were vested in their respective governments (Dourado, 2006:81). At the same time, the Constitution provided a separate legislature, executive and judiciary in and for Zanzibar, while the Parliament and Executive of the United Republic acquired exclusive authority in respect of all other matters in Tanganyika. Thus, the Zanzibari government has exclusive authority within the islands for domestic matters and all non-union matters other than those reserved to the Parliament and Executive of the URT (Killian, 2008:111). For instance, Zanzibar has her own President as head of the islands’ government. But the Union President, whether originating from either mainland or Zanzibar, is also the President of the mainland (Tanganyika) (Dourado, 2006).

1.1.7 Tensions following the Union

The Union question remains one of the most intractable political challenges facing Tanzania (Mfumbusa, 2010:158) and is central to the issues this study seeks to address. In relation to this, four tensions pertaining to the Union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar are identified here. First, the distribution of benefits coming from the Union to Zanzibar is questioned by the Zanzibaris in terms of its equitability (Othman, 2006:63). Second, there is disagreement as to whether the
Articles of Union of 1964 (see Appendix 5) provided for a federation, that is three governments (one of Tanganyika, the other of Zanzibar, and the third, a federal one), or only two governments (the Union government and the RGZ, with the government of Tanganyika ceasing to exist after the Union) as presently configured (Aseka, 2005:301, Shivji, 2008:98). As the Union government is also the government of the mainland in non-union matters, the contentious issue is whether this implies that the mainland is the Union with Zanzibar being merely a region within the United Republic and not a sovereign country. It is claimed that the Union ‘sold’ Zanzibar to the mainland (Othman, 2006:61). Third, there is contestation as to whether Zanzibar is adequately represented in the diplomatic service and whether it receives an equitable share of the foreign aid coming to Tanzania (Othman, 2006:63). Finally, the very question of the legality of the Union is at issue as a result of the claim that, despite historical connections between the two countries, a prior satisfactory mandate of both Tanganyikans and Zanzibaris to unite the two countries was never sought (Dourado, 2006:73). It is in the press that these tensions are articulated, particularly on Union Day, when attention is given explicitly to the issue of Tanzania as a nation.

1.1.8 Tanzania media landscape
As this study is concerned with the press coverage of issues of Union in both state and commercial newspapers, the media landscape needs contextualisation. The history of the media of Tanzania (Tanganyika and Zanzibar) can be traced in two main phases: the colonial phase and the post-independence era that includes the years which are the focus of this study.

The advent of colonialists in both Tanganyika and Zanzibar marks the initial phase of the Tanzania media landscape. With the colonial incursion modern media forms were inserted into this space, mostly print media such as newspapers and magazines. These publications targeted indigenous people, and were seen as part of the broad project of Christianisation (Sturmer, 1999:29). In the 1880s Anglican missionaries began publishing newssheets that served spiritual communication and political interests. The first newssheet called Msimulizi, a Swahili word for ‘news-bearer’, was established by the Anglican missionaries of the Anglican Universities’ Mission to Central Africa (UMCA) in Zanzibar in 1888. The paper, which focused on religious
(Christian) issues, was aimed at converting Zanzibari people to Christianity and encouraging them to seek ‘knowledge about God’ (Sturmer, 1999:29).

In Tanganyika, a Swahili monthly, Habari za Mwezi (Monthly News) which is regarded as the first real newspaper on the mainland was established by these UMCA missionaries in 1894 (Sturmer, 1999:29). At the very beginning, Habari za Mwezi ran only religious articles, but after negative responses from the readership, secular items were printed too. As it targeted Tanganyikans in terms of promoting (Western) civilisation, its contents tended to be of European origin (particularly British Christianity that was in effect due to the presence of Anglican missionaries in many colonies including those of the Germans) and did not serve the needs of the indigenous population (Sturmer, 1999:29-30). As the entire ‘newspaper market’ was in the hands of the UMCA missionaries in East Africa by 1898 and the papers were published in English (not in German), this situation was considered unsatisfactory by the German government in Tanganyika. Thus, in 1899 the government established the Deutsch-Ostafrikanische Zeitung (German-East-African Newspaper), a weekly paper that was the mouthpiece of the German settlers (planters and farmers) of Tanganyika. It became a bi-weekly in 1908 ostensibly with the objective of endorsing ideologies of Aryan superiority (Rioba, 2008:10, Sturmer, 1999:32), thus reflecting the political antagonisms brewing in Europe prior to World War 1.

During British colonial rule in Tanganyika from 1919 until 1940s when there was a rise in nationalist movements in Tanganyika, a number of newspapers targeting both readers of ethnic groups and a national audience sprang up. A few members of the African elite who had received colonial education started these papers to state their grievances. These included Kwetu (Home), a weekly which was established in 1937 by Erica Fiah and became the Tanganyika’s first African owned newspaper. Kwetu focused on topics which were considered significant among the indigenous community, such as racial discrimination, economic exploitation and European control of the political system (Sturmer, 1999:56). Other papers included Wangaluka (Good Morning), a monthly edited in Swahili and Nyamwezi which was established in Nzega, Tabora in 1951 by C. H. B. Hakili, and Bukya na Gandi (Fresh News) established in 1952 by Ewald R. Munseri as a weekly published in English, Swahili and Haya in the Bukoba district, Lake
Victoria region. Both Wangaluka and Bukya na Gandi made attempts to present articles that criticised the colonial government policies (Sturmer, 1999:62).

In Zanzibar, The Gazette and The Samachar (The News) were established in 1892 and 1902 respectively. The Gazette, which was an English periodical run by the British colonial government, published administrative announcements and local news. The Samachar was a weekly publication privately owned by Fazel J. Master. It was published both in English and the Indian language Gujarati and had a readership predominantly of Asian merchants. Accordingly, it focused on the political and economical situation in India with little coverage of Zanzibar. Both papers operated until early 1940s (Sturmer, 1999:275).

As the nationalist movements gained more support in both Tanganyika and Zanzibar in the 1950s, the print media also changed in purpose and character. In Zanzibar, several newspapers, which were affiliated with particular political parties, emerged. They included Afrika Kwetu (Afrika-Our Home) and Afro-Shirazi with affiliations to Afro-Shirazi Party (ASP). Zanews and Sauti ya Wananchi (The Voice of Citizens) were affiliated to Zanzibar Nationalist Party (ZNP) and Pemba People’s Party (ZPPP) respectively (Sturmer, 1999:283).

Consequently, in 1957 a Swahili weekly, Mwafrika (The African) as the first newspaper to have a more widely national reach was established in Tanganyika. Privately owned by two Tanganyikans, Kheri Rashid and Robert Makange, Mwafrika set itself up as in opposition to the British colonial government in Tanganyika. It also advocated for greater representation of Africans in the Legislative council, and for self-government and independence. The British colonial regime set up Mamboleo (Today’s issues) as a counter to Mwafrika (Rioba, 2008:11). Mamboleo, described as the paper that was launched to serve ‘political aims’, published educative articles, local news and executive announcements. It also carried a number of soft news articles, arranged pen-friendships, and contributed the search for missing persons by the publication of wanted announcements (Sturmer, 1999:51).

In terms of broadcast media, it was only in 1951 that the British colonial government established the first radio broadcasting stations of Sauti ya Unguja (The Voice of Unguja) and Sauti ya Dar
e Salaam (The Voice of Dar es Salaam). These stations came into operation on 15 March and 1 July of 1951 respectively (Sturmer, 1999:78, 293). While it is argued that the establishment of radio in Africa during the colonial period served initially to provide links for expatriates to the metropoles (Bourgault, 1995:69), in both Tanganyika and Zanzibar, the establishment of radio stations has been argued to have been established to primarily serve the colonialists’ need for effective instruments of propaganda (Sturmer, 1999:76). However, it has also been argued that, similar to other Anglophone Africa, both stations (designed along the Public Corporation model of the BBC) were designed to also provide something of a public service to the native people of Tanganyika and Zanzibar (Bourgault, 1995:70).

In the second phase of the media history of Tanzania, the post-independence era, the print and broadcast media in both Tanganyika and Zanzibar changed in character. At the time of independence in Tanganyika in 1961, there were 35 monthly papers, 8 weekly papers (with only one state-owned newspaper namely The Standard which was later renamed Daily News) and 8 fortnightly papers (Chachage, 1997, Mukandala & Killian, 2010:79); all were published in either English or Kiswahili rather than any other local languages (Sturmer, 1999:108). However, as a single-party state Tanganyika witnessed increasing monopolisation of the media by the state. By 1967, only four daily papers remained. Two of them, namely the Nationalist and Ngurumo, were privately owned, while Uhuru and The Standard (to later become the Daily News and its Sunday edition, Sunday News) were owned by the ruling party and the government respectively (Mukandala & Killian, 2010:79). When it came to the broadcast media, the former colonial radio station, Sauti ya Dar e Salaam, was nationalised and renamed Tanganyika Broadcasting Corporation (TBC). The TBC remained the only broadcast medium and served as the state broadcaster, the character it retained until 1990s. It was then renamed Radio Tanzania Dar es Salaam (RTD) in 1965 following the formation of Union in 1964 (Sturmer, 1999:112-115).

In Zanzibar, when the islands became part of Tanzania under one-party rule early in 1964, the print media of the prohibited political parties, namely ZNP and ZPPP, disappeared. The government held a monopoly of the media with two government-owned weeklies, the English language paper Truth Prevails Where Lies Must Vanish and its Swahili translation Kweli Ikidhirí Uwongo Hujitenga, and Sauti ya Unguja, later renamed Sauti ya Tanzania Zanzibar (The Voice
of Tanzania-Zanzibar) after the Union, which were set up as instruments of the state to serve government interests (Sturmer, 1999:289,294).

Since 1964 when Tanzania adopted single party rule guided by the socialist ideology of *Ujamaa*, the government-owned media retained monopoly of news collection and distribution. In this way the privately-owned (or commercial) press were brought under the control of the state. The media were co-opted as part of the government’s development efforts to disseminate party policies and propaganda (Mukandala & Killian, 2010:79). In this way government sought to ensure that the party position with its policies to effect the Union were not easily challenged. Opposition to the government ideology by the press was framed as ‘irresponsible citizenship and an act of exploiting the privileges of democracy and freedom of press’ (Sturmer, 1999:106).

Although no law existed that explicitly barred registration of the private press in the country, ideological constraints, lack of personnel, high priced newsprint, as well as prohibitive taxes prevented the growth of private media and their pursuing of opposing views against the government (Rioba, 2008:13). At that time, the role the press played was one in which they partnered with the interests of the state and this role has been described as ‘collaborative’ as it involves press’s partnership with the state, a relationship premised on a commitment by the press to play a positive role in the process of national development (Christians et al, 2009:197). The state took the position that the role of the media ought to be one that was supportive of the forms of development they were pursuing. Thus, this ensured a single ideological position: development and unity through *Ujamaa* (Sturmer, 1999:107). The government justified their strategies of media control as promoting unity and implementing socialist policies, and when any journalists in the private media were critical of them they were branded as traitors of socialism (Rioba, 2008:13).

Subsequently, the adoption of a liberal market economy in the mid-1980s, which reshaped the economic and social landscape, marked another moment in the history of post-colonial Tanzania media. The media industry opened up to private investment in the early 1990s (Mfumbusa, 2010:158) and since then has experienced rapid growth; it has been described as ‘among the fastest growing in the sub-Saharan Africa’ (Media Council of Tanzania, 2007:12). Currently,
there are approximately 80 newspapers (19 dailies and over 40 weeklies and monthlies) and magazines, 62 radio stations (especially community radio in rural constituencies) and 28 TV stations (Tanzania Election Monitoring Committee, 2011:163). While not more than five radio stations have a national reach, the languages of publication and broadcast according to the laws are only English and Kiswahili (Mfumbusa, 2010:155).

Importantly, the United Republic government has remained a significant player in contemporary Tanzanian media during this era of liberal market economy, particularly as regards the print media. It owns the Daily News, the oldest English newspaper in the country, whose circulation in the country (both Tanzania mainland and Zanzibar), ranges from 8,000 to 12,000 copies. It also publishes the Kiswahili tabloid Habari Leo in Tanzania mainland and circulates it both on the mainland and in Zanzibar. The Zanzibar Leo daily is published in Zanzibar by the Ministry of Information of the Zanzibar government and circulated predominantly in Zanzibar (Mfumbusa, 2010:160). The major media corporation in the private print media industry is Mwananchi Communications Company (Mfumbusa, 2010:161). It publishes the Kiswahili daily, Mwananchi (whose circulation reaches 35,000 copies) and the English daily, The Citizen whose circulation ranges from 7,000 to 9,000 copies (Mwananchi, 2012).

The other privately owned dailies in the country, mostly tabloids, include The Guardian, The African, Mtanzania, Majira; and weeklies such as Rai, Raia Mwema, and Business Times. These arguably also play a watchdog role because they are independent newspapers and seek to hold the government accountable to the public (Tanzania Election Monitoring Committee, 2011:153, 156). This role is consistent with that identified as the monitorial role through which the media have no ties with political parties, governments, and even campaigning proprietors, and their task is to maintain and monitor the independent accountability of government to the public and wider society (Christians et al, 2009:142,144).

As a consequence of the tremendous increase in print and electronic media in Tanzania beyond state-owned entities in recent years, a range of views are increasingly articulated in the press regarding various national matters (Mukandala & Killian, 2010:79-80, Mfumbusa 2010:157). In addition, the introduction of the multiparty system in 1992 granted the different political parties
the status to articulate different ideological positions and to advocate for different policies (Mukandala & Killian, 2010:80). This has enabled the articulation of a divergence of opinion in how the Union is understood and now opposition to its existence, which was formally disallowed, can be articulated (Othman, 2006: 61). It is this divergence of opinions that my study is concerned with for it seeks to investigate, by analysing two newspapers namely Daily News and The Citizen, how the Tanzania press constructs the Tanganyika-Zanzibar Union as nation on Union Day, 26 April (from 2005 to 2011).

1.2 Theoretical foundations of the study

1.2.0 Union Day and newspapers’ construction of nationhood

This study recognises the ideological work necessary to construct and maintain nationalism or the ideology of ‘nationhood’ (Billig, 1995:22). If various strategies are deployed to do such ideological work, significantly days of remembrance provide the opportunity for government to articulate nationalistic arguments and narratives (Breuilly, 1993:64), and signify the existence of the territorial relation of the nation through military displays and mass rallies (Grosby, 2005:47, McClintock, 1996:274). Certainly, as with national days elsewhere, the Union day in Tanzania is a significant occasion as ‘the state celebrates itself’ (Billig, 1995:44), and provides the occasion to observe how the nation is imagined and narrated (Roosvall and Slovaara-Moring, 2010:9). Recently, newspapers in Tanzania have provided coverage on Union Day that extends beyond celebration to address questions raised by both, mainlanders and islanders on the significance, legality, strength and areas covered by the Union. The Union question ‘has refused to go away’, but is continuously contemplated (Shivji, 2009).

1.2.1 Representation

This study works within a broad cultural and media studies framework and is informed by a constructionist approach to representation that conceptualises culture as a ‘constitutive’ process (Hall, 1997a:2). Rather than representation being a reflection of the world or the event, a constructivist approach considers the media not to represent (re-present) reality, but rather to produce or construct it (Macdonald, 2003:11, Fiske, 1991:56). This approach asserts that, despite its existence, it is not the material world which conveys meaning but the language system used to
represent concepts (Hall, 1997a:25). It calls for attention to the way language is used to create particular agendas and frame meaning.

1.2.2 Nationhood
With regard to nationhood, this study drew on theories relating to collective and cultural identities inclusive of national identity. It recognises nation as a construction, an imagined community (Anderson, 1983). Accordingly, for groups or nations to exist, individuals must categorise themselves in group terms (Billig, 1995:66). By self-categorisation, individuals embrace nationhood by imagining themselves as national subjects and nation as a community (Billig, 1995:68). This approach guided the investigation into the discursive work performed by Tanzania’s media in conceptualising Tanzania as a nation and perhaps contesting it.

1.2.3 Agenda-setting and roles of the press
As the study probed the agendas set by the two newspapers on Union Day in addressing nationhood, it drew on theories of agenda-setting (the ability of news media to influence the salience of topics on the public agenda) and framing (McCombs, 2006). The analysis was additionally informed by normative theories of the press (Christians et al, 2009). If they include the facilitative, radical, monitorial and collaborative roles it was anticipated that the two roles namely monitorial (which overlaps with the familiar press role of watchdog or guardian of the public interest through which the media have no ties with governments) and collaborative (where the media partner with the government) would particularly be useful to this study.

1.3 Goals of the research
The research investigates the debates around Union in The Citizen and Daily News newspapers in their coverage on Union Day from 2005 to 2011. In seeking to critically probe the nature of the discursive frames to which Tanzanians have access and from which they might make sense of nationhood and the Union, this study sets out to address the central research question: ‘How has the Tanganyika-Zanzibar Union been represented in The Citizen and Daily News newspapers from 2005 to 2011?’ Implicit in this question are the issues of power relations and senses of identity that the discourses validate. The relevance of this research relates to the press’s considerable power to shape understandings and thus the identity positions of Tanzanians.
1.4 Research methodology
The study is both quantitative and qualitative in its approach and the primary method of analysis is a Qualitative Content Analysis. This study applies Budd et al (1967)’s and Guest et al (2012)’s approaches to thematic content analysis to probe the particular themes and their patterns regarding the Union; as well as the role of frames in these themes in *The Citizen* and *Daily News* newspapers as far as the representation of the Union as nation on the Union Day is concerned. In exploring themes and particular issues on the Union and nationhood in the articles, the study takes into consideration the fact that qualitative techniques treat language as a type of social practice used for representation and practice and that ‘texts are produced by socially situated speakers and writers’ (Kress, 1990:86).

1.5 Sample for the study
The sample of the two publications, *The Citizen* and *Daily News* newspapers on 26 April of 2005 to 2011, is purposively selected. Both are published in English, the official language of instruction in Tanzania from secondary level upwards. The *Daily News*, the oldest newspaper in Tanzania, was selected as the only remaining state-owned one that publishes in English (Bourgault, 1995:166, Mfumbusa, 2010). Its editorial policy identifies its role as to inform and act as a collective educator, and to inspire and disseminate socialist ideas. Its target readership is all Tanzanians as well as the international market (Sturmer, 1999:138). *The Citizen*, a privately-owned paper with ‘diverse and independent coverage’, has a comparatively wide circulation (Mfumbusa, 2010:160-161). Both are considered as Tanzania’s most credible papers that perform well in adherence to ethics (Media Council of Tanzania, 2011:1). The time frame from 2005 to 2011 is selected as this coincides with the existence of *The Citizen* which was launched in August 2004 and thus the first time it covered Union day was on 26 April 2005 (Mwananchi, 2011). Also, while it is only since 2000 that Tanzania has experienced more extensive political and constitutional debates that probe the Union question, in 2005 the government created a new ministry under the Vice President’s Office that deals with Union matters (Killian, 2008:121). This informed the decision to use 2005 as the starting date of the investigation. Editorials and feature articles about the Union are also purposively selected as described in Chapter 3.

The findings of the quantitative and qualitative analyses, and reflections on them are presented in the final two chapters of this study.
CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

The argument we will be considering here is that, in fact, national identities are not things we are born with, but are formed and transformed within and in relation to representation. ... It follows that a nation is not only a political entity but something which produces meanings – a system of cultural representations. People are not only legal citizens of a nation; they participate in the idea of the nation as represented in its national culture (Hall, 1992:292).

This chapter provides an overview of the theoretical framework and literature that inform this study by presenting the theories and concepts central to this undertaking. This study confines its investigation to how the nation is constructed or narrated by the media and therefore works within a broad cultural and media studies framework, informed by a constructionist approach (Hall, 1992, 1997, Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002).

As the study sought to critically probe the nature of the discursive frames to which Tanzanians have access and from which they make sense of nationhood and the Union, it draws on theories relating to collective and cultural identities inclusive of national identity and recognises nation as a construction, an imagined community (Anderson, 1983). Accordingly, this chapter is concerned with representation and the work through which a nation is socially constructed and imagined in particular ways; and outlines theories relating to collective and cultural identities, and nation-related concepts which are paramount and relevant to this study such as nation is ‘an imagined community’ (Anderson, 1983), national culture and national identity. Also, because this study probes the agendas set by the Tanzania’s press on Union Day in addressing nationhood, it draws on theories of agenda-setting (the ability of news media to influence the salience of topics on the public agenda) and framing (McCombs, 2006), as well as normative theories of the press (Christians et al, 2009) which link this study, in a particular way, to the question of how The Citizen and Daily News newspapers construct the Union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar as nation.

The chapter is divided into three main parts: the first outlines the social constructionist approach to representation that is involved in constructing nation and nationhood. The second is concerned
with theories pertaining to collective and cultural identities inclusive of national identity; and the final part addresses the role of the media more directly by considering agenda-setting and framing, as well as the normative theories of the media.

2.1 Representation

2.1.1 Representation, meaning and language

The term representation is used to refer to how meanings are produced through language. It refers to the process by which meaning is produced and exchanged between members of a culture (Hall, 1997a:15). Culture, in this sense, refers to a way in which people make sense of or give meaning to things of one sort or another. It consists of the maps of meaning, the frameworks regarding intelligibility, as well as the things which allow people to make sense of a world which exists (Hall, 1997b:9). In other words, culture is a set of practices involved in creating and transmitting meanings (Berger, 2008:167). It has been argued that representations shape public beliefs and behaviours and thus construct the social fabric of people’s lives (Hall, 1997a, 1992; Fiske, 1991; Barker, 2000; Devereux, 2007:188). In this sense, media texts tend shape the way we understand ourselves and others and the way we conduct our lives. Representation as a concept then is concerned with how the world is socially constructed and represented to and by us (Barker, 2000:8).

Representation is concerned with the use of language, where language is understood as a system of signs which stand for or represent things, and with the production of the meaning and concepts through language (Hall, 1997a:16). Thus, it is the link between the concepts and the language which facilitates reference to the ‘real’ world of objects, people or events, or indeed to imaginary worlds of fictional objects, people and events. Consistent with this, Hall (1997a) has described representation as involving two systems. The first one relates to a correlation by which all objects, people and events are connected to a set of mental representations that is carried around in people’s heads. Without such representations, people or the audience cannot interpret the world meaningfully because meaning depends on the shared system of concepts and images that ‘represent’ the world, enabling the audience to refer to things that are both inside and outside their minds (Hall, 1997a:17).
The second system of representation consists of the ways in which concepts are organised, arranged and classified into complex relations with one another (Hall, 1997a). In addition to the former system of representation therefore, the latter implies that the concepts which were referred in the former system are not merely random concepts but systematic ones that enable people to build up a shared culture of meanings and construct a social world which they inhabit together (Hall, 1997a:18). Therefore meaning usually depends on the relationships, in terms of similarity or difference, between things in the world – people, objects, and events, real or fictional – and the conceptual system which operates as mental representations (Hall, 1997a:18). Hence, this second system of representation depends on constructing a set of signs, arranged or organised into various languages which stand for or represent those concepts (Hall, 1997a:18).

If the two related systems of representation are central to the process of making meaning in any culture, it is language that enables people in the world to communicate because they share broadly the same conceptual maps and thus make sense or interpret the world in roughly similar ways (Hall, 1997a:18). Therefore, shared conceptual maps facilitate similar interpretations of the world among individuals despite the fact that each individual understands the world in a unique way. Meaning arises because of the shared conceptual maps which groups or members of a culture or society share together (Hall, 1997b:9). In this sense, meaning is referred to as ‘social production’ (Hall, 1982), that is, a means by which the world has to be made to mean. Subsequently, in meaning-making processes, language is used in its broadest sense to refer to sets of signifiers (internal structures of language or form through which things are made to mean – signified) of different kinds such as actual word, image or photo (Hall, 1982:66-67, Hall, 1997a).

2.1.2 Approaches to representation

The constructivist approach adopted by this study stands in contrast to other approaches to representation, namely the reflective and the intentional, all of which respond in different ways to the questions, ‘where do meanings come from?’ and ‘how can we tell the “true” meaning of a word or image?’ (Hall, 1997a:24).
The reflective approach to representation assumes that meaning lies in the object, person, idea or event in the real world. In this sense, language functions as a mirror, to reflect the true meaning as it already exists in the world (Hall 1997a:24). This approach however does not address the issue of the existence of certain words or images that are used to refer to worlds that are imaginary and do not refer to material objects, persons or events in the world, nor does it explain why no words exist for particular objects in some languages. In other words it evades the issues of language as coded.

The intentional approach to representation, on the other hand, holds that it is the speaker or the author who creates a unique meaning which is the ‘true’ one or, in other words, that ‘words mean what the author intends them to mean’ (Hall, 1997a:25). This approach fails to take into account the social character of language. An individual cannot be the sole or unique producer of meaning because the essence of language is communication and communication depends on shared linguistic conventions and shared codes. Consequently, individual’s private thoughts have to negotiate with all other meanings for words or images which have been stored in language (Hall, 1997a:25).

The constructivist approach which informs this study recognises the social character of language and argues that neither things in themselves nor the individual users of language can fix meaning in language. In other words, ‘things don’t mean: we construct meaning, using representational systems – concepts and signs’ (Hall, 1997a:25). Accordingly, the world has to be made to mean and therefore it is social actors who use the conceptual systems of their culture and the linguistic and other representational systems to construct meaning, to make the world meaningful and to communicate about the world meaningfully to others (Devereux, 2007:188).

Importantly, constructivists do not deny the existence of the material world, but they insist that it is not the material world which conveys meaning. Rather, it is the language system used to represent concepts (Hall, 1997a:25). Cultural representations have a certain materiality; they are embedded in sounds, inscriptions, objects, images, books, magazines and television programmes. They are produced, enacted, used and understood in specific social contexts (Barker, 2000:8). Therefore, central to the approach this study adopts, meaning is constructed or produced in and
through language (constituted by signs), and accordingly the representations in media texts function in this way.

The constructionist approach proposes a complex and mediated relationship between the material world, our conceptual images and language which, governed by the cultural and linguistic codes, produce meaning (Hall, 1997a:35). What this insight puts at issue are questions of which meanings are systematically and regularly constructed around particular objects, people or events in the ‘real’ world, or indeed around a particular issue such as nation and nationhood (Hall, 1995:67; 1997a:36). It is argued that, essentially, ‘to construct this rather than that account requires the specific choice of certain means (selection) and their articulation together through the practice of meaning production (combination)’ (Hall, 1995:68).

Meaning construction or representation is the ability to shape ideas and attitudes, in this case, in sustaining and embracing or challenging the idea of nationhood. The constructivist approach to representation is concerned with the textual generation of meaning. It calls for investigation of the modes by which meaning is produced in a variety of contexts (Barker, 2000:9). This study adopts this constructivist approach in the analysis of The Citizen and Daily News newspapers’ representation of the Union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar as nation. This approach recognises that media content plays a significant role in the shaping and framing of peoples’ understanding and perceptions of the social world. Media content, it has been argued, provides people with various ‘scripts’ which they have access to in order to negotiate and make sense of the social contexts in which they find themselves in their everyday lives (Devereux, 2007:186). It informs people about personal, social and political issues. Accordingly, this study considers that the two newspapers namely Daily News and The Citizen do not just reflect, but actively construct the attitudes to ‘nationhood’. Moreover, the particular meanings and frameworks they provide have the social effect of either sustaining or challenging the existence of the Union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar, by which Tanzania nation is thus defined.

Language is the basis of representation which constitutes the social world in particular ways; it is through language that media texts articulate coherent, if shifting, ways of seeing the world (Croteau and Hoynes, 2000:157). The social constructionist approach proposes that the ways in
which people understand and categorise in everyday life are not in response to transparent reflections of a world ‘out there’, but a product of historically and culturally specific understandings of the world and therefore contingent (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002:103).

2.1.3 Discourse
Discourse, according to Jorgensen and Phillips (2002:1), can be defined as a particular way of talking about and understanding the world (or an aspect of the world). Discourse is a form of social action that plays a part in producing the social world – including knowledge, identities and social relations – and thereby in maintaining specific social patterns. It is further argued that this view is anti-essentialist: that the social world is constructed socially and discursively implies that its character is not pre-given or determined by external conditions, and that people do not possess a set of fixed and authentic characteristics or essences (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002:5). Importantly, discourse is linked to ideology by several critical analysts because discourses are viewed as ‘categoris[ing] the world in ways that legitimate and maintain social patterns’ (Wetherell and Potter, 1992:95). In the next section I consider the concept of ideology and the related concept of hegemony.

2.1.4 Ideology and hegemony
2.1.4.1 Ideology
The concept of ideology in Cultural Studies draws on the ideas of Marx whose conception links ideology to power, dominance and class conflict. Marx was interested in how minority groups could maintain power and why the majority of people accepted a system that appeared to be at odds with their own interests (Grossberg et al, 1998). Ideology was thus conceived of in terms of a ‘false consciousness’ that presented individuals in society with an illusory view of reality that operated so that systems of power can be maintained (Billig, 1991:4). Subsequently, the theorising of ideology has moved beyond the concept of false consciousness alone, while remaining concerned with questions of power and the ways in which systems of meaning (language in terms of ideologies) are part of the process of wielding power. It pays attention to the ongoing nature of ideological struggles and to how people negotiate with, and even oppose, the ideologies of the powerful (Croteau and Hoynes, 2000:163).
Two major approaches to the concept of ideology have been identified by Blommaert (2005). On the one hand, ideology has been defined as a specific set of symbolic representations – discourses, terms, arguments, images, stereotypes – serving a specific purpose, and operated by specific groups or actors, recognisable precisely by their usage of such ideologies (Blommaert, 2005:158). Ideology in this first sense stands for partisan views and opinions. It is sensed to represent a particular bias characterising specific social formations with specific interests (Blommaert, 2005:159). The well-known ‘-isms’ such as socialism, nationalism, racism, liberalism, fascism, communism, libertarianism, and anarchism fall into this category. It also includes more specific ‘ideologies’ attributed to an individual or a ‘school’, such as Marxism, Leninism, Maoism, Stalinism, Rooseveltism, Gaullism, Mobutism, and so forth (Blommaert, 2005:159).

On the other hand, ideology is defined as a general phenomenon characterising the totality of a particular social or political system, and operated by every member or actor in that system (Blommaert, 2005:158). In this second category, ideology stands for the ‘cultural’, ideational aspects of a particular social and political system, the ‘grand narratives’ characterising its existence, structure, and historical development. Ideology in this category penetrates the whole fabric of societies or communities and results in normalised, naturalised patterns of thought and behaviour. Accordingly, ideology becomes a sort of ‘common sense’, the normal perceptions we have of the world as a system, the naturalised activities that sustain social relations and power structures, and the patterns of power that reinforce such common sense (Blommaert, 2005:159). This sense of ideology is often attributed to the work of Antonio Gramsci (1971).

Consistent with both approaches, ideology can be defined as a system of representations that masks our true relations to one another in society by constructing imaginary relations between people and between them and the social formation (Blommaert, 2005). This rejects an understanding of ideology as ‘false consciousness’ and the understanding of power as the property of particular individuals or groups; it incorporates the view that ideology is concerned with the ways in which meaning serves to establish and sustain relations of domination or ‘the meaning in the service of power’ (Thompson 1990:56). Consider the ideological work that the Tanzanian state undertakes in postulating that ‘the Union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar is
synonymous to the Nation or ‘United Republic’ in order to legitimate this position and its implicit relations of power (Constitution of the United Republic of Tanzania, 2008:18).

While Thompson (1990) does not view ideas that contest the hegemonic ones as ideological but regards them as ‘incipient forms of the critique of ideology’ (Thompson, 1990:68), this study, consistent with Wetherell and Potter’s (1992) position, recognises that contesting positions are similarly ideological. Critical analysis of media text needs to pay attention to the potential and wide range of ideological positions among different subjects and discourses (both dominant and otherwise) and consider the range of possible readings that audiences may place upon the text (Devereux, 2007:178).

2.1.4.2 Hegemony
Gramsci’s\(^5\) concept of ‘hegemony’ is valuable in that it proposes a sense of contesting ideological positions in society. Hegemony has been defined as ‘an order in which a certain way of life and thought is dominant, in which one concept of reality is diffused throughout society’ (Abercrombie, 1980:115). As a key theoretical concept that animates much of the contemporary study of ideology of media, hegemony connects questions of culture, power and ideology. Briefly, Gramsci argued that ruling groups can maintain their power through either force or consent, or combination of the two (Croteau and Hoynes, 2000:163, Blommaert, 2005:167). Ruling by way of force requires the use of institutions such as the military, the police and prisons in an effort to physically coerce – or threaten coercion – so that people will remain obedient. The authoritarian government is the most obvious example (Croteau and Hoynes, 2000:163). However, Gramsci pointed out that power can be wielded at the level of culture or ideology, not just through the use of force.

In liberal democratic societies in particular, force is not the primary means by which the powerful rule. Instead, power is wielded in the realm of everyday life – where people essentially

\(^5\) Antonio Gramsci, the Italian theorist and a famous Marxist follower (1891-1937) was a political activist and journalist. Imprisoned in 1926 for his political activism, he spent much of the following ten years writing what have become known as the Prison Notebooks. He grappled with the failure of the socialist project and thus began to write how consent can be achieved in a society; accordingly, he developed his concept of *hegemony* (Devereux, 2007:166).
agree to current social arrangements. Consent then is the key concept underlying Gramsci’s notion of hegemony and it is exercised through a kind of ‘cultural leadership’ (Croteau and Hoynes, 2000:164). Consent is something that is won; ruling groups actively seek to have their world view accepted by all members of society as the universal way of thinking. Institutions such as schools, religion, and the media – the latter being the focus of this thesis in relation to the Union question in Tanzania – are deployed by the powerful to exercise this cultural leadership. Such institutions are effective as ‘the sites where we produce and reproduce ways of thinking about the society’ (Croteau and Hoynes, 2000:164). This understanding of the process of ‘producing and reproducing ways of thinking about the society’ is consistent with the social constructivist approach to representation.

Central to this understanding of hegemony is that it operates not at the level of ideological domination whereby the ideas of one group are imposed on another, but at the level of common sense. This refers to the assumptions people make about social life and what they consider as ‘natural’ or ‘the way things are’ (Croteau and Hoynes, 2000). Common sense refers the way we describe things that ‘everybody knows’ or at least should know, because such knowledge represents deeply held cultural beliefs. Nevertheless, crucial to this theorising is the point that commonsense assumptions, the taken-for-granted, are social constructions (Devereux, 2007:166, Croteau and Hoynes, 2000:164).

Consequently, hegemony is a process that is not permanent but always in the making. On the one hand, for ruling groups to effectively wield power through consent, ideological work on the part of cultural leadership is an ongoing necessity (Croteau and Hoynes, 2000:164). Thus, in relation to the focus of this thesis, it is recognised that the government of Tanzania, through its institutions such as the state-media, will promote and privilege the Union on Union Day annually as both legitimate and beneficial. Their aim is to win or consolidate the consent of the majority and hence thus gain support and a sense of legitimacy in relation to Union. On the other hand, hegemony ascribes a degree of agency to all social groups in the production and negotiation of meaning (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002:16). It also involves a continuous struggle about people’s underlying conceptions of the world, a struggle always subject to revision and opposition (Croteau and Hoynes, 2000:164). In the context of Tanzania there exists a range of views to
Union that are in contestation, and it is presumed that the independent or private media are more likely to articulate opposing or revision views on the Union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar.

Media institutions are recognised as principal sites where the cultural leadership, the work of hegemony, is performed. The media are involved in ‘the politics of signification’ (Hall, 1982). As noted earlier, media texts do not simply reproduce the ‘reality’ of the world ‘out there’, but engage in practices that define reality too. Media representations are intertwined with questions of power and ideology because the process of giving meaning to events suggests that there are multiple definitions of reality. However, media are not simple agents of the powerful. They are cultural sites where the ideas of the powerful are circulated and also where they can be contested. The preceding discussion on representation and the constructivist approach to representation established that media texts are socially constructed. They are consequently implicated in the discursive construction of, among other things, ‘nation’ and ‘nationhood’.

2.2 Nation: concepts and theories
As it is the representations of nation in the Tanzania press that this study focuses on and therefore issues of identity and nationhood are central, this section addresses theories of nation and national identity. First, it considers identity as a concept and addresses both the subject and collective identity. Secondly, it discusses nation and nation states and includes national culture, national identity, nationhood and the idea of banal nationalism.

2.2.1 Subject and Identity
The social constructivist approach of this study draws on insights from discursive psychology with regard to subject and identity. This assumes that the individual self (subject) is not an isolated, autonomous entity but, rather, is in constant, dynamic interaction with the social world. Thus, minds, selves and identities are formed, negotiated and reshaped in social interaction (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002:108). Subjectivity within constructivist approaches refers to the condition of being a person and the processes by which an individual becomes a person, that is, how he or she is constituted as subject (Barker, 2000). As a subject, an individual is a ‘subject to’ social processes which bring him or her as ‘a subject for’ himself or herself and others (Barker, 2000:165).
This conception of the subject has been referred to as the postmodern subject and stands in contrast to other conceptions. Hall (1992) identified three conceptions, namely the Enlightenment subject, sociological subject and post-modern subject. The latter rejects the conception of the enlightenment subject as a fully centred, unified individual, endowed with the capacities of reason, consciousness and action an inner core that remained essentially the same throughout the individual’s existence and was seen to be continuous or ‘identical’ with itself (Hall, 1992:275). It similarly positions itself in contradistinction to the sociological conception although it also rejected the idea of an inner core of the subject as autonomous and self-sufficient but formed in relation to ‘significant others’ who mediated values, meanings and symbols to subjects and the culture of the world a person inhabited. It is held that identity stabilises both the subjects and the cultural worlds they inhabit, making both reciprocally more unified and predictable. However, these are exactly what are in times of late modernity are considered to be shifting. This process of shifting identities is consistent with the social constructionist assumption that, the processes of identification and categorisation underpinning social identity are historically and socially specific (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002:102).

This postmodern subject of late modernity, as identified by Hall (1992), is a fragmented rather than a stable one, and consists of several contradictory or unresolved identities rather than a single identity, as the modern subject is understood. Therefore, the conceptualising of the ‘postmodern’ subject recognises the variety and complexity of identity. The very process of identification, through which people project themselves into their cultural identities, has become open-ended, variable and problematic. Within the third conception of identity – the post-modern subject, rather than possessing an essentialised or permanent identity (Hall, 1992:275-277), becomes unstable. This means that it is formed and transformed continuously in relation to the ways in which we are represented or addressed in the cultural systems which surround us. Accordingly, identity becomes historically defined. As identities are not unified around a coherent “self” the fully unified, completed, secure and coherent identity is recognised as a fantasy. As systems of meaning and cultural representation multiply so are people confronted with a multiplicity of possible identities any one of which we could identify with, even if only temporarily (Hall, 1992:277). Therefore, the decentred or postmodern self involves the subject in shifting, fragmented and multiple identities. Subsequently, persons are composed of several,
sometimes contradictory identities (Barker, 2000:170). Consistent with this view, for instance, are issues that are pertinent in the present study such as the politics or issues surrounding Tanzanian, Tanganyikan or Zanzibari ethnic and national identities.

As mentioned earlier, discursive psychology informs this approach to the subject. It allows that while identities are constructed on the basis of different, shifting discursive resource and are thus relational, incomplete and unstable, they are however not completely open. In Hall’s (1992) terms, individuals form a ‘sense of self’ by choosing one version of the self out of all the possible versions of himself or herself (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002:111). Importantly, this process is ongoing; in fact, it is an ‘evolving configuration’ persisting throughout an individual’s entire life (Bloom, 1990:36). The features of identity described by Laclau and Mouffe (1985) as summarised by Jorgensen and Phillips (2002:43) inform the approach of this study:

- The subject is fundamentally split; it never quite becomes ‘itself’.
- It acquires its identity by being represented discursively.
- Identity is thus identification with a subject position in a discursive structure.
- Identity is discursively constituted through chains of equivalence where signs are sorted and linked together in chains in opposition to other chains which thus define how the subject is, and how it is not.
- Identity is always relationally organised; the subject is something because it is contrasted with something that it is not.
- Identity is changeable just as discourses are.

Therefore, in discursive psychology approach, the changeable, contingent nature of identity does not mean that people start all over again with new identities every single time they speak or do anything else. The identity that is articulated at a given time can be understood as the sedimentation of earlier discursive practices (Wetherell and Potter, 1992:78). One factor responsible for continuity is that the individual has to present herself in a way which is acceptable and recognisable both to herself and to the people with whom she interacts (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002:112).

As noted earlier, identities have become additionally fragmented and unstable in late modernity as they are constructed across a number of contradictory and often antagonistic discourses (Hall, 1996:6). Therefore, where dimensions such as nation, Union (in Tanzania), class, gender and
family earlier functioned as central categories, shaping all the other identities, there is now a wide range of centres that produce contradictory identities. It can thus be argued that an identity as a Christian, for example, can challenge an identity as a feminist or as a worker (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002:110). Similarly, an identity as Zanzibari or Tanganyikan can also challenge Tanzanian identity. Accordingly, the fact that people create their identities through temporary ‘closures’ opens up for the possibility of creating collective identities, and thus in Anderson’s (1983) terms, imagined communities, which are based on an idea of a common (or collective) identity – for example, as a woman, a Tanzanian, a Zanzibari and so on (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002:112).

2.2.2 Collective identity

Identity is understood here as formed through unconscious processes over time, rather than being innate in consciousness at birth and although there might be a sense of a cohesive identity, there is always something ‘imaginary’ or fantasised about its unity. It always remains incomplete, is always ‘in process’, always ‘being formed’ (Hall, 1992:287). Accordingly, as argued by Hall (1992) it was thus possible in the eighteenth century (the era of an Enlightenment subject) to imagine the great processes of modern life as centred upon the individual subject-of-reason. However, as modern societies grew more complex, they acquired a more collective and social form or in other words collective categories, that is, collective identities. Consequently, classic liberal theories of government based on individual rights and consent were obliged to come to terms with structures of the ‘nation-state’ and the great masses which make up a modern democracy (Hall, 1992:183).

Collective identities, it is argued, were formed in, and stabilised by, the huge, long-range historical processes which have produced the modern world. Certain ideologies or discourses, such as social inequality, colonialism and so on were legitimated in such processes – consistent with the interests of capital whose process of circulation from one form to another depended on certain value (money or commodity) as a primal factor (Aseka, 2005). The crucial determining factor that was mostly used in legitimating such ideologies was power termed as ‘organisational or destructive force’ (such as governments) through means such as culture and religion (Aseka, 2005:8). Therefore, collective identity, the result of various historical processes in a society,
relates to a collective memory through which a contemporary group recognises itself through a common past, remembrance, commemoration, interpretation and reinterpretation (Schlesinger, 1991:153).

Importantly, identities are the products or inventions of cultural representations or discourses which both facilitate and restrict choice (Hall, 1992). Thus, collective identity refers to individuals’ cognitive, moral, and emotional connection with a broader community, category, practice, or institution (Polletta and Jasper, 2001:285). Often, cultural beliefs and practices form the basis of collective identities, or ‘unity in diversity’ (Schlesinger, 1991:144). Culture creates systems of meaning which people use in their daily lives and which provide a framework for organising their world and for collectively guiding individual action and behaviour (Ross, 1997:42). A central aspect of modernity has been its insistence that cultures can be categorised as groups, the most important of which are nations according to Schlesinger (1991:142). Other categories include ethnicity, religion and race (Barker, 2000:193, Schlesinger, 1991:157).

This understanding of identities and collective identities in particular inform the analysis of the form of cultural identity which this study is concerned with, that is national identity and its related conceptions such as national culture, nation-building and the construction of nationhood. As a nation or national identity is the product of continuous cultural and ideological work, there is an ongoing need for nation building (constructions).

2.2.3 Nation and nation-states
The term ‘nation’ carries two interrelated meanings, both ‘nation’ as nation-state and ‘nation’ as the people living within the state (Billig, 1995:24). The relation between ‘territory’ and ‘people’ is conveyed by a variation in term that simultaneously refers to both the territory and its population (Grosby, 2005:11), for example England-English, France-French, Germany-Germans, Tanzania-Tanzanians and so forth. This variation implies that ‘a people’ has its land and a land has its people. Thus, the nation is a social relation with both temporal depth and bounded territory (Grosby, 2005:11). On the other hand, the nation-state is a structure that, through institutions, exercises sovereignty over a territory using laws that relate the individuals within that territory to one another as members of the state (Grosby, 2005:22). It is significant to point
out that the linkage of the two meaning reflect the general ideology of ‘nationhood’, which will be explained shortly.

The nation-state is a political concept for it refers to an administrative apparatus deemed to have sovereignty over a specific space or territory within the nation-state system (Barker, 2000:197). Geographical environment and the political accidents of warfare may provide a setting for a group to form a nation. However, whether that particular group will subsequently do so, it may depend on how far that group (in general), or its ruling classes, become conscious of their identity, and reinforce it through education, legal codes and administrative centralisation (Smith, 2001:335). Thus, nation-states as political entities emerge over time as a result of numerous historical processes (Grosby, 2005:7). This is the view this study adopts in relation to the origins and characters of ‘the nation’ and the nation as a product of continuous processes of construction. The constructivist approach of this study (Jorgensen and Phillips 2002; Hall 1992) views a nation and national identity or nationhood as collective forms of organisation and identification as not ‘naturally’ occurring phenomenon but continuous and contingent historical-cultural formations (Barker, 2000:197).

2.2.4 Approaches to nations and nationalism

Scholars have identified two major approaches to the debate about the origins and character of ‘the nation’ itself (McCrone, 1998:10) which is concerned with the origin of national sentiment and whether the nation is an ancient or modern entity. It differentiates between the essentialist and the instrumentalist or constructionist view (McCrone, 1998:10), or the paradigm of primordialism and perennialism versus that of modernism (Ozkirimli, 2000:64).

Primordialism, an essentialist approach, conceives of nations as primordial entities embedded in human nature and history which can be identified through distinctive cultures expressed by way of language, religion, culture and so on (McCrone, 1998:10) and nationality as a ‘natural’ part of human beings (Ozkirimli, 2000:64). The perennialist approach views nations as historic entities which have developed over the centuries, with their intrinsic characteristics largely unchanged (Ozkirimli, 2000:68). Central is the idea that modern nations are the lined descendants of their medieval counterparts (Smith, 1995:53).
On the other hand, the *modernist* approach asserts the modernity of nations and nationalism (Ozkirimli, 2000:64). Classical modernism achieved its canonical formulation in the 1960s, above all in the model of ‘nation-building’ which had a wide appeal in the social sciences in the wake of the movement of decolonisation in Asia and Africa. This was followed by a variety of models and theories, all of which regarded nations as historically formed constructs (Smith, 1998:3). Accordingly, both nations and nationalism appeared in the last two centuries that is in the wake of the French Revolution, and they are the products of specifically modern processes like capitalism, industrialism, the emergence of the bureaucratic state, urbanisation and secularism (Smith, 1995:29).

Another instrumentalist approach of nations and nationalism is *ethno-symbolism*. The common denominator of the ethno-symbolists is the stress they lay in their explanations on ethnic pasts and cultures (Ozkirimli, 2000:64). Ethno-symbolists reject the axiom that nations may be *ipso facto* invented. They rely on a pre-existing texture of myths, memories, values and symbols. According to this school of thought, the emergence of today’s nations cannot be understood properly without taking their ethnic forebears into account (Ozkirimli, 2000:168). Hence, the rise of nations needs to be contextualised within the larger phenomenon of ethnicity which shaped them (Hutchinson, 1994:7).

Consistent with the constructivist view this study draws on the instrumentalist approach to nations and nationalism that regards nation and national identity as part of a continuous process. It conceives of nation as a product of various historical processes and that the nation-state, nationalism, national identity and national culture as the products of collective forms of organisation and identification. They are not ‘naturally’ occurring phenomenon but contingent historical-cultural formations (Barker, 2000:197).

### 2.2.5 National culture

Nation-related conceptions include the question of uniform culture or ‘cultural identity’ which defines the nation as a named human population sharing an historic territory, common myths and historical memories, a mass, public culture, a common economy and common legal rights and duties for all members (Smith, 2001:334). Within a constructivist approach, a national culture is
not viewed simply as a point of allegiance, bonding and symbolic identification. Rather, it is a structure of cultural power (Hall, 1992:297). Most modern nations are argued to consist of disparate cultures which are only unified by a lengthy process of violent conquest. Nations are also always composed of different social classes, gender and ethnic groups (Hall, 1992:297). Thus instead of thinking of national culture as unified, we should think of it as constituting a discursive device which represents difference as unified identity (Hall, 1992:296). They are cross-cut by deep internal divisions and differences, and unified only through the exercise of different forms of cultural power. Despite these considerations, national identities continue to be represented as unified. One way of unifying them has been to represent them as the expression of the underlying culture of ‘one people’ (Hall, 1992:296), such as ‘Tanzanians’. While ethnicity is the term given to cultural features such as, *inter alia*, language, religion, custom, traditions and feeling for ‘place’ shared by a people, modern nations are seldom composed of only one people, one culture or ethnicity – but rather are cultural hybrids (Hall, 1992:296).

National culture is a distinctly modern form. The allegiance and identification which, in pre-modern age or in more traditional societies, were given to tribe, people, religion and region, came gradually to be transferred to the national culture, or in other words, they were subsumed beneath what Gellner (1983) calls the ‘political roof’ of the nation state, and which thus became a powerful source of meanings for modern cultural identities (Hall, 1992:292). Accordingly, Africa’s countries and their modern national culture can be traced from the intrusion of colonialism in the continent (‘the scramble for Africa’) by European powers at the end of the nineteenth century and includes the recent post-independence period (Mazrui, 2010). Colonialists deployed certain means in the instituting ‘national culture’ such as African chiefs who constituted a class of intermediaries paid to transmit government orders, colonial media and missionaries who introduced primary and secondary schools (Meredith, 2006:6-7).

National cultures are composed not only of cultural institutions, but are dependent on set of symbols and representations (Hall, 1992:292-293). National culture, as with any discourse, is dependent on a repository, *inter alia*, of classificatory systems. In the first place, it allows ‘us’ to

---

6 It was in 1884 at the famous Berlin conference when ‘nations’ of Africa were created as European powers drew boundaries that divided Africa among parts each of them (European powers) could acquire (Mazrui, 2010).
define ourselves against ‘them’-understood as those beyond the boundaries of the nation (Schlesinger, 1991:173-174). In addition, such a classificatory system may also reproduce distinction between ‘us’ and ‘them’ at the intra-national level, for example a distinction between ‘islanders’ (Zanzibaris) and ‘mainlanders’ (Tanganyikans) in Tanzania in line with the internal structure of social divisions and relations of power and domination (Schlesinger, 1991:174).

National identities are constructed in relation to the meanings about ‘the nation’ which circulate and with which a person can identify (Hall, 1992:293). They are contained in the stories which are told about it, the memories which connect its present with its past and images which are constructed of it (Hall, 1992:293). These sets of ideas impact both on people’s actions and conceptions of themselves. In his discussion of nation as a construct, Hall (1992) identified five strategies by means of which national culture is legitimated (Hall, 1992:293). First, the narrative of the nation includes what is told and retold in national histories, literatures, the media and popular culture. These narratives provide a set of stories, images, landscapes, scenario, historical events, national symbols and rituals which stand for, or represent shared experience, sorrows, and triumphs and disasters which give meaning to the nation (Hall, 1992:293). As members of such an ‘imagined community’, particular people see themselves, in their minds, sharing this narrative. Investing in this kind of identity lends significance and importance to their existence, connecting their everyday lives with a national destiny that pre-existed them and will outlive them.

The second involves an emphasis on origins, continuity, tradition and timelessness. National identity is represented as primordial or as in the very nature of things. It proposes that essential elements of the national culture remain unchanged through all the vicissitudes of history. National culture constructs identities which are ambiguously placed between past and future (Hall, 1992:294-295).

The third discursive strategy by which national culture is told is the invention of tradition. In this, traditions which appear or claim to be old are often invented quite recently (Hall, 1992:294). Invented tradition refers to a set of practices of a symbolic nature which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behaviours by repetition which implies continuity with a suitable historical
past (Hall, 1992:294). For instance, in Tanzania, the first president, Julius Nyerere recognised a kind of (Tanzanian) socialism, *Ujamaa*, as a continuation of ancient tribal socialism (which maintained that the richness or poverty of individuals and families corresponds to the well-being or relative wealth of the whole society). In 1967, in what is known as the Arusha Declaration, Nyerere declared *Ujamaa* as Tanzania’s political ideology (Duggan & Civille, 1976:171).

A fourth strategy for the construction of nation is that of foundational myths, that is, stories which locate the origin of the nation, the people and their national character so early that they are lost in the mists of, not ‘real’, but mythic time (Hall, 1992:294). An example of this kind of narrative is the definition of the English as ‘free-born’ on the Anglo-Saxon parliament (Hall, 1992:295). In Kenya, for instance, a narrative, *Harambee* (working together) which was mostly used by her first president Jomo Kenyatta in 1960s for national unity and for co-operation (Aseka, 2005:219) is deployed to date for describing Kenyans and their national character.

Finally, national culture is symbolically grounded on the idea of pure, original, people or ‘folk’. However, in the realities of national development, it is rarely this primordial folk who persist or exercise power (Hall, 1992:295). Consistent with this idea, because Tanzania is a nation comprised of two united countries namely Zanzibar and Tanganyika, the merger between these two countries is often justified by a ‘homogeneous culture’ described to have been prevalent in both countries time immemorial (Killian, 2008:99).

In spite of the emphasis of homogeneity within the discourses and representations of nationhood (as pointed out earlier that a nation is composed of different social classes, gender, race and ethnic groups); no matter how different its members may be in terms of these groups a national culture seeks to unify them into one cultural identity and represent them as all belonging to the same great national family. Thus, the present representations of modern nations are the products of concerted effort and ideological work aimed at unifying the classes and groupings across the various social divisions by providing them with an alternative point of identification – common membership of ‘the family of the nation’ (Hall, 1992:297). Nation or national identity as a ‘unified cultural community’ has been described and theorised by Anderson (1983) as an ‘imagined community’ (Hall, 1992:298).
2.2.6 National identity

National identity is generally understood as ‘the shared identity of the naturalised inhabitants of a particular political-geographical space, such as a particular nation’ (Higson, 1998:354). It is a definite social space, a fairly well demarcated and bounded territory, with which the members identify and to which they feel they belong (Smith, 1991:9).

Within a constructivist approach, national identity is however a form of imaginative identification with the symbols and discourses of the nation-state (Barker, 2000). Consequently, nations are not simply political formations but dependent on systems of cultural representation through which national identity is continually reproduced as discursive action (as noted earlier it is also through processes of text production and consumption that social and cultural reproduction and change take place (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002:61)). The nation-state as a political apparatus and a symbolic form has a temporal dimension in that political structures endure and change while the symbolic and discursive dimensions of national identity work to narrate and create the idea of origins, continuity and tradition (Barker, 2000:197).

This position recognises national identities as constructs, not essences, which are formed and transformed within and in relation to representation. A person only knows what is to be ‘English’ or ‘Tanzanian’ in relation to how ‘Englishness’ or ‘Tanzanian-ness’ has come to be represented as a set of meanings. A nation accordingly needs to be recognised as not only a political identity but as the product of a system of cultural representation. People are not only legal citizens of a nation; they participate in the idea of the nation as represented in its national culture (Hall, 1992:292). For instance, it is argued that to speak of being a South African implies that one is a citizen of the nation-state South Africa (Prinsloo, 1999:45). Arguably, this implies that through various strategies of representations, particular people identify and recognise their particular ‘citizenship’ or nation belonging. However, to possess a sense of identity as a citizen of a particular country or to hold particular loyalties to that same country is not simply the result of an accident of birth or naturalisation but rather the products of continuous cultural and ideological work. Since the birth of the nation, citizenship or nationhood has been signalled in numerous ways, enabling or proposing a particular national identity (Prinsloo, 1999:45).
With regard to numerous ways by which particular national identity is proposed, this study also considers one of the constructivist views by Anderson (1983) regarding national identity that a nation is an imagined community. This strand asserts that a particular nation is an imagined community in the following ways: it is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each, lives the image of their communion. The nation is imagined as limited because even the largest of them, encompassing perhaps a billion living human beings, has finite, if elastic boundaries, beyond which lie other nations. It is imagined as sovereign because the concept was born in an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying the legitimacy of the divinely-ordained hierarchical dynastic real. It is imagined as a community, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship (Anderson, 1996:6-7).

In summary, the nation as an imagined community in Anderson’s definition has the following characteristics: it is imagined as a ‘communion’ of people (whom one has never met). It has finite territorial boundaries. It implies sovereignty and self-determination of its members; and the community is viewed as deep and horizontal comradeship (McCrone, 1998:89).

However, how a (our) particular nation is imagined relies on the kinds of representational strategies, through instruments such as language and media in particular, deployed to construct our common-sense views of national belonging or identity. It is thus argued that the difference between nations relies upon how differently these nations are imagined. It follows that our understanding of national identity must also include the idea we have of it. Since it would not be possible to know all those who share our identity, we must have a shared idea of what it constitutes. This is how the difference between national identities lies in the different ways in which they are imagined (Woodward 1997:18).

2.2.7 Nationhood or nationality
Nationality or in other words nation-ness as well as nationhood are cultural artefacts of a particular kind. Understanding them properly needs a consideration of how they have come into historical being; in what ways their meanings have changed over time, and why, today, they
command such profound emotional legitimacy (Anderson, 1996:4). Nationhood is a discourse that constantly shapes our consciousness and the way we constitute the meaning of the world (Ozkirimli, 2000:4). This is consistent with the constructivist view pointed out earlier that nations are not simply political formations but dependent on systems of cultural representation through which national identity is continually reproduced by discursive practices (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002:61). Such practices determine people’s collective identity by producing and reproducing them as ‘nationals’ (Billig, 1995:6). Such a collective identity, that is nationality, means an alignment of large numbers of individuals from the middle and lower classes linked to regional centres and leading social groups by channels of social communication and economic intercourse, both indirectly from link to link and directly with the centre (Deutsch, 1966:101).

The concept of nationalism as well as nationality appears to be used in five different ways: firstly, as the whole process of forming and maintaining nations; and secondly, a consciousness of belonging to the nation. Thirdly, it is a language and symbolism of the ‘nation’; and fourth is an ideology (including a cultural doctrine of nations). Finally, nationality is a social and political movement to achieve the goals of the nation and realise the national will (Smith, 1991:72 in Ozkirimli, 2000:181). Generally, these ways that describe ‘nationality’ correspond to the function of a nationalist ideology which seeks to bind together people in a particular territory in an endeavour to gain and use state power. It also provides people of a particular nation with the means to identify their own position in the world in relation to others (Breuilly, 1993:381).

However, not all national subjects are attributed with equal status. It is argued (Prinsloo, 1999, Williams, 1987) that nationhood (or citizenship) remains gendered frequently in both its duties and entitlements. Nationalism proposes a hegemonic masculine position, that the inscriptions (or representations) of citizenship (or nationhood) are articulated within the terms of powerful and varied masculinised identities (Prinsloo, 1999:45). In line with this argument, Gallagher (2001) postulates that as the media increasingly provide the ‘common ground’ of information, symbols and ideals for most social groups, women’s representation in the media helps to keep them in a place of relative powerlessness. Moreover, it is argued by Hartley (1994) that news or press coverage is not simply about men but it is largely by men and seen through men.
Generally, in today’s world a person must have a nationality and it would seem natural to have such an identity; and thus in established nations people do not generally forget their national identity. National identity is not only something which is thought natural to possess, but also something natural to remember (Billig, 1995:37). Consistent with this view, is the term ‘banal nationalism’ that refers to how nationhood is daily reproduced (Billig, 1995).

### 2.2.8 Banal nationalism discursive actions

It is argued that there are daily social forms through which nationhood is ‘flagged’ or indicated and sustained both metaphorically and literally (Billig, 1995:45). In fact, daily, countries such as Britain, South Africa, and Tanzania are reproduced as nations and their citizenry as nationals. For such daily reproduction to occur, a whole complex of beliefs, assumptions, habits, representations and practices must also be reproduced (Billig, 1995:6). Such habits are evident in the visible, ritual organisation of fetish objects – flags, uniforms, airplane logos, maps, anthems, national flowers, national cuisines and architectures as well as through the organisation of collective fetish spectacle – in team sports, military displays, mass rallies, the myriad forms of popular culture and so on (McClintock, 1996:274). Moreover, this complex must be reproduced in a banally mundane way, for the world of nations is the everyday world, the familiar terrain of contemporary times.

The ideological habits by which ‘our’ nations are reproduced as nations are unnamed and, thereby, unnoticed. For this reason the term ‘banal nationalism’ is introduced by Billig (1995) to cover the ideological habits. Such habits are not removed from everyday life of citizens hence daily the nation is indicated, or ‘flagged’ in the lives of its citizenry (Billig, 1995:6). Nationhood or nationalism has to be reproduced daily if it is to persist. Thus, there is a continual ‘flagging’, or reminding, of nationhood (Billig, 1995:8). In short, to understand the continuing hold of nationalism, we must probe into the process by which ordinary people continue to imagine themselves as an abstract community (Ozkirimli, 2000:195).

Generally it can be argued that national symbols, customs, national days such as ‘Union Day’ in Tanzania and ceremonies are ‘the most potent and durable aspects of nationalism or nationhood’ (Smith, 1991:77). They embody nationhood’s basic concepts, making them visible and distinct.
for every member, communicating the tenets of an abstract ideology in palpable, concrete terms that evoke instant emotional responses from all strata of the community (Smith, 1991:77).

However, on national days in particular, there are occasions such as parades, speeches, particular media coverage and so on that sufficiently flag nationhood so that it is remembered the rest of the year when banal routines of private life predominate. On national days other normal routines are disrupted and the nation’s citizenry commemorates, or jointly remembers, itself and its history (Billig, 1995:45). Nation or nationhood is imagined through representational strategies which construct people’s common-sense views of national belonging or identity (Woodward, 1997:18). The media, particularly newspapers in their opinions and editorial columns, speak to and for the nation and represent the nation in both senses of ‘representation’ (Billig, 1995:114-115).

2.3 Roles of the Press
I now turn to the roles of the media, and how these roles are crucial determinants in the construction of, or in the continuous processes of ‘imagining’, the nation. I consider how the press ‘initiates items for the public agenda’ (agenda-setting) (McCombs, 2006:6) and the particular roles of the press drawn from the normative theories of the media (Christians et al, 2009) in relation to the focus of this study.

The media are instrumental in the process of continuous and contingent historical-cultural formations of nation and national identity or nationhood (Barker, 2000:197). They are important agents of socialisation in that they are centrally involved in the social construction of reality and thus they reproduce dominant (and other/contesting) social norms, beliefs, discourses, ideologies and values (Devereux, 2007:15). Consistently, this section addresses the role of the media in the construction (or contestation) of nation or nation identity by introducing theories of agenda-setting and framing, as well as the normative theories of the press.

The media, the press in particular, at times refer to their own role, framed in terms of their purposes or the services they provide. Early theorists (such as Lasswell, 1948), identified three main social functions of communication, expressed in terms of the roles the press plays in a
society. These include surveillance (providing information on the world); correlation (promoting social cohesion); and continuity (transmitting values and culture across generations). A fourth function of entertainment was added in 1959 by Charles Wright (Rioba, 2008:64).

A contemporary formulation of the roles of the press is that of the ‘normative theories of the media’ proposed by Christians et al (2009) to include the monitorial (which overlaps with the familiar press role of watchdog or guardian of the public interest through which the media have no ties with governments); collaborative (where the press partners with the government); facilitative (the press supports and strengthens participation in civil society outside the state and the market) and radical (in which the press insists on the absolute equality and freedom of all members of a democratic society). These normative roles of the press are discussed after considering agenda setting, whereby the press frame the public agenda (McCombs, 2006). The agenda-setting process informs the way the press determines and frames the issues the public thinks and talks about (Severin & Tankard, 1992:207).

2.3.1 Agenda-setting

Agenda setting became one of the major concepts in communication theory from the early 1970s. The concept implies that the press, by the display of news and emphasis on certain topics, determines the issues the public thinks about and talks about (Severin and Tankard, 1992:207, 227). In addition to setting the agenda of what to think about, the press also shapes people’s views of the major issues in the society by the way in which they frame the issues and the amount of emphasis they give to them. Agenda-setting is consistent with the constructionist view of representation for the press is not a mirror, reflecting the realities of society, but instead it constructs and frames an event or issue in a way that catches the public’s attention or serves other intended purpose(s) (Severin and Tankard, 1992:227).

In essence, the newspapers are the prime mover in setting the territorial agenda (Long, 1958). They play a great part in determining what most people will be talking about, what most people will think the facts are, and what most people will regard as the way problems are to be dealt with. In so doing, they force attention to certain issues and build up public images of political
figures. They also constantly, in detail, present objects suggesting what individuals in the mass should think about, know about and have feelings about (Long, 1958:260).

In line with the relationship between the press and public opinion, the concept of agenda-setting has been expanded to another concept of agenda-building. The latter is broken down into six steps which, at the end, conform with the original concept of agenda-setting (Lang & Lang, 1983). The six steps through which the press builds and hence sets agenda respectively include the following. First, the press highlights certain events, activities or issues and make them stand out. Second, different issues are given different kinds and amounts of news coverage. Third, the events or issues in the focus of attention must be ‘framed’ or given a field of meanings within which they can be understood by the respective audience. Fourth, the language used by the press is purposely constructed in a way to affect the perception of the importance of a particular issue. Fifth, the press links the activities or issues that have become the focus of attention to secondary symbols whose location on a certain aspect of the society such as political landscape is recognised. The secondary symbols used, for instance a label or statement ‘the need to get good leadership’, are those that appear to be supported by majority. Such symbols become the basis and justification of people taking sides on a particular issue. The final step in agenda-building is the use of well-known individuals such as political leaders, and credible individuals to speak out on the particular issue (Severin and Tankard, 1992:222).

To this end, it is important to point out that the press essentially builds and sets an agenda in the public, or in other words it determines how a particular issue, such as ‘Union’ (in Tanzania), is thought about and talked about. Based on setting particular agendas, the press consequently performs a specific role such as monitorial, facilitative and so on. The following section discusses the four roles of the press, drawn from normative theories of the press (Christians et al, 2009), and identifies two particular roles that suited the focus of this study.

2.3.2 Normative roles of the press
The normative theories of the press proposed by Christians et al (2009) provide a relevant framework for considering the work they do. The framework outlines four normative roles of the press namely facilitative, radical, collaborative and monitorial.
In its *facilitative role*, the press promotes dialogue among its readers or audience in general through communication that engages them in ways that encourage active participation. In facilitative terms, the press particularly supports and strengthens participation in civil society outside the state and the market (Christians et al, 2009:158). It advocates the process of negotiation in the social, political and cultural agenda. In essence, the press in its facilitative role frames an interactive dialogue in which citizens engage one another on both practical matters and social vision. The press facilitates this dialogue by supporting civil society and related organisations outside the state (government) (Christians et al, 2009:163). In this role the press is concerned with facilitating ‘negotiation’ between the citizens and the state, but by mainly supporting the former through the civil society. This is not a role that the government-owned and private-owned press in Tanzania play in their construction of nationhood as far the Union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar is concerned.

The *radical role* of the press insists on the absolute equality and freedom of all members of a democratic society in a completely uncompromising way. In essence, radical journalism seeks to help minorities articulate an alternative set of goals that represent the needs and just moral claims of all, especially the marginalised, the poor, and the dispossessed. In this context, the press seeks to redistribute the social power of the privileged (typically few) among the underprivileged (typically many) (Christians et al, 2009:179-181). It recognises that power holders impede the flow of information and that is necessary to change the system of public communication so that the less powerful groups can get the information they need. Again, this role is not applicable to the study as neither the state owned or commercial press seek such radical change.

As the name suggests, the *monitorial role* of the press relates to monitoring or to interpretation and investigation, the latter mainly with respect to activities of government and business that are perceived to be against the public interest. Consistent with this role and its secular and commercial nature, the press would have minimal ties with political parties, governments, and even campaigning proprietors (Christians et al, 2009:142). The monitorial role overlaps with the press role of watchdog or guardian of the public interest. Its activity extends to the practice of investigative reporting that requires the identification of a social issue and an active search for
evidence rather than simply collecting and disseminating what is readily available (Christians et al, 2009:142). Consistently, this role is relevant to this study which considers the extent to which such a role is played, particularly by the independent or non-government press in constructing nationhood with regard to Union in Tanzania and whether it stands for the public interest.

The collaborative role is argued to be unique among other roles in that it deals as much as with the needs and expectations of the state as the needs and expectations of the press. Defined ‘in relation to the state’, a collaborative role for the press implicates government(s) – locally, regionally, nationally, and at times even transnationally – in the mission of the press (Christians et al, 2009:197). Collaboration represents an acknowledgement of the state’s interest, to which the press accede either passively or unwittingly, reluctantly or wholeheartedly, in participating in the choices journalists make and the coverage they provide.

The collaborative role of the press is also associated with the tradition of development journalism. The term ‘development journalism’ denotes certain media practices and arrangements presumably appropriate for ‘transitional’ nations whose political, economic, and cultural institutions lack the maturity that a truly free press arguably requires. Collaboration in the development journalism tradition usually involves a partnership with the state, though not always a formal one, a relationship premised on a commitment by the press to play a positive role in the process of development (Christians et al, 2009:200-201). However, normatively, a collaborative role for the press implies a partnership, a relationship between the press and the state built on mutual trust and a shared commitment to mutually agreeable means and ends, a partnership to which the larger community consents (Christians et al, 2009:198).

Therefore, consistent with the aim of this study that investigates the discourses articulated around Union in The Citizen and Daily News newspapers in their coverage on Union Day from 2005 to 2011, the two normative roles of the press namely monitorial and collaborative are of relevance. In essence, the relevance of these particular roles relates to the fact that first, The Citizen newspaper is independently (commercial) owned and thus it is a reasonable assumption that it might play a monitorial role with regard to how the nation is narrated. Second, the Daily News as a government-owned newspaper was considered likely to perform a collaborative role (partners
with the interests of the state) regarding the construction of Union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar as Tanzania nation. While these hunches informed the investigation, the methodology adopted and which is outlined in the next chapter allowed for these ideas to be confirmed or refuted.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODS

3.0 Introduction

A widespread approach in media research has been loosely inductive categorisation of interview or observational extracts within reference to various concepts, headings, or themes. The process comprises, to varying degrees, the comparing, contrasting, and abstracting of the constitutive elements of meaning. It is the very occurrence of a particular theme or frame in a context of communication which is of primary interest to qualitative data (Jensen, 2002:247).

This chapter presents the research methods deployed in this study. It first establishes the goals of the research and the methodology before it addresses the method it employs, that is thematic content analysis. Content analysis was adopted for it functions quantitatively, as in the manner of a survey, and again qualitatively and is thus appropriate for textual analysis. As McQuail (2005) points out, textual analytic methods range from simple classifications of types of content for organisational or descriptive purposes to deeply interpretative inquiries into specific examples of content with the aim of uncovering subtle and hidden meanings in the texts. As the research design adopted content analysis for the study, a discussion of it constitutes a major section of this chapter. It outlines the content analysis procedures that were undertaken, including sampling issues, formation of categories and theme formulation.

3.1 Goals of the research

This research investigates the representations of Union in The Citizen and Daily News newspapers in their coverage of Union Day from 2005 to 2011. As pointed out in the previous chapter, this study considers the press’s role as central in their selection of issues for inclusion, and defining or framing these issues, and thus proposing particular understandings and identities as well. Consistent with this understanding, this study investigates the nature of the discursive frames to which Tanzanians have access and from which they make sense of nationhood and the Union. It sets out to address the central and pivotal research question: ‘How has the Tanganyika-Zanzibar Union been represented in The Citizen and Daily News newspapers from 2005 to 2011?’ To do this, it restricts its focus to the reportage on the issues of the Union on Union Day as this day serves as a time for the articulation and rehearsal of positions related to Union. The investigation pays particular attention to the various aspects of Union and the themes and kinds
of debates relating to them. The interrogation of how the Union is represented is thus linked to issues of nationhood and how Tanzanians might make sense of their nationhood.

3.2 Methodology: qualitative and quantitative methods

While the study sets out to be interpretive and thus qualitative, it employs both quantitative and qualitative techniques. The combination of quantitative and qualitative methods is considered appropriate to the goals of this study. As in other studies, the quantitative method precedes and provides an aid to the collection of qualitative data for the study (Bryman, 1996:136). For simple pragmatic reasons (such as the immense amount of work that is essential for this kind of analysis), qualitative analysis requires the quantitative to narrow the focus (Wimmer and Dominick, 2006:113). Subsequently, quantitative and qualitative approaches are combined in the attempt to produce a general, comprehensive and representative picture of the coverage of Union (Bryman, 1996:136). The discussion of content analysis is structured so that ‘content analysis’ as the data gathering and analysis method is discussed before outlining the quantitative and qualitative techniques deployed in the analysis stages of this study. The method employed is thematic content analysis.

3.3 Content analysis

Content analysis developed in the early twentieth century and was originally designed to bring the rigour and authority of ‘natural’ scientific enquiry to the study of human and social phenomena (Deacon et al, 2010:118). A second impetus for the method’s development grew out of the widespread concerns before World War II about the growth and influence of new mass media industries. It was widely supposed that mass audiences were highly susceptible to manipulation by media messages, and thus content analysis was developed to provide academics and politicians with the means to police the symbolic arenas of mass culture and detect the presence and influence of propaganda (Deacon et al, 2010:118). During World War II, allied intelligence units used content analysis to monitor the number of types of popular songs played on European radio stations. By comparing the music played on German stations with that on other stations in occupied Europe, the allies were able to measure with some degree of success, the changes in troop concentration on the continent (Wimmer & Dominick, 2006:150, Gunter, 2000:55). Techniques similar to content analysis were also in use during the first half of the 20th
century, largely to monitor social and economic trends. Post World War II content analysis evolved as a distinct methodology and was used by academic researchers to study a wide range of media issues (Gunter, 2000:56).

The range of purposes that content analysis addressed included identifying the intentions and other characteristics of communicators, detecting the existence of latent propaganda or ideology, reflecting on cultural patterns of groups, revealing the foci of organisations, and describing trends in communication content (Devereux, 2007:192). The definition frequently referenced describes content analysis as ‘a research technique for the objective, systematic and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication’ (Berelson, 1952:147). This definition is arguably initially useful because it highlights key facets of the method’s origins and concerns. In particular, the claim to ‘objectivity’ and the emphasis on ‘manifest’ (that is ‘observable’) evidence reveals the scientistic ambitions that prompted this method’s development (Deacon et al, 2010:118). Although Berelson’s (1952) definition emphasises the quantitative nature of content analysis, with ‘manifest' implying physical presence and counting, subsequently content analysis has also been employed to focus on the intention and the interpretation of the message (Wigston, 1997:155). Content analysis can serve to quantify salient and manifest features of a large number of texts, and the statistics can be used to make broader inferences about the processes and politics of representation (Deacon et al, 2010:118) and thus the latent (underlying) meaning, that emerges from this exercise, for instance as regards which themes and issues are emphasised. This introduces and highlights the qualitative nature of the process. In this regard, content analysis is dependent on two basic strands. The first, which is the quantitative dimension, is that the link between the in-text reference and the object of reference is clear thus making interpretation straightforward. The second is that, the repetition of selected codes justifiably expresses/reflects the predominant and intended meaning of the text (McQuail 2005:363). Accordingly, the two strands include ‘pure’ quantitative content analysis and qualitative content analysis (which focuses on the analysis of emerging themes and issues in media content) respectively (Sibanda, 2006:58). This study is concerned primarily with the latter strand. Quantitative content analysis, and then qualitative content analysis and characteristics in relation to quantitative content analysis are outlined below.
3.3.1 Quantitative content analysis

It is important to point out that, quantitative content analysis assigns numerical values to certain categories and units (Berelson, 1952:116). The quantitative method depends on numerical counts, i.e. manifest coding (Wigston 1997:159). Prior to the coding process certain rules or protocols are drafted to allow processing of the text. For example, the number of reports containing a specific word or phrase within a period could be counted. Likewise the number of occurrences of specific words in a text could be counted. In visual texts, the number of appearances of particular categories of characters and their roles might be coded. Thus, statistical analysis of the data is possible and certain conclusions can be drawn. The inferences made in quantitative content analysis are usually inductive (Wimmer & Dominick, 1991:46). Inductive research infers either from examination of several instances to a law or conclusion (Jensen 2002: 259).

3.3.2 Qualitative content analysis

Interpretative methodologies have become increasingly used in media research and qualitative content analysis has become a commonly used method to analyse media texts (Gunter, 2000:82). Consistent with quantitative content analysis, numerical values are assigned to certain categories and units (Berelson, 1952:116). However, the difference is that the values of the qualitative strand are less explicit and consequently descriptions like ‘repeatedly’, ‘rarely’, and ‘usually’, and so on are common and are used in comparing and describing the emphasised issues and themes. While quantitative content analysis is considered more explicit in its modus operandi of quantification or counting of instances to arrive at significance (McQuail, 2005:364), precision is also appropriate in qualitative analysis; depending on the nature of the study, more precise ways of enumeration can be used (Sibanda, 2006:59).

The fundamental distinction between qualitative and quantitative methods is found in their approach to the issue of meaning in media texts. Quantitative content analysis presupposes a fixed meaning of media texts and therefore subsequent analysis of the same data repeatedly identified by different ‘readers’ using the same analytical framework would produce identical results. Qualitative content analysis procedures accept the idea of the capacity of texts to convey multiple meanings and therefore more than a single reading can be made by the researcher or
reader (Gunter, 2000:82). In qualitative content analysis, there is an emphasis on allowing categories to emerge out of data and on recognising the significance for understanding the meaning in the said context which the media inhabited. Therefore, particular items in the data are analysed and then categories are derived from them (Bryman, 2012:291). Thus, in qualitative content analysis, attention is directed to latent (deeper meaning) rather than to manifest content (McQuail, 2005:364).

Qualitative content analysis is also appropriate for this study that seeks to consider themes relating to Union. The organising of the data according to content elements enables to identify the issues most emphasised and ‘examine ideological mind-sets, themes, topics, symbols and similar phenomena’ (Berg, 1998:242). In this regard, the analysis is extended to an interpretative reading of the physical data. Also, qualitative content analysis employs less formalised categorisation than quantitative analysis because it provides for the counting of such complex issues as themes that cannot be easily categorised in a scientific manner, and thus it allows for more open strategies that respond to specific concerns (Berelson, 1952:125). In qualitative analysis therefore, the basic unit of analysis becomes more complex than in quantitative analysis. The latter tends to break complex materials down into their components so that they can be reliably measured. Qualitative content analysis, on the other hand, assumes that meanings reside in the totality of impression, the gestalt, and not in the atomistic combination of measurable units (Berelson, 1952:126).

3.3.2.1 Thematic analysis

Thematic analysis refers to a particular form of content analysis. A theme is considered a useful unit for analysis particularly for the study that employs qualitative content analysis method (Budd et al, 1967, Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 1996). In the case of media text, themes are the recurring typical theses that run through many reports (news stories, feature articles or editorials) (Altheide, 1996:31). They are general meanings or frames (the focus, a parameter or boundary, for discussing a particular event or issue (Altheide, 1996:31)) that are crucial in defining situations and thus provide much of the rationale for content analysis (Altheide, 1996:31). Themes are arguably powerful features of public information and therefore studying them is essential to understanding the relevance and significance of media in people’s lives.
In a content analysis study, a unit of analysis or recording unit is classified and coded into categories. The researcher codes text in terms of certain subjects and themes through which what is being sought is the categorisation of the problem, phenomenon or phenomena of interest (Bryman, 2004:188). Importantly, theme categories seek to classify texts according to the themes or issues that are being raised (Holsti, 1969:116). In so doing, a thematic analysis of this kind relies upon the coder to recognise certain themes or ideas in the text, and then to allocate these to pre-determined categories (Deacon et al, 2010:124, Sibanda, 2006). Accordingly, each theme detected is placed in a larger ‘compartment’ as a theme category and in this way a variety of different themes with essentially the same basic meaning can be classified under a single theme category (Budd et al, 1967:47). As a theme is an assertion about a subject matter, the subject (for instance ‘Leadership roles in the Union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar’) thus is a referent and must be present or implied in the assertion.

Importantly, it is argued by Guest et al (2012) that thematic analyses require more involvement and interpretation from the researcher. Thematic analyses move beyond counting explicit words or phrases and focus on identifying and describing both implicit and explicit ideas within the data, that is, themes (Guest et al, 2012:10). Subsequently, codes are then typically developed to represent the identified themes and applied or linked to raw data as summary markers for later analysis. Therefore, while categorisations in content analysis are often relatively straightforward (Bryman, 2004), when the process of coding is thematic they become a more interpretive approach. At this point, what is being searched is not just manifest content but latent content as well. Such a process probes and unearths what happens beneath the surface (Bryman, 2004:189).

With regard to both quantitative and qualitative methods, it is argued that thematic content analysis can therefore be placed in the middle of the continuum of social enquiry. While thematic content analysis shares many of the principles and rigorous procedures of the quantitative method, it also has the traits of the interpretive and subjective approaches of the qualitative method (Sibanda, 2006:59). Also, the merit of a thematic content analysis approach for studies such as the present one is its more exploratory nature in comparison to quantitative content analysis. While the latter is interested with the frequency of occurrence of certain categories, the former is concerned with the presence/absence of certain themes, issues or genres in texts under
study. In thematic content analysis data is read through looking for ‘themes’ that arise, the aim being to end up with key themes that describe the essence of the text being studied (Sibanda, 2006:59).

Generally, the advantage and usefulness of thematic content analysis for this study is its flexibility. Thematic content analysis involves a fairly flexible unit of analysis based on decisions about ‘themes of meaning’ (Sibanda, 2006). As further argued by Sibanda (2006), this differs from ‘pure’ content analysis, which relies on fixed units of analysis like word counts. Similar to critical discourse analysis, thematic content analysis thus seeks to analyse texts in their contextual settings (see Fairclough, 1995). Subsequently, thematic content analysis applied to this study provides one with a tool for a subject and/or a theme-based description of large chunks of media texts.

However, thematic content analysis is a very painstaking and time-consuming undertaking because it requires careful and fine judgment, based on detailed analysis (Deacon et al, 2010:124). It is also complex in that the unit of analysis is not so easily identifiable. This is because a single sentence can contain several assertions, all classifiable under a single theme or each classifiable under separate themes. As a consequence, it is important that in developing theme categories, the analyst must be able to detect the major motifs in the text and recognise them in their various forms (Budd, et al, 1967:48, Berelson, 1952:139, Sibanda, 2006).

To this end, in the following section the general limitations and merits of content analysis that render it as a valuable method for this study are identified.

3.3.3 Limitations of content analysis

Despite the identified usefulness of content analysis that renders it valuable for this study, it is important to point out its general limitations. The first relates to generalisability. Wimmer and Dominick (2006) argue that the findings of a particular content analysis are limited to the framework of the categories and the definitions used in that analysis. Different researchers and their use of different research questions and frameworks lead to varying definitions and category systems to investigate an issue or concept. This is only a concern if the researcher seeks to
generalise the results beyond the content being studied. Another problem that might occur when setting out to undertake content analysis is a lack of messages or dates relevant to the research (Wimmer and Dominick, 2006:154). However, this is not as much as a limitation but a caution to researchers to be sure of their data and thus preliminary research is necessary.

Also, in some senses, content analysis can be a blunt instrument. It ignores the important role which syntactic or linguistic structures play in the ideological (re)construction of social reality (Richardson, 2007:20). Although in content analysis the occurrence and recurrence of certain characteristics of content may be important, the recording of texts’ manifest content ignores textual absences. Thus, such syntactic structures are ignored because their importance lies in textual absence (Richardson, 2007:20). Finally, merely recording the content ignores the important issue of context that surround the formation of content (Richardson, 2007:20). For instance, when a pragmatic or illocutionary act such as an argument or accusation is recorded and coded in the text, the context in which such an act is performed often goes uncoded. This again is more of a caution to contextualise adequately.

3.3.4 Advantages of content analysis
Understanding the scope of possibilities of content analysis is crucial in assessing its appropriateness for the task at hand. First, it has been argued that content analysis is valuable in that it allows the researcher to observe a communicator’s public messages at times and places of the investigator’s own choosing (Budd et al, 1967). Consistent with this position, the researcher’s choice of the timeframe for the present study includes the coverage of the Union in the extended period from 2005 to 2011. Second, it is argued, although this is of less relevance for this study, content analysis also allows the researcher to carry out their observation without fear that the attention will bias the communicator (Budd et al, 1967:2). Moreover, the advantage of content analysis over other techniques of textual analysis, for example semiotic analysis, is that it enables one to analyse large bodies of media content through the process of sampling and thus to develop a broad and representative picture (Hansen et al, 1998:100).

Similarly, Deacon et al (2010) and McQuail (2005) identify aspects that are relevant to this study. They assert that content analysis, in comparison to other data-generating techniques,
assists the researcher in the following: identifying the intentions of the communicator; detecting existence of propaganda; reflecting the cultural patterns of groups, institutions or societies; revealing the focus of individuals, groups, and institutional or societal attention; and in describing trends in the media content being studied (McQuail, 2005:364, 551). These components are of relevance given the political, cultural and economic scope of this study. Linked to these points, content analysis then has particular advantages that render it valuable for the kind of study of media texts such as this one. As noted earlier, content analysis methodology accommodates and combines qualitative and quantitative operations for the analysis of texts (Bryman, 2004:196). Media texts provide appropriate sites for the study of shifts in concerns and attitudes to political issues (Babbie, 1992). It provides an approach that operates directly on texts (Berg, 1998). Further usefulness of content analysis lies in its acceptance of unstructured material such as news coverage and that it allows, in conjunction with other reliable data, to assess systematically the relationships between political, social and economic change (Wimmer and Dominick, 1991). It is an unobtrusive method (Webb et al, 1966) in that it does not entail participants (such as journalists) in a study having to take the researcher into account (Berg, 1998, Bryman, 2004:196).

Content analysis is also a transparent and systematic research method. The coding scheme and the sampling procedures can be clearly set out so that the replications and follow-up studies are feasible (Bryman, 2004:195). Arguably, the greatest advantage of content analysis is that it is methodical. All sampled material is submitted to the same set of categories. To this extent, it equips one with the tools for the systematic description of large amounts of media output such as a number of feature articles, and at the same time it also allows for verification of results/findings (Holsti, 1969:127, Sibanda, 2006). Importantly, content analysis is useful for studies concerned with media agendas such as the present research, as it can be used to establish the nature of the agenda set by particular media (Gunter, 2000:197).

3.3.5 Steps in content analysis
As a systematic approach, content analysis needs to follow particular stages. Consistent with the particular form of content analysis this study adopts, that is thematic content analysis (see Guest et al, 2012, Budd et al, 1967), the stages that were followed consist of the following: formulating
the research question and goals of research, defining the population and selecting the appropriate sample for the study, selecting the units of analysis, constructing the categories and themes of content to be analysed, analysing the collected data and, finally, drawing conclusions (Wimmer and Dominick, 2006:154, Budd et al, 1967:6). These were undertaken in line with the particular research question and the goals for this study established in 3.1.

3.4 Population and sampling

The sample procedure included three processes of selection, first in relation to which newspapers, second, to the timeframe and, third to the genres which were identified as relevant.

Tanzania’s press coverage on the Union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar, specifically on Union Day, spans from 1964 (the year the Union was established) to date. However, as mentioned in Chapter 1 (see section 1.5), the research sample is confined to the coverage on Union Day of two specific newspapers, Daily News and The Citizen. Importantly, the time frame from 2005 to 2011 was selected as The Citizen was launched in August 2004 and thus the first time it covered Union day was on 26 April 2005 (Mwananchi, 2011). This timeframe is also appropriate as it is only since 2000 that more extensive political and constitutional debates that probe the Union question have occurred (also see Chapter 1, section 1.5).

Furthermore, the sample of the two newspapers analysed includes two journalistic genres, namely feature articles and editorials as these are the genres where issues of Union are likely to be included. Editorial, apart from being the official position of the newspaper usually written by the editor (Nell, 1994:23, Stonecipher, 1979:42), offer commentary and selectively provide background detail to argue the significance of an issue and outcome or forecast future developments (Stonecipher, 1979:61). The Union Day editorials attribute significance to the issue of Union and represent it in line with a particular world view (Jaworski & Galamski, 2002). Feature articles examine and provide detailed description of the topics, events, trends or ideas that have been mentioned in the news (Fedler, 1984:571) and are explicitly interpretive with the intention of helping people understand more complex issues (Hennessy, 1997:9). A closer reading of feature articles and editorials of the two newspapers on the Union Day identified a full sample for the study that includes 58 feature articles and 8 editorials about the Union over 7
years, from 2005 to 2011. This sampling procedure produces a sample of 58 feature articles, with the state-owned, *Daily News* at 51 and *The Citizen* at 7 feature articles. It also includes 8 editorials, 4 each in the *Daily News* and *The Citizen* (see Table 2 and 3 below).

**Table 2: Daily News coverage on Union Day (2005-2011)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of editorials</th>
<th>Number of feature articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: The Citizen coverage on Union Day (2005-2011)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of editorials</th>
<th>Number of feature articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.5 Units of analysis**

Content analysis requires a systematic approach and this extends to decisions about the units of analysis and categories of analysis. It involves the interaction of two processes: *specification* of the characteristics of the content that researchers are to measure and *application of the rules* researchers must use for identifying and recording the characteristics appearing in the texts (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 1996:327). Such processes in the analysis of content involves ‘recording units’ (the smallest body of content in which the appearance of a reference – a single occurrence of the content element, is noted) (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias,
1996:327). Subsequently, recording units are classified and coded into categories. A category (or broad theme) is a variable, with meaning and emphasis, under which a variety of other recording units (themes in particular) with essentially the same basic meaning can be classified (Budd et al, 1967:47, Altheide, 1996:28). Five major recording units, which are classified and coded into categories, are used in content analysis research: words or terms, themes, characters, paragraphs, and items. For many research purposes, such as those of this study, the theme is a useful recording unit particularly in the study of propaganda, attitudes, images and values (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 1996:327). The following section outlines the categories and themes used in the analysis.

3.5.1 Categories and themes for analysis

In essence, at the heart of any content analysis study on media is the category system used to classify media content (Wimmer & Dominick, 2006:157). For a study like the present one to be productive requires clearly formulated categories, well adapted to the problem and to the content (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 1996:327). Therefore, as the analysis was conducted qualitatively (thematically), the next important undertaking for the analysis process was to formulate categories. While any kind of themes or issues can be categorised or counted, the themes which are chosen for analysis should be relevant and relate directly to the aims and objectives of the study, and primarily answer the research question (s) (Hansen et al, 1998:106). Through categories, the researcher identifies major ‘subject matters’ present in the data being studied, and which are relevant for the study (Holsti, 1969:104). As argued by Berelson (1952:147), content analysis ‘stands and falls by its categories’. Therefore, it is essential that during the formulation of the study, the researcher works closely with the data so that he/she is able to develop the categories inductively (Holsti, 1969:95). Additionally, categories must be exhaustive and mutually exclusive. While exhaustiveness ensures that every recording unit relevant to the study can be classified, mutual exclusivity means that no recording unit can be included in more than one given category within the system (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 1996:327, Budd et al, 1967:44).

The categories in this content analysis were determined inductively. An inductive approach begins with the researchers ‘immersing’ themselves in the documents (for this case, various
media texts or message) in order to identify the dimensions or themes that seem meaningful to the producers of each message (Berg, 1998:245). Such an inductive approach, by which a researcher establishes categories after a preliminary examination of the data, is also known as ‘emergent coding’ (Wimmer and Dominick, 2006:159).

In the case of this study, a close reading of the editorials and feature articles of *Daily News* and *The Citizen* on Union Day (2005-2011) led to the establishment of five categories, which guided the analysis of how the two newspapers represent the Union namely: *History and descriptions of the Union*, *Value of Union*, *Problems experienced by Union i.e. Union as problem*, *Challenges facing Union* and *Way forward* (the focus here being the future of the Union or the future of Tanzania as nation) (see Table 4 below).

Consistent with thematic content analysis procedures discussed in 3.3.2.1., and after going through the collected data thoroughly, 20 separate themes were identified to ensure that all of them fall under one of the five categories established above (see Table 4 below). The History and Descriptions of the Union category includes six themes, namely ‘Factors that prompted the Union’, ‘Structure of the Union’, ‘Identities of Tanganyika and Zanzibar and their citizens in the Union’, ‘Founders of the Union (Karume and Nyerere)’, ‘Leadership roles in the Union’, and ‘Extra (non-political) issues role in cementing the Union’, such as sports. Consistently, two themes were identified in the category Value of Union, namely ‘Positive value attributed to Union’ and ‘Arguments for retaining Union’. Also, in the category: Problems Experienced by Union (famously in Kiswahili as ‘Kero za Muungano’) (Othman, 2006, Killian, 2008, Shivji, 2008), there were six themes, namely ‘Arguments opposing Union’, ‘Structure of the Union as problematic’, ‘Sidelining of one part (Zanzibar/Tanganyika) of Union’, ‘Power sharing problems’, ‘Articles of Union critiqued’, and ‘Divisive lines of identity and the Union’. The Challenges Facing the Union category had three themes, ‘Relevance of the present Union’, ‘Shifts in and nature of leadership’, e.g. founding leaders Nyerere and Karume in contrast to current leaders, and ‘Impacts of new global relationships’ such as neo-liberal economy.

---

7 The two recording units used namely categories and themes are differentiated stylistically throughout this study. To indicate categories, a capital letter is used for every first letter of a word in a category’s name, while inverted commas (‘’) are used to indicate themes. Additionally, these categories and themes are presented in Table 4 below in the same order as they are later analysed in Chapter 4, section 4.2 (thematic analysis section).
democracy, and terrorism, on Union. Finally, in the category Way Forward, three themes were identified: ‘Proposals for dissolution of Union’, ‘The kind of Union people of Tanganyika and Zanzibar want to retain’. Finally, ‘Miscellaneous issues’ relates to future of Union and Tanzania nation or nationhood.

Table 4: Categories and themes for analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. History and Descriptions</strong></td>
<td>1. Leadership roles in the Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Identities of Tanganyika &amp; Zanzibar and their citizens in the Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Founders of Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Factors that prompted the Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Structure of Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Extra (non-political) issues in cementing the Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Value of Union</strong></td>
<td>7. Positive value attributed to Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Arguments for retaining Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Problems Experienced</strong></td>
<td>9. Structure of the Union as problematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Sidelining of one part (Zanzibar or Tanganyika) of Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Power sharing problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Arguments opposing Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Articles of Union critiqued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Divisive lines of identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Challenges Facing Union</strong></td>
<td>15. Impacts of new global relationships such as neo-liberal economy, democracy, and terrorism on Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Relevance of the present Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. Shifts in and nature of leadership, e.g. founding leaders Nyerere and Karume and current leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Way Forward</strong></td>
<td>18. The kind of Union people of Tanganyika &amp; Zanzibar want to retain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. Proposals for dissolution of Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. Miscellaneous issues (future of Union/Tanzania nation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following the sampling procedures described and in line with the research question posed, eight editorials and 58 feature articles of the two newspapers, *The Citizen* and *Daily News*, are accordingly analysed. The study structures the analysis to first deal with the quantitative dimensions and then to analyse and reflect on qualitative dimensions. Additionally, in the quantitative analysis, the study deliberates specifically on the trend of the two newspapers’ coverage and framing of Union in two time periods namely 2005 to 2008 and 2009 to 2011. By so doing, the study explores the presence of any particular shift(s) or frames regarding the Union in the two periods and then, at the end, assesses the overall representation of the Union by the two newspapers.
CHAPTER FOUR

CONTENT ANALYSIS OF THE CITIZEN AND DAILY NEWS COVERAGE OF UNION

4.0 Introduction

The press has the power to stimulate people to clean up the environment, prevent nuclear proliferation, force crooked politicians out of office, reduce poverty, provide quality health care for all people and even to save the lives of millions of people as it did in Ethiopia in 1984 (Dr. Carl Jensen, founder of Project Censored, cited in Hargreaves, 2005:4).

This chapter presents the analysis of the research results obtained by applying quantitative and qualitative content analysis. As mentioned in the preceding chapters, this study seeks to investigate the representations of Union in The Citizen and Daily News newspapers coverage of Union Day. It recognises the press’s considerable power to select particular issues for inclusion in the news coverage and to define or frame these issues, thereby validating particular understandings and identities as well. Accordingly, in this chapter the research findings are presented with a view to address the central research question: ‘How has the Tanganyika-Zanzibar Union been represented in The Citizen and Daily News newspapers from 2005 to 2011?’

The first part deals with the quantitative dimension of the coverage to present a broad picture of the findings, while the second part moves to the thematic analysis, i.e. the qualitative dimension of the analysis of the coverage of The Citizen and Daily News newspapers on Union Day from 2005 to 2011. Linking them to particular quantitative aspects it analyses the identified themes one by one, in order to explore the dominant issues relating to each, and to consider their implications in relation to issues of identity, nationhood and the role of the press (as discussed in Chapter 2).

4.1 Quantitative elements

This study’s sample is confined to two news genres, namely the feature articles and editorials, in The Citizen and the Daily News newspaper coverage on the Union Day from 2005 to 2011. The quantity of coverage differed significantly in the two newspapers with sampling procedure produced a corpus of 66 units consisting of 58 feature articles, 51 in the state-owned Daily News and 7 in the privately-owned The Citizen, and 8 editorials, 4 each in the privately-owned Daily
News and The Citizen. In the following sections a quantitative analysis is presented in terms of occurrences and re-occurrences of particular themes, and periodical shifts of themes or frames regarding Union. The re-publication of certain feature articles is additionally discussed and attention is directed to the issue of gender in relation to authors of feature articles.

4.1.1 Frequency of themes in both editorials and feature articles (2005-2011)
A close reading of the sample of 66 texts on Union produced five categories for analysis in relation to the focus on nationhood, which broke down further into 20 themes (as discussed in Chapter 3; see 3.5.1). The analysis employing the 20 themes identified 660 occurrences of such themes in both units (editorials and feature articles), 118 in The Citizen and 542 in Daily News (see Table 5 below). In this discussion they are identified both in terms of number of occurrences and as percentages (of either the 66 texts examined overall or articles appearing in the one or the other newspaper). The most frequently occurring theme was ‘Leadership roles in the Union’ which appeared in 62 units (93.9%). The next five most frequently occurring themes included ‘Identities of Tanganyika and Zanzibar and their citizens in Union’ (61, 92.4%); ‘Positive value attributed to Union’ (60, 90.9%); ‘Arguments for retaining Union’ (58, 87.9%); ‘Founders of Union’ (49, 74.2%); and ‘Factors that prompted Union’ (46, 69.7%). Interesting to note is that, of these six themes that occurred most often, four of them (Leadership roles in the Union; Identities of Tanganyika and Zanzibar and their citizens in Union; Founders of Union; and Factors that prompted the Union) fall under a single category, namely History and Descriptions. The least frequently occurring theme was ‘Proposals for dissolution of Union’ (9, 13.6%), in the Way Forward category (see Table 5 below).

4.1.2 Dominant themes in The Citizen and Daily News
The two newspapers differed in terms of total number of units on Union, with The Citizen at 11 units (4 editorials and 7 feature articles) and Daily News at 55 units (4 editorials and 51 feature articles) (see Chapter 3, section 3.4). By publishing more articles and editorials on Union, the government newspaper, Daily News, arguably engages in issues of Union so much more. This can be understood in terms of how the media – the sites where ways of thinking about the society are produced and reproduced (Croteau and Hoynes, 2000:164), particularly the state media, are usually deployed to do an ideological/discursive work intended for achieving and promoting
national hegemony (Billig, 1995:27). In this case therefore, the Daily News collaborates effectively with the state (see Chapter 2, section 2.3.2) in the construction of nationhood process.

Table 5: Theme occurrences in units (editorials & feature articles) of Daily News and The Citizen (2005-2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History and descriptions</td>
<td>Leadership roles in the Union</td>
<td>51/55, 92.7%</td>
<td>11/11, 100%</td>
<td>62/66, 93.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identities of Tanganyika and Zanzibar and their citizens in Union</td>
<td>51/55, 92.7%</td>
<td>10/11, 90.9%</td>
<td>61/66, 92.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Founders of Un</td>
<td>39/55, 70.9%</td>
<td>10/11, 90.9%</td>
<td>49/66, 74.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factors that prompted the Union</td>
<td>41/55, 74.5%</td>
<td>5/11, 45.5%</td>
<td>46/66, 69.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure of Union</td>
<td>35/55, 63.6%</td>
<td>7/11, 63.6%</td>
<td>42/66, 63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extra (non-political) issues</td>
<td>16/55, 29.1%</td>
<td>1/11, 9.1%</td>
<td>17/66, 25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Union</td>
<td>Positive value attributed to Union</td>
<td>51/55, 92.7%</td>
<td>9/11, 81.8%</td>
<td>60/66, 90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arguments for retaining Union</td>
<td>49/55, 89.1%</td>
<td>9/11, 81.8%</td>
<td>58/66, 87.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems experienced</td>
<td>Structure of Union as problematic</td>
<td>27/55, 41.8%</td>
<td>6/11, 54.5%</td>
<td>33/66, 50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sidelining of one part of Union</td>
<td>23/55, 43.9%</td>
<td>6/11, 54.5%</td>
<td>29/66, 43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power sharing problems</td>
<td>16/55, 29.1%</td>
<td>8/11, 72.7%</td>
<td>24/66, 36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arguments opposing Union</td>
<td>17/55, 30.9%</td>
<td>5/11, 45.5%</td>
<td>22/66, 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles of Union critiqued</td>
<td>16/55, 29.1%</td>
<td>5/11, 45.5%</td>
<td>21/66, 31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divisive lines of identity</td>
<td>11/55, 20.0%</td>
<td>4/11, 36.4%</td>
<td>15/66, 22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges facing Union</td>
<td>Impacts of new global relationships</td>
<td>13/55, 23.6%</td>
<td>4/11, 36.4%</td>
<td>17/66, 25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance of the present Union</td>
<td>12/55, 21.8%</td>
<td>2/11, 9.1%</td>
<td>14/66, 21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shifts in and nature of leadership</td>
<td>13/55, 23.6%</td>
<td>1/11, 9.1%</td>
<td>14/66, 21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way forward</td>
<td>The kind of Union people of Tanganyika &amp; Zanzibar want to retain</td>
<td>36/55, 65.5%</td>
<td>8/11, 72.7%</td>
<td>44/66, 66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposals for dissolution of Union</td>
<td>6/55, 10.9%</td>
<td>3/11, 27.3%</td>
<td>9/66, 13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous issues (future of Union/Tanzania nation &amp; nationhood</td>
<td>19/55, 34.5%</td>
<td>3/11, 27.3%</td>
<td>22/66, 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total theme occurrences :</td>
<td></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, in most instances, the two newspapers tended to emphasise similar themes as Table 5 above indicates. Accordingly, the three themes that occurred most frequently in the 11 units of The Citizen included ‘Leadership roles in the Union’ (11, 100%); ‘Identities of Tanganyika and Zanzibar and their citizens in Union’ (10, 90.9%); and ‘Founders of Union’ (10, 90.9%) (see Table 5 above). Two of these three themes occur most frequently in the Daily News as well. Of the 55 units, the three themes that recurred most frequently, all occurring 51 times (92.7%) were: ‘Leadership roles in the Union’; Identities of Tanganyika and Zanzibar and their citizens in Union’, and ‘Positive value attributed to Union’. However, whereas the two least emphasised themes in The Citizen were ‘Shifts in and nature of leadership’ (1, 9.1%) and ‘Extra (non-political) issues in cementing Union’ (1, 9.1%), in the Daily News, two themes that appeared least frequently included ‘Proposals for dissolution of Union’ (6,10.9%) and ‘Divisive lines of identity’ (11, 20%) (see Table 5 above).

4.1.3 Periodical shifts in themes

Both similarities and fluctuations in theme occur in the coverage of The Citizen and Daily News newspapers on Union in specific periods within the seven years (2005-2011). This section focuses on identifying any particular shift(s) in framing of Union from one period to another, and thus this enables me to compare and assess the overall representations of the Union by the two newspapers. Because of the discrepancy in numbers of editorials, this analysis confines itself to considering the thematic shifts in the feature articles to ensure consistency, thereby excluding all editorials. Unlike the editorials which appeared sporadically, at least one feature article appeared in every year of this study’s timeframe (2005-2011) in the two newspapers, The Citizen and Daily News (see Chapter 3, section 3.4). The timeframe was broken down to two periods, namely 2005 to 2008 and 2009 to 2011 in order to explore any shifts in the coverage. Table 6 below presents graphically the occurrences of themes and their periodical shifts in the two newspapers.


There were a total of 23 Daily News (the state/government owned publication) feature articles on Union in the period from 2005 to 2008 and 28 from 2009 to 2011 respectively. While there was a slight variation in the themes that occurred most frequently over the two periods, the same categories appeared in both. From 2005 to 2008, they were: ‘Positive value attributed to Union’
(23, 100%) and ‘Arguments for retaining Union’ (23, 100%) – both within the broader category of Value of Union, while three other themes recurred within the category of History and Descriptions, namely ‘Leadership roles in the Union’ (23, 100%); ‘Identities of Tanganyika and Zanzibar and their citizens in Union’ (20, 86.9%); and ‘Factors that prompted the Union’ (17, 73.9%) (see Table 6 below).

Again, coverage foregrounded the two categories of History and Descriptions, and Value of Union in 2009-2011. In this particular period, the five most frequently occurring themes consisted of, under History and Descriptions: ‘Identities of Tanganyika and Zanzibar and their citizens in Union’ (27, 96.4%); Leadership roles in the Union’ (24, 85.7%) and ‘Founders of Union’ (22, 78.6%); and under the category of Value of Union: ‘Positive value attributed to Union’ (24, 85.7%) and ‘Arguments for retaining Union’ (22, 78.6%) (see Table 6 below).

Consistent with the trend above, the same three categories occurred least frequently between 2005-2008 and 2009-2011, namely Challenges Facing Union, Problems Experienced, and Value of Union. Between 2005-2008 the themes that appeared least frequently were ‘Arguments opposing Union’ (2, 8.7%) and ‘Articles of Union critiqued’ (3, 13%) within Problems Experienced category; ‘Proposals for dissolution of Union’ (2, 8.7%) within Way Forward, and ‘Relevance of the present Union’ (3, 13%) in Challenges Facing Union (see Table 6 below).

Four themes that occurred least frequently in the 2009-2011 period were ‘Proposals for dissolution of Union’ (4, 12.3%) in the Way Forward category (as in the previous period, 2005-2008); ‘Divisive lines of identity’ (5, 17.9%) under Problems Experienced; ‘Shifts in and nature of leadership’ (5, 17.9%) and ‘Impacts of new global relationships’ (6, 21.4%) – both in the category of Challenges Facing Union (see Table 6 below). Significantly, ‘Proposals for dissolution of Union’ theme, which appeared among the least frequent themes in the previous period, recurs in this period. This particular theme is clearly a position the state wishes to endorse. The state-owned publication thus places emphasis on a ‘supra-national’ identity (Billig, 1995:133) and does not endorse challenges or reasons given against such identity.
### Table 6: The Citizen and Daily News Union coverage, 2005-2008 versus 2009-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History and descriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra (non-political) issues</td>
<td>5/23, 21.7%</td>
<td>10/28, 35.7%</td>
<td>0/3, 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that prompted the Union</td>
<td>17/23, 73.9%</td>
<td>20/28, 71.4%</td>
<td>2/3, 66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founders of Union</td>
<td>15/23, 65.2%</td>
<td>22/28, 78.6%</td>
<td>3/3, 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identities of Tanganyika and Zanzibar and their citizens in Union</td>
<td>20/23, 86.9%</td>
<td>27/28, 96.4%</td>
<td>2/3, 66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership roles in the Union</td>
<td>23/23, 100%</td>
<td>24/28, 85.7%</td>
<td>3/3, 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of Union</td>
<td>15/23, 65.2%</td>
<td>17/28, 60.7%</td>
<td>3/3, 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguments for retaining Union</td>
<td>23/23, 100%</td>
<td>22/28, 78.6%</td>
<td>2/3, 66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive value attributed to Union</td>
<td>23/23, 100%</td>
<td>24/28, 85.7%</td>
<td>2/3, 66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguments opposing Union</td>
<td>2/23, 8.7%</td>
<td>15/28, 53.6%</td>
<td>2/3, 66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles of Union critiqued</td>
<td>3/23, 13.0%</td>
<td>13/28, 46.4%</td>
<td>2/3, 66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisive lines of identity</td>
<td>4/23, 17.4%</td>
<td>5/28, 17.9%</td>
<td>0/3, 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power sharing problems</td>
<td>5/23, 21.7%</td>
<td>10/28, 35.7%</td>
<td>2/3, 66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidelining of one part of Union</td>
<td>8/23, 34.8%</td>
<td>15/28, 53.6%</td>
<td>1/3, 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of Union as problematic</td>
<td>11/23, 47.8%</td>
<td>15/28, 53.6%</td>
<td>1/3, 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges facing Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts of new global relationships</td>
<td>7/23, 30.4%</td>
<td>6/28, 21.4%</td>
<td>1/3, 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of the present Union</td>
<td>3/23, 13.0%</td>
<td>9/28, 32.1%</td>
<td>1/3, 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifts in and nature of leadership</td>
<td>6/23, 26.1%</td>
<td>5/28, 17.9%</td>
<td>1/3, 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals for dissolution of Union</td>
<td>2/23, 8.7%</td>
<td>4/28, 12.3%</td>
<td>2/3, 66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kind of Union people of Tanganyika &amp; Zanzibar want to retain</td>
<td>16/23, 69.6%</td>
<td>17/28, 60.7%</td>
<td>2/3, 66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous issues (future of Union/Tanzania nation &amp; nationhood)</td>
<td>7/23, 30.4%</td>
<td>9/28, 32.1%</td>
<td>0/3, 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, the consistent emphasis of the state-owned Daily News on the two categories of History and Descriptions and Value of Union across both periods points to the setting of a particular agenda and its framing – the attempt to define what counts as important. By emphasising certain issues, the publication creates an agenda of issues the public thinks and talks about (Severin and Tankard, 1992:207, 227) (see Chapter 2, section 2.3.1). Accordingly, the
 emphasis and repetition of the history and value of Union across the two periods foregrounds them as important. In this way it undertakes discursive work relating to nationhood and nationalism. The publication here reinforces national identity and proposes, for instance, a homogeneous culture (Hall, 1992:292).

4.1.3.2 The Citizen Union coverage: 2005-2008 versus 2009-2011

Although the privately-owned, The Citizen had a smaller number of feature articles than the Daily News in both periods, at 3 in 2005-2008 and at 4 in 2009-2011, significant shifts in the categories and themes of the Union coverage were evident across the two identified periods. While the category History and Descriptions with its three themes namely ‘Structure of Union’ (3, 100%); ‘Founders of Union’ (3, 100%); and ‘Leadership roles in Union’ (3, 100%) occurred most frequently in 2005-2008, three different categories appeared most often in 2009-2011. They include ‘Identities of Tanganyika and Zanzibar and their citizens in Union’ (4, 100%) and ‘Leadership roles in the Union’ (4,100%) within the History and Descriptions category; ‘Structure of Union as problematic’ (4, 100%) and ‘Power sharing problems’ (4, 100%), both within Problems Experienced category; and finally, within the Way Forward category, ‘The kind of Union people of Tanganyika and Zanzibar want to retain’ (4, 100%) (see Table 6 above).

There was a shift in terms of themes that occurred least often in The Citizen coverage on Union between the two periods. Particular themes were seldom addressed or given no attention at all. The themes ‘Extra (non-political) issues in cementing Union’ within History and Descriptions category; ‘Divisive lines of identity’ within the category of Problems Experienced and ‘Miscellaneous issues’ in the category Way Forward were absent through 2005-2008, while ‘Shifts in and nature of leadership’ within the category of Challenges Facing Union was given no attention in the latter period, 2009-2011 (see Table 6 above).

Interesting to note in The Citizen coverage of Union across the time spans is the significant increase in the occurrence of themes of one particular category, namely Problems Experienced. This escalation was as follows: ‘Arguments opposing Union’ changed from 66.7% in 2005-2008 to 75% in 2009-2011; ‘Structure of Union as problematic’ from 33.3% in 2005-2008 to 100% in 2009-2011; ‘Sidelining of one part of Union’ from 33.3% in 2005-2008 to 75% in 2009-2011);
‘Power sharing problems’ from 66.7% in 2005-2008 to 100% in 2009-2011 and ‘Divisive lines of identity’ from 0% in 2005-2008 to 25% in 2009-2011 (see Table 6 above).

This trend of increased attention by The Citizen to problems experienced by Union is consistent, first, with this argument made in Chapter 1 (1.2.8) that more extensive political and constitutional debates have occurred in Tanzania that probe the Union question in recent years, which raise concerns about problems that have been given voice more frequently in the public sphere. The trend also relates to the argument made earlier (also 1.2.8) that opposition to Union’s existence, which was formally disallowed, is now articulated in the press (Othman, 2006:61). This tendency, occurring most in the independent publication (The Citizen) is indicative of how different ideologies are in contestation and how the identities they propose may pull in different directions. The identities are fluid and may shift (Hall, 1992:277, Barker, 2000:170).

Second, this particular trend of more critical coverage is evidence of an ideological contestation and to how hegemony has to be constantly struggled for (Barker, 2000, Croteau and Hoynes, 2000). Therefore, as the independent newspaper, The Citizen, pays more attention to the problems of Union; it suggests that it is acting more in a monitorial role, in which the press stands for the public interest, has no or less ties with government and works to identify problems in society (Christians et al, 2009:142). Also the different emphases suggest some degree of ideological contestation relating to constructing or contesting the nation (Croteau and Hoynes, 2000; see Chapter 2, section 2.1.4.1). Thus, on one hand, the non-government publication i.e. The Citizen engages in ideological contestation to negotiate with and oppose the ideologies of the government on Union. While, the government-owned, Daily News, fails to clearly stipulate Union’s problems, instead it maintains that the Union remains very stable (Daily News, 2005:4; Daily News, 2006:4).

4.1.4 Republishing feature articles (‘copy and paste’)

While the Daily News Union coverage adopted a particular trend in which similar categories appeared most often throughout the seven years (2005-2011) (as explained in 4.1.3.1), it was also observed that this state-owned paper quite simply republished some of the feature articles it had used in the past. Giving extensive or repetitious coverage to particular issues (Severin and
Tankard, 1992:222) points to the nature of the agenda it seeks to set and the manner in which it attempts to narrate the nation.

Two feature articles, namely ‘Union survives political tribulations’ by Ali Uki (Daily News, 2005:24) and ‘Sports, culture play key role on Union’ by Chaby Barasa (Daily News, 2006:7) were republished in 2007 (pg. 18 and pg. 17 respectively). The first one was republished as ‘Opinions on Union structure diverse’ (Daily News, 2007) while the second one was republished in 2007 as ‘Co-operation in sports cement the Union’ (Daily News, 2007). Both recurring feature articles lack attribution apart from crediting them to ‘Staff writer’. It was only when attempting to analyse them thematically that it became clear that the content was cut and pasted.

Also unlike the other feature articles, a Daily News article in 2005 consist of the entire speech delivered by the first Union president, Julius Kambarage Nyerere, in 1984. It was published as a four-page feature article, with each page under a different headline, or sub-heading, namely ‘African countries should learn from Tanzania’ (pg. 19); ‘Union: A good lesson for Africa’ (pg. 21); ‘African should borrow a leaf from Tanzania’ (pg. 23); and ‘Africa’s survival rests in unity’ (pg. 28). Accordingly, several of the themes relating to Union identified and used for analysis were present in this particular article, including ‘Factors that prompted the Union’; ‘Identities of Tanganyika and Zanzibar and their citizens; ‘Leadership roles in the Union’; ‘Positive value attributed to Union’; ‘Arguments for retaining Union’; ‘Shifts in and nature of leadership’; and ‘The kind of Union people of Tanganyika and Zanzibar want to retain theme’ (see further details in thematic analysis 4.2 below). The use of Nyerere’s speech by the Daily News as a feature article works as an agenda-setting and framing strategy. It depends here on the authority of a well-known and credible political leader to articulate the particular issue (Severin and Tankard, 1992:222). Also, the emphasis on the roles of leaders, Nyerere in this case, works in relation to the construction and continuous imagining of nation. Such ‘heroes’ function as very important kinds of archetypes in relation to collective identities (nationhood in particular); they play a crucial role in the continuous imagining or construction of nation (Berger, 2011:129).
4.1.5 Number of female and male articles’ authors: news and nationhood as gendered

As mentioned earlier (see Chapter 2), this study is based on the social constructionist approach whose premise is that subjects are in constant, dynamic interaction with their social world. In the process of their social interactions the identity of subjects encounter various discourses which endorse particular subject positions such as nationhood or nationalism, which they then negotiate and reshape (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002:108). However, it is argued that both nationhood and news are gendered (Prinsloo, 1999, Williams, 1987, Gallagher, 2001) and thus this is a further discursive positioning that is implicated in these discussions of news coverage of Union (see Chapter 2, section 2.2.7). This section presents a comparison, in numbers, between the Union feature articles authored by female authors and those by male authors in both The Citizen and Daily News.

As mentioned, the privately-owned, The Citizen coverage of Union from 2005 to 2011 consisted of seven feature articles (see Chapter 3). Two of these appeared with anonymous by-lines as ‘The Citizen correspondent’ and thus the sex of the journalist is not explicit. Of the five remaining articles, only one (20%) was written by a female author, Salma Said, with four feature articles (80%) authored by men (see Appendices section; appendix 3 (a)).

As the state-owned Daily News Union coverage (2005-2011) was comprised of 51 feature articles (see Chapter 3), three of them, which are excluded in this section’s analysis, as their by-lines were indicated merely as ‘staff writer’. Of the remained 48 feature articles, 44 (91.7%) were authored by men (where some authors had more than one feature article). The other four (8.3%) feature articles were authored by women. In sum, there was a total of 29 authors, 3 female authors (10.3%) and 26 male authors (89.7%) (see Appendices section; appendix 3 (b)).

To account for this imbalance in the sex of journalists who write the feature articles one has to take into account the gendered nature of journalistic practice. It has been documented how particular beats and issues in the public domain are deemed as ‘hard’ and ‘soft’, with women journalists getting soft beats (Williams, 2003:57). The limited representations of, and involvement of women in, the news coverage of Union might be explained in these terms, that is, because it is deemed a hard beat. In line with this practice, it is argued that the media which
increasingly provide the ‘common ground’ of information, symbols and ideals for collective identities such as nation, limit women’s representation thereby working to keep them in a place of relative powerlessness (Gallagher, 2001). While news is not simply about men, it is largely by men and seen through men (Hartley, 1994). The findings of this study indicate that the Union coverage is centred around men, particularly the ‘founders of Union’ i.e. then presidents of Tanganyika and Zanzibar namely Julius Nyerere and Abeid Karume.

4.2 Qualitative elements: thematic analysis
This section presents the (qualitative) thematic analysis of Union coverage of the Daily News and The Citizen (2005-2011). This approach enables greater detail and insight in relation to the issues of concern in the Union coverage than a more quantitative one. This analysis proceeds by systematically considering separately each category and the themes identified within each. It orders the discussion of each category by beginning with those themes that occurred most frequently, moving finally to those which appeared less often. This enables discussion of the particular issues that emerge in each theme and their implications in relation to the theoretical framework that underpins this study, namely theories relating to nationhood and roles of the press. In this part, I deal with the coverage of both newspapers\(^8\) collectively in the first instance and then draw out the differences between the two.

4.2.1 Category one: History and Descriptions
4.2.1.1 Theme one: leadership roles in the Union
Theme one addresses the coverage of how the roles, obligations and activities of political leaders in relation to the Union were represented in the Union coverage (2005-2011) of The Citizen and Daily News. As already established, ‘Leadership roles in the Union’ was the most recurrent theme in this coverage, occurring in 62 units (93.9%). Ten aspects of leadership (with 75 occurrences in the 62 units) were introduced, and relate to the perceived obligations, activities and duties of (Tanzanian) political leaders in relation to the Union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar. The identified issues include having the political will to protect and strengthen the Union and national unity; mobilising people’s support and participation in the Union; addressing Union

\(^8\) Four articles (2 editorials and 2 feature articles) of both The Citizen and Daily News, which are printed in full, are included in the Appendices section (see appendices 1a, 1c, 2a and 2c) to give a sense of the nature of the actual coverage.
problems; calling on experts to deal with sensitive national (Union) matters; keeping Zanzibar in the Union; and giving serious attention to the issues pertaining to Zanzibar. Both editorials and feature articles described the kind of appropriate leaders and leadership roles most frequently in relation to ‘safeguarding the Union’. The feature article, ‘Union: A shining marriage in Africa’ \(^9\) \((Daily\ News,\ 25\ April,\ 2008:5)\ addresses leadership in terms of the politicians entrusted with this role, who are constituted as influential and powerful.

…the future of the merger between Tanganyika and Zanzibar lies in the hands of the politicians in the two sides of the union. Why politicians? It is because they normally influence public opinion and decision making through politics. Politicians influence the way a society is governed through an understanding of political power and group dynamics. Politicians usually include those in decision-making positions in government, and those who seek those positions, whether by means of democratic elections, coup d’états, appointments, electoral fraud, and conquest.

Accordingly, the leadership role requires that they safeguard, promote or strengthen the Union. The feature article, ‘Lusinde opts for one Union government’ \((The\ Citizen,\ 26\ April,\ 2010:6)\ describes Ambassador Job Lusinde as one of the long-serving Tanzanian political leaders, who articulates the role of leaders as follows:

“I urge our leaders to continue with what they are doing to strengthen the Union; they are in the right track. Problems and people who are not satisfied will always be there. Even if we introduce one government, problems will be there,” he says.

In terms of the role of leaders in relation to protecting the Union, most editorials and feature articles of both newspapers identified their role in terms of a responsibility to address Union problems (administrative and constitutional shortcomings) or complaints by either side of the Union, amicably and through joint and open discussions.

Interesting to note is that both newspapers adopt a collaborative role \((Christians\ et\ al.,\ 2009)\ in the case of the ‘Leadership roles on the Union’ theme is concerned, for they present the protection of the Union as the duty of leaders and so endorse the state’s objectives of embracing

\(^9\) In this analysis, quotations extracted from the two newspapers’ feature articles and editorials are presented as printed, without using ‘[sic]’ to mark any errors of grammar, to avoid altering their original structure and meaning.
the Union, strengthening it and addressing its problems in line with what the Constitution of the United Republic of Tanzania stipulates:

The structure of the Government of the United Republic and the Revolutionary Government of Zanzibar or any of their organs, and the discharge of their functions shall be so effected as to take into account the unity of the United Republic and the need to promote national unity and preserve national dignity (2008:24).

The collaborative role is consistent with the development journalism tradition that endorses an informal partnership with the state by playing ‘a positive role’ in the process of development (Christians et al, 2009:201). Thus the press works to ensure and perpetuate the situation where one social grouping or class has power over others (Richardson, 2007:148). While it might ‘question or even challenge the state, it does not do it to the point where it undermines a government’s basic plans for progress and prosperity’ (Christians et al, 2009:201). This analysis thus indicates that coverage in both newspapers endorsed government (leadership) in its efforts to protect the Union. An editorial of the privately-owned The Citizen illustrates this position in ‘Tanzanians should strengthen Union’ (The Citizen, 26 April, 2011:8):

The leadership is aware of the fact that the Union is a sensitive matter, much as is solid on the ground; no wonder, there is a full-fledged ministry under the Vice-President’s Office to deal with Union matters on a day-to-day basis. The ministry, whose officials hail from both the Mainland and the Isles, constantly monitors happenings and sentiments that are of significance to the wellbeing of the “marriage”. The aim is to nip in the bud, through discussions, any problems before they erupt into issues of unmanageable proportions. It is probably thanks to this ‘modus operandi’ of solving Union problems before they rear their ugly heads that our unity continues to survive.

This view is also expressed in the editorial, ‘Let’s work for a stronger Union’ (Daily News, April 26, 2006:4), in the state-owned Daily News, which argues that leaders have a central role to play in the Union’s prosperity:

President Kikwete has declared his intention to tackle Union problems. He has shown his resolve by appointing a minister in the Vice-President’s Office to deal with Union affairs … He admitted challenges facing the Union. He said the Union structure was ideal and workable and restated his conviction that there is a will among the public to strengthen the Union. The
problem appears to the leaders on both sides. Leaders have a central role to play and the president wants this to happen.

These excerpts serve as illustration of the nature of the collaborative role they adopt.

4.2.1.2 Theme two: identities of Tanganyika & Zanzibar and their citizens in the Union

The second most frequently recurring theme, ‘Identities of Tanganyika and Zanzibar and their citizens in the Union’ occurred in 61 (92.4%) of the 66 units that make up the sample. To discuss this theme this analysis focuses on the identification or naming of both the two components of the Union and their citizens, that is to how they are represented. As established in Chapter 2, the work to create a sense of a national culture depends on unifying its subjects as one cultural identity and representing all as belonging to the same great national family or ‘one people’ (Hall, 1992:297). Also, by identifying particular identities of the two sides of the Union as represented in the press, this study sought to unveil how the press negotiates the tensions of the two parts (i.e. Tanganyika and Zanzibar) that it seeks to unify (see Chapter 1, section 1.2.7).

The citizens of the two sides were identified through six names or identities with a total of 64 occurrences in the 61 units of both newspapers (see Appendix 4). The most frequently recurring label was ‘Tanzanians’ (34, 53.1%) which signifies a common identity of all citizens, regardless of their Tanganyikan or Zanzibari origin. Reference was made additionally to Zanzibaris or People of Zanzibar (19, 29.7%) and Islanders/Isle people (5, 7.8%) to refer to people of Zanzibar, in contrast to Mainlanders/mainland people (2, 3.1%) and Tanganyikans (2, 3.1%) to indicate people whose origin is Tanganyika. Reference was made at times to Tanzanians simply as ‘people of the two sides’ (2, 3.1%). Arguably, the labelling, with the unified identity of Tanzanians as most frequent, works ideologically to flag a unified nation. This is consistent with the recognition of nation as a construct dependent on the deployment of ongoing strategies to flag inclusive national identity to legitimate national culture (Hall, 1992, Billig, 1995). National identity, for example ‘Tanzanian’, is constructed in relation to the meanings about ‘the nation’ which circulate and with which a person can identify (Hall, 1992:293) and through which a nation, here the Union or Tanzania, is legitimated. Consider the argument in the Daily News article, ‘The Union vibrant, going strong and strong’ (Daily News, 26 April, 2011:2):
We are celebrating the 47th Union anniversary with great achievement in economic, social and political spheres; with union being an identity of Tanzanians in the country and abroad. Some people, who think the union is worthless, need to be educated and enlightened on the importance of union to all Tanzanians.

Here, a collective identity is endorsed. It incorporates what Billig (1995:66) calls ‘a strong motivational theme’ that proposes a positive identity and serves as a means of unification for individuals through which an individual becomes a member of a particular group. By extension, the in-group (or nation) compares itself positively with other out-groups. Here, those who might hold a contrary view are effectively expurgated as uneducated and unenlightened.

Similarly Tanzanian identity (the consequence of the formation of the Union) is constructed as a positive one in the *Daily News* (26 April, 2005:4; see the editorial printed in full in Appendices section, appendix 1c) extract below.

Today, Tanzanians have more areas of co-operation – practically in all branches of national life – compared to when the Union was created. The call to solve the ‘Union problems’ is proof of how informed Tanzanians value the Union... and its inherent benefits to all Tanzanians.

Yet the identification of people on the part of both newspapers in terms of their geographical location as Zanzibaris/people of Zanzibar, islanders/Isle people, mainlanders/mainland people and Tanganyikans, indicates the existence of a classificatory system, a system that Schlesinger (1991) argues reproduces the distinction that underpins any so-called national culture. Accordingly, in the first place, national culture allows ‘us’ to define ourselves against ‘them’– understood as those beyond the boundaries of the nation (Schlesinger, 1991:173). Such a classificatory system may also reproduce distinction between ‘us’ and ‘them’ at the intra-national level, for example such a distinction between ‘Islanders’ (Zanzibaris) and ‘Mainlanders’ (Tanganyikans) in line with the internal structure of social divisions and relations of power and domination (Schlesinger, 1991:174) as far as the Union is concerned.

It is interesting how the two Tanzanian components are represented in the Union coverage of the two newspapers differently. There were a total of nine names (with 33 occurrences) that flagged such identities. Both sides were identified as ‘the two partners that remain sovereign and never
lost their identities when they united’ (6, 18.2%). However, what is striking is that reference is made more frequently to Zanzibar rather than the mainland, with 7 of 9 issues focussing on Zanzibar. On one hand Zanzibar is represented in a way that implies the positive consequences of Union: the side that benefits from the economic and political clout of mainland (1, 3.1%); the side that has in the recent years been expanding its autonomy (3, 9.1%); and, unlike Tanganyika, it remains autonomous with its own government, president and legislature (of all nine issues this issue recurred most frequently (11, 33.3%). On the other hand, Zanzibar is depicted as enduring certain negative consequences of Union: as the smaller partner (3, 9.1%); thus inferior and muzzled by the mainland (3, 9.1%); and a complex entity that needs due attention (1, 3.1%).

While Tanganyika, unlike Zanzibar, is depicted as peaceful or calm (2, 6.1%), negative consequences of Union are at times identified in relation to Tanganyika. Its government was ‘deleted’ by the formation of the United Republic of Tanzania parliament in 1964 and completely absorbed by the Union (Tanzanian) government (3, 9.1%)’ (see the article: ‘Union boat sails on despite stormy seas’, Daily News, 26 April, 2010:1); it thus lost its identity and autonomy. Hence the name used to refer to former Tanganyika becomes the ‘Tanzania mainland’ (while Zanzibar retains its name and identity more explicitly). Below, the Daily News article, ‘Critical focus on Union structure’ (Daily News, 26 April, 2005:25; see the article printed in full in Appendices section, appendix 1a) argues for the retaining of ‘Tanganyikan identity’:

It is tragic for instance, to belong to a political union where the primary condition is to kill your identity as a nation. Mwalimu Nyerere once shocked journalists when he told them bluntly that the government of Tanganyika ceased to exist when we became the United Republic of Tanganyika… With due respect, our union resembles very much a situation where the bride is alive but the groom is dead…there has to be a way of recognising and articulating Tanganyika’s identity within the Union in the same way that Zanzibar agitated for internal autonomy and won their case. I wish to submit that anything short of that would be a discriminatory and will in the long run not hold water.

Interestingly, the above extract uses the marriage metaphor in relation to the Union. Richardson (2007:66) points out that a metaphor usually involves perceiving one thing in terms of another. In this case therefore, the metaphorical Union marriage implies the intention of a lifelong partnership for mutual benefit. Extending the metaphor, it then implies the possibility of marital problems and even divorce. Interestingly, Zanzibar is identified as the bride because the
‘marriage’ proposal is said to have been initially made by Tanganyika (through Nyerere), the metaphorical groom (*Daily News*, ‘What the future holds for Tanzania’, 26 April, 2010:2). If the bride is described as alive with her autonomy intact, the groom (Tanganyika) here is dead.

The particular representations of the two sides of Union and identities of their people present the different positions and identify contentious issues in this figurative ‘marriage’. Each side makes continuous efforts to maintain their identity within the Union. What continues to persist is the distinction between ‘us’ and ‘them’ (Zanzibar against Tanganyika) at the intra-national level (Schlesinger, 1991:174). In some senses, this suggests that there is contestation on both sides with the idea of Union. At some level each side contests the Union or the unified Tanzania that provided them with an alternative point of identification – common membership of ‘the family of the nation’ (Hall, 1992:297) in 1964. This attention to identity in the press is part of the ongoing and contested construction and negotiation of nation, which has to be continuously imagined (Anderson, 1983). That the ideological work to construct nationhood is not automatically successful or assured is indicative of hegemonic struggle and the necessity for continual striving. While certain groupings may be imagined as similar and as one nation at a particular time, similarly, as a consequence of changing political, economic and social circumstances, representations, and ideological work, such communities can be imagined differently (Anderson, 1983:16 cited in Billig, 1995:68). New positions may emerge and new identities might be produced (Woodward, 1997:15) for a nation is a product of various historical processes which are not ‘naturally’ occurring phenomenon but a contingent historical-cultural formation (Barker, 2000:197).

### 4.2.1.3 Theme three: founders of Union

In the discussion of nation and construction of nationhood, Berger (2011) argues that certain individuals play a crucial role as ‘national heroes’ in the continuous imagining or construction of nation. Significantly, national heroes serve as important archetypes and manifestations of collective identities. These accounts of heroes in the press play an important role. According to Berger (2011) they propose a valued identity which people can draw on to develop and strengthen their own identity and enable them to deal with problems they may face (Berger, 2011:129). Consistent with this position, two leaders, the then president of Tanganyika Mwalimu
(‘teacher’) Julius Kambarage Nyerere and then president of Zanzibar, Sheikh Abeid Amani Karume, are arguably used as national or Union heroes (Daily News, 26 April, 2005:17) and national symbols (or ‘symbols of unity’ (Daily News, 26 April, 2005:17)) to validate that history.

Particular descriptions of these leaders in the coverage include: ‘architects’ (Daily News, 26, April, 2005:12) and ‘crafters’ of the Union; major players or prime movers in the Union formation; fervent believers of African unity and participants of Pan-Africanism movement (Daily News, 26 April, 2005:13); founders/founding fathers of Union and Tanzania (Daily News, 26 April, 2005:20, Daily News, 26 April, 2006:10, The Citizen, 26 April, 2005:6; The Citizen, 26 April, 2006:8 – see the printed editorial in full in Appendices section, appendix 2c); and visionary leaders who made ‘quick’ and ‘wise’ decision to form the Union (The Citizen, 26 April, 2006:9, see the printed article in full in Appendices section, appendix 2a). The Daily News article, ‘Union Articles and soil-mixing symbolism’ (Daily News, 26 April, 2010:3) describes the two leaders in relation to Union:

Today is Union Day in Tanzania, marking 46 years since Tanganyika Republic (Dec 9, 1962-Apr 25, 1964) united with the People’s Republic of Zanzibar (Jan 12, 1964-Apr 25, 1964) to form the United Republic at midnight on Apr 25/26, 1964. Prime movers behind this dramatic development were Mwalimu Nyerere (1922-1999) and Sheikh Abeid Karume 1905-1972). The two were the founder presidents of the countries which Nature and the Almighty had placed cheek-by-jowl across the 22-mile wide Zanzibar Channel.

Similarly, The Citizen’s editorial, ‘Union should be the pride of Tanzanians’ (The Citizen, 26 April, 2010:8) reiterates the point that the Union was a creation of the two leaders:

Tanzanians have every reason to walk with their heads high today as we mark the 46th anniversary of the union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar, which gave rise to the United Republic of Tanzania...The brainchild of Mwalimu Julius Kambarage Nyerere and Sheikh Abeid Amani Karume is still going 46 years down the road.

Similarly, this extract (Daily News 26 April, 2007:9) attributes the present existence and successes of the Union to the two leaders:

Much of the successes of the Union are due to the strong foundation set by the architects of the marriage, Mwalimu Julius Nyerere, the first Union President, and the first Zanzibar
President Sheikh Abeid Amani Karume. Their commitment to ensure that the union flourishes has also been instrumental to its survival…

4.2.1.4 Theme four: factors that prompted the Union

In the coverage in both the privately-owned The Citizen, and the state-owned Daily News Union was depicted as prompted or impelled by certain factors. Of the eight factors identified, the most frequently recurring one was reference to the Pan-Africanist movement and the urge for African unity (such as the drive to form a ‘United States of Africa’ in the 1960s). The Daily News (26 April, 2010) article, ‘Practical response to a united Africa’ addresses this.

The idea of having a United States of Africa is said to have been advanced in the early 1960s by Ghana’s founder, President Kwame Nkrumah. Dr Nkrumah’s attempt to have the whole of the continent united as a single country in as early as 1963 did not receive widespread support from leaders such as Tanzania’s founder father, Mwalimu Julius Kambarage Nyerere. Mwalimu Nyerere and a group of like minded leaders preferred a continental union which came from regional blocs such as East African Community of West African States (ECOWAS) which remains in force to date. Many post independent African countries tried to form unions amongst themselves to counter neo-colonialism and other post World War II forces threatening their infant nations. Tanganyika and Zanzibar were among the first initiatives by independent African countries to form unions as early as 1964 …

Other factors that fostered Union mentioned in the coverage include the long-time or historical (blood/social, economic and political) interactions between Tanganyikans and Zanzibaris (Daily News, 26 April, 2006:5), and security issues pertaining to independent Tanganyika and Zanzibar after the 1964 revolution (The Citizen, 26 April, 2009:2). In addition, the powerful Western countries of Britain and United States endorsed the formation of Union (an endorsement that was linked to the Cold War contestation between the rival power blocs of the United States of America and the Soviet Union (as noted in Chapter 1) (Daily News, 26 April, 2005:14). Then, other factors referred to in the coverage speak to the power interests and amicable agreement between then presidents of the two countries i.e. Nyerere and Karume; and the political will of the people of both sides (The Citizen, 26 April, 2006:8). It is argued that the merger was aimed at promoting peace as well as social, economic and cultural development on both sides, i.e. Tanganyika and Zanzibar (Daily News, 26 April, 2005:19-21).

These factors identified in the coverage are grounded in narratives of national culture, in Hall’s (1992) terms, to legitimate the nation. They provide a set of stories, images, landscapes, scenario
and historical events which stand for, or represent shared experience and triumphs and which give meaning to the nation (Hall, 1992:293). They also propose a particular significance to the nation’s existence and to its citizens’ existence, connecting their everyday lives with a national destiny that pre-existed them and will outlive them (Hall, 1992:293) The Citizen (26 April, 2011:8) editorial, ‘Tanzanians should strengthen Union’, puts it like this:

Our strength as Tanganyikans and Zanzibaris actually rests on the Union, and this conforms to the idea of the founders of the Organisation of African Union (OAU), the forerunner of the present African Union… As we celebrate 47 years of the United Republic of Tanzania, it is prudent that we ask ourselves how far our unity has made it a better place for the people, more so, the ordinary people… But all in all, no matter what, we must not allow any misgivings to kill our Union; we owe it to ourselves, our children and to Africa.

Here the factors are presented to argue the legitimate the decision to form the Union. They work as a deliberative form of rhetoric/argument (Richardson, 2007:157) or, in other words, a deliberation on the desirability of this decision. In adopting a deliberative mode, the writers urge readers (particularly Tanzanians here) to accept and promote the Union.

4.2.1.5 Theme five: structure of Union

Of the sample of 66 units in both The Citizen and Daily News, 42 units (63.6%) addressed the structure of Union, accepting it as comprised of the two-government structure of the Union government, formally known as the government of the United Republic of Tanzania (URT), and the Revolutionary Government of Zanzibar (RGZ). The government-owned Daily News (26 April, 2010:9) recounts how this particular structure and the name, Tanzania10, came into existence:

…the President of Tanganyika, Mwalimu Julius Kambarage Nyerere and the President of the Revolutionary Council of Zanzibar, Sheikh Abeid Amani Karume mixed soils from Tanganyika and Zanzibar to form the Union Government. The name for the Union became Tanzania. The new name used some letters from the words Tanganyika and Zanzibar. This

---

10The name ‘Tanzania’ was created in 1964 by 18-year old Tanzanian and Mzumbe secondary school student, Mohammed Dar, in a national competition that sought to find a name for a new nation following the Union of the two countries namely Tanganyika and Zanzibar (Mwalimu, 2012:3).
union caused the formation of two governments: United Republic of Tanzania and the Revolutionary Council of Zanzibar.

Perhaps interesting to point out is that there is consensus between the two newspapers’ coverage on the structure of the Union. For instance, in line with this position, an editorial, ‘Union should be the pride of Tanzanians’ (The Citizen, 26 April, 2010:8) in the privately-owned The Citizen validates the present Union structure:

We sincerely believe that there is no shortcoming that cannot be effectively and conclusively addressed by the Union and Zanzibar governments.

Similarly, the Daily News article, ‘Union: A shining marriage in Africa’ (Daily News, 26 April, 2008:5), describes this two-government structure and supports its potential in addressing the Union problems:

…through consultation meetings between the government of the United Republic of Tanzania and the Revolutionary Government of Zanzibar it has been possible to find solutions to those problems step by step, and such a trend should always be kept alive.

4.2.1.6 Theme six: extra (non-political) issues in cementing the Union

The final theme in the category History and Descriptions addresses non-political issues involved in consolidating the Union and occurred least frequently in the entire sample of the study, appearing only in 17 units (25.8%) of the 66 units. They make reference to what are described as other positive ingredients in cementing the Union and include social interactions such as intermarriages between Tanganyika and Zanzibaris; sports; religion; and co-operation in tourism (‘the industry that mostly cements the Union’ and gives Tanzania highest foreign earnings/income (Daily News, 26 April, 2005:11)). While ostensibly non-political in nature, these issues do not stand outside of the politics of nationhood, but are subsumed beneath what is called the ‘political roof’ of the nation state (Hall, 1992:292). ‘The consciousness of belonging to the nation’ (Smith, 1991:72) is achieved through such apparently non-political issues. For instance, it is argued by Billig (1995) that sports, in particular, are used to reinforce a collective memory and sense of patriotism (or ‘flagging of nation’) as far as the continuous imagining of nation is concerned (Billig, 1995:120-123). Generally, sports serve to bind people together as a nation, here as the Union. The Daily News article, ‘Sports strengthens national unity’ (Daily News, 26 April, 2011:12) argues:
By their very nature, sports essentially denote participation. They are about inclusion and citizenship. Sports activities bring individuals and communities together, highlighting commonalities and bridging cultural or ethnic divide. Sports cut across barriers that divide societies, making them a powerful tool to support conflict prevention and contributing to peace-building efforts. When applied effectively, sports programmes promote social integration and foster tolerance to help reduce tension and generate dialogue.

In sports, there is no racial segregation as the people will become one when they participate as a team or when they support a team. When people go to the stadium they do not support the national teams based on skin colour, race or religion. They do it for the love of the country and this is what Tanzanians have always been doing since independence and since the country formed the union between the former Tanganyika and the Republic of Zanzibar to form the United Republic of Tanzania.

Similarly, religion is described as an ‘essential ingredient’ that serves to cement the Union. *Daily News* article, ‘Religion pivotal saving the Union’, (*Daily News*, 26 April, 2009) discussed religion in this way:

Another subtle but essential ingredient to the sustainability of the Union, which forms Tanzania, is the availability of religion in the first place. This way all members of the population have the opportunity of being part of at least one group, which teaches tolerance, as all religious sections do…religion has played a very important role in maintaining unity between the two sections of the nation.

### 4.2.2 Category two: Value of Union

#### 4.2.2.1 Theme seven: positive value attributed to Union

In Anderson’s (1983) concept of nation as an imagined community, in which ‘imagining’ is a continuous process, nationhood involves a distinctive imagining of a particular sort of community rooted in a particular sort of place. Each ‘homeland’ (nation) is imagined both in its totality and its particularity and in so doing a country as a totality is praised as special and ‘the beautiful’ (Billig, 1995:75). In this process therefore, a sense of uniqueness and integrity is conveyed. Accordingly, themes of uniqueness can be readily mobilised should an ‘alien’ threat to ‘our’ identity or nationhood be imagined (Billig, 1995:71). Frequently this nationhood particularity is presented in an epideictic or ceremonial kind of argument (Richardson, 2007:157). Epideictic argument sets out to prove someone or something worthy of admiration or disapproval, using praise or censure, and focusing on honour or dishonour (Richardson, 2007:157). Consistently, *The Citizen* and *Daily News* Union coverage (2005-2011) represented the Union’s particularity as special and worthy of admiration. Accordingly, this argument about
the honour (praise) and legitimacy of the Union seeks to move the audience to admire and value this Union. Consequently, ‘positive value of Union’ was among the themes that occurred most frequently (60, 90.9%) in this study’s sample.

Subsequently, the positive values attributed to Union that occurred most frequently were references to the uniqueness of Union; its longevity or endurance; and consequently its exemplariness in terms of unity, in Africa and the world at large. Thus, it is argued, particularly by the state-owned, *Daily News* (26 April, 2006:5) that the Union stands out as a unique and a shining example on the continent (Africa) as ‘many countries in Africa tried to unite but failed, or they survived for a short time’.

Consistent with the above argument, it is further argued that the Union has maintained peace, tranquillity and political stability if the country and the East African region, and thus has boosted Tanzania’s integrity, voice and strength as a nation. Consider the *Daily News* (2005:20) article ‘Union boosts national integrity’:

> Today Tanzanians mark the 41st anniversary of the union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar and formed what is known as the United Republic of Tanzania. Experiences tell us it is only through the union that can boost our integrity as nation...

The Union was also described epideictically as the pride and noble treasure of Tanzanians, or ‘one of the greatest wonders [sic] in the African political landscape’ (*Daily News*, 26 April, 2011:13); and proof that African unity, given the good and political will, is possible (*Daily News*, 26 April, 2005:13). Also, the Union is represented as valuable in its strengthening long-established and close links between the people of Tanganyika and Zanzibar (*Daily News*, 26 April, 2005:17) and its introduction of social, economic and cultural achievements in both Tanganyika and Zanzibar (*Daily News*, 26 April, 2011, *The Citizen*, 26 April, 2008:4).

**4.2.2.2 Theme eight: arguments for retaining Union**

Linked to the value of Union were the reasons given and arguments made for retaining the Union, and this constituted the fourth most frequently recurring theme, occurring in 58 units (87.9%) of the sample. Among the arguments presented, one that occurred very frequently (28
times in the 58 units) was that the formation of Union has led to greater development and better lives for its citizens through improved social services (Daily News, 26 April, 2010, Daily News, 26 April, 2011:9). It is also argued that the Union formalises and strengthens the historical and beneficial political, social and economic relationships between Tanganyikans and Zanzibaris, thus justifying Union (Daily News, 26 April, 2011:12); good will prevails among the majority Tanzanians who want the Union (thus it is the will of the majority and not merely that of the leaders (Daily News, 26 April, 2010)); a break-up of this merger ‘would be tragic leading to socio-economic disruption’ (Daily News, 26 April, 2005:25, The Citizen, 26 April, 2010:6); and additionally the Union serves as an important means to avoid external domination, threats or exploitation. Thus its dismemberment is rendered as ‘absurd’ (Daily News, 26 April, 2006:5) when many regions of the world are now pressing for economic, social and cultural integration as the Daily News article proposes in ‘Tanzania: Unique in the world’ (Daily News, 26 April, 2006:5):

Any attempts to frustrate the Union should not be given a room. There are a number of Mainlanders and Zanzibaris living on the other side, raising families and doing economic activities to make a living. Many worlds’ regions are now pressing for economic, social and cultural integration to solve their common problems. It will be an absurd to talk about the break-up of the Union...

As in the previous theme, ‘Positive value attributed to Union’, arguments with regard to this theme are also epideictic. Arguably, they attempt to entice the audience to admire the Union because of its qualities. Additionally, a deliberative form of argument (or an argument that is concerned with the future and seeks to induce the audience to concur about its advantageousness (Richardson, 2007:157)), and seeks to argue its legitimacy. Such arguments lend significance to a nation and its citizens’ existence, ‘connecting their everyday lives with a national destiny that pre-existed them and will outlive them’ (Hall, 1992:293). For instance, the state-owned, Daily News (26 April, 2011:9) article, ‘The Union remains strong despite challenges’, describes the Union’s benefits and thus entices readers to admire it:

…the Union between the two countries has enabled Tanzanians to cement the social and cultural relations, which existed for many years before the marriage. The interaction between the people of Tanganyika and those of Zanzibar has intensified as a result of inter-marriages and exchange of regular visits between the two parts. As far as economy is concerned, trade activities have increased in such a way that many Tanzanians in both parts have
benefited…What is clear though is that the Union has brought the two peoples much closer…The national language, the ethics of equality and human dignity, and the Union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar are what overcame the ethnic hatred, religious bigotry, regional parochialism and forged national cohesion and unity.

Consequently, in support of the above arguments, the two newspapers present a particular position with regard to Union (as summarised in these words) as: ‘despite the grumbling, squabbling and rumbling over the years, there are sufficient voices of reason which see more advantages in maintaining the Union than breaking it’ (The Citizen, 26 April, 2005:6).

4.2.3 Category three: Problems Experienced

4.2.3.1 Theme nine: structure of Union as problematic

The theme of the ‘structure of Union as problematic’ occurred in 33 units (50%) of the sample. However, it occurred more often in The Citizen, at 54.5% of all its units as compared to 41.8% of all units of the Daily News. Particular concerns about the present two-government structure were identified, as were the complaints from each side of Union (Tanganyika or Zanzibar) in terms of the present Union structure. However, both newspapers further recognise that each side of the Union holds that the structure benefits its counterpart (the other side of Union) in one way or another. Thus, particular issues in this theme propose the Union structure as one of the Union’s problems. One of the issues relates to a perceived rigidity of structure that fails to accommodate the shifts and reforms that continuously take place in any nation (This issue was repeated most frequently, appearing 18 times in the 33 units). The Daily News article, ‘Opinions on Union structure diverse’, points about how this Union structure is problematic (Daily News, 26 April, 2007:18).

Some proposals floated in various meetings and quoted by the media is for the two sides, to sit again to propose the best form of the Union structure, instead of maintaining the present set-up, which they claim fail to accommodate reforms taking place in the country.

In this way, the present structure is recognised as the basic problem and thus the source of other problems experienced by the Union, maintaining that it is like ‘having the two countries apart’ (The Citizen, 26 April, 2010:6).
Again, the national culture’s classificatory system (Schlesinger, 1991) is deployed, distinguishing between Zanzibar and the mainland, pitting the one against the other (Schlesinger, 1991:173, Billig, 1995:78). Certain concerns related to Zanzibar in terms of the structure: the present structure renders Zanzibar inferior as, among other issues, Zanzibar cannot make independent international agreements (The Citizen, 26 April, 2005:6, Daily News, 26 April, 2007:9). Also, as the Union government serves also as the government of the mainland in non-Union matters, it gives the impression that the mainland is the Union (Daily News, 26 April, 2011). In these ways, the structure is perceived to favour the mainland and act as ‘an obstacle to the Isles’ economic development’ (The Citizen, 26 April, 2008:4). On the other hand, there is the concern that the Union’s present structure is problematic because it ‘killed’ the autonomy or identity of Tanganyika (Daily News, 26 April, 2005:25) while Zanzibar retained its identity. Thus, it is proposed, mostly by the state-owned Daily News, that the appropriate way is to form either a three-government structure which comprises of three governments namely the Union government, Tanganyika government and Zanzibar government, or to have a federal (one government) set-up (Daily News, 26 April, 2005:24, Daily News, 26 April, 2008:10).

4.2.3.2 Theme ten: sidelining of one part of Union

Connected to the issues of structure was the argument about sidelining one or other part. In this theme, both newspapers portrayed the two components of Union as complaining about being sidelined in relation to certain Union matters. The theme of ‘Sideling of one part of Union’ occurred in 54.5% of all The Citizen units, and in 43.9% of all units of the Daily News. For Zanzibar, the concern is that it is not involved fairly in a number of economic, political and other decisions relating to Union. (This concern recurred 13 times in the 29 units that comprised this theme). It is argued that Zanzibar is never adequately engaged in the decision process as to what comprises Union matters. Below, the government-owned, Daily News (26 April, 2005:24), points out:

Most Zanzibar intellectuals feel that the Isles government under the present union set-up has been “swallowed” or “muzzled”… They claim that the original list of Union has been changed and varied from time to time but without the consent of the other side of the union, Zanzibar.
Both newspapers report on Zanzibari complaints that the Mainlanders are favoured and that the ‘Union as a political institution has retarded development in Zanzibar’ (The Citizen, 26 April, 2010:2) by suppressing the economy of the Isles (Daily News, 26 April, 2011). Zanzibaris further complain of unfair distribution of Union benefits such as local resources, revenues, jobs, and foreign grants and loans. The privately-owned, The Citizen editorial, ‘This Union is the strength of our nation’ (The Citizen, 26 April, 2005:6) explains:

There have been murmurs over the economic cake, with the Islanders complaining that they do not get their fair share of local resources and foreign and loans. This compliant is acknowledged in the Daily News (26 April, 2010) article, ‘Union boat sails on despite stormy seas’:

Some influential personalities from Zanzibar, including MPs, have also on several occasions demanded to know the Isles’ position in the East African Community (EAC) hierarchy. In addition, there have been misgivings that the 4.5 per cent share of foreign aid that Zanzibar gets from the Union government is “too little”.

On the other hand, Mainlanders have their own issues. They represent themselves as having few business opportunities in Zanzibar for cultural and economic reasons, notably Zanzibar’s allegiance to Islam and its clove trade (because neither cloves are grown on the Mainland nor Tanganyikans are involved in the clove trade in the Isles)\(^\text{11}\), while the Mainland offers unlimited business opportunities to Zanzibaris (Daily News, 26 April, 2005:25). Similarly it is argued that Tanganyika is disadvantaged by Union as the people ‘spend a lot of their taxes to keep the Isles afloat’. Zanzibar is thus viewed as a ‘burden’ to them (The Citizen, 26 April, 2005:6).

It is interesting that the issues in contestation relate to economic issues in the first instance and thus spill over to explicit political and social concerns. The modern nation involves and is a product of its economic, social and political conditions (McCrone, 1998:15). These issues are in constant contestation in the ongoing imagining of a particular nation. The sideling of each side,

\(^\text{11}\)The clove (large) plantations and trade are in the Zanzibar Isles, owned by Zanzibaris, mostly (landlords or ‘ruling class’) Ungujans (The Citizen, 2005:6). This has been a common practice (during the Arab rule, and currently under the Revolutionary Government of Zanzibar in the Isles) which denies Tanganyikans the access to this clove trade.
as represented in both newspapers, is thus a reflection of where the ideological work is insufficient to paper over the differences.

4.2.3.3 Theme eleven: power sharing problems

Linked to, and a consequence of, the issue of sidelining was the theme of problems of power sharing. The word nation has two interrelated meanings: nation as the nation-state and nation as the people living within the state (Billig, 1995:24) (see Chapter 2). Nation-state is a political concept that refers an administrative apparatus deemed to have sovereignty over a specific space or territory within the nation-state system (Barker, 2000:197). Accordingly, a nation’s ruling class (government) in which power is vested reinforces in its subjects (citizens) a sense of nationhood (collective identity) through various social institutions such as education, legal codes and administrative centralisation (Smith, 2001:335, Hall, 1992:289). However, within a poststructural framework (Chapter 2; section 2.2.3), the subject is recognised as possessing changeable, perhaps contradictory, unfinished and fragmented identities. Consistent with this approach, power is in contestation at all times. *The Citizen* emphasised this theme more as it occurred in 72.7% of its units and only in 29.1% of the units of the *Daily News*. The coverage of the two newspapers, *The Citizen* and *Daily News* identify certain contentious issues relating to power sharing in the Union, the focus of this theme.

First, both newspapers report that the Mainlanders complain that Zanzibaris have more leadership opportunities (for example more ministers, members of parliament positions) in the Union, and that such opportunities are not proportional to their smaller population. For instance, the *Daily News* (26 April, 2005:25) argues about this case:

Zanzibaris are hardly one million people but are represented on almost equal proportion in the ruling CCM’s 36 member Central Committee (CC). One may argue that that is a party issue – few Tanzanians belong to that CCM. But given the might of CCM in this country, unarguably CCM’s central committee is one of the country’s most important policy organs. Information for instance, is not a union matter but at the moment the Minister of State for (Information and Politics) is a Zanzibari, something that cannot happen for Mainlanders in the Zanzibar government.

Also, *The Citizen* (26 April, 2011:8) editorial, ‘Tanzania should strengthen Union’, explains similar concerns in relation to Tanganyika and power sharing in the Union:
From the Mainland, there have been dissenting voices as well. There are those among us who wonder why Zanzibar has as many as 50 MPs in the Union Parliament when it has a population of hardly a million. Yes, there are numerous constituencies on the Mainland that are much bigger in size than whole districts or even regions in the Isles.

Second, Zanzibaris’ concerns as depicted in both *The Citizen* and *Daily News* include the argument that their president is not accorded due status in the Union set-up when he attends Union cabinet meetings and thus his status becomes equivalent to a minister without portfolio (*Daily News*, 26 April, 2005:24). Their complaint, of being overshadowed by the mainland (*The Citizen*, 26 April, 2011:8), leads to a call to be recognised and be allowed to act independently in relation to foreign relations. They call for their own Foreign Affairs ministry, the right to sign international deals, and so join the East African Community as Zanzibar rather than under the auspices of the United Republic of Tanzania. The *Daily News* (26 April, 2011:15) discussed this:

One thing is, however, clear that Zanzibaris have been complaining a lot compared to their counterparts in the Mainland. Among the thorny issues affecting the Union, include participation of the Isles in the East African Community (EAC) and other international organisations.

Finally, the two newspapers represent both sides of the Union attacking the Constitution and administrative regulations as problematic and lacking provisions to address issues relating to how powers in the Union could be shared equally and fairly by both sides. This was the most recurrent issue with 16 occurrences in the 24 units of this theme. The absence of provisions relating to power sharing result in issues such as cost sharing, decision making on Union matters, and budgetary allocations remaining contentious. The *Daily News* (26 April, 2005:24) identifies this concern:

Efforts taken by the Union and Zanzibar governments to make constitutional amendments to rectify the shortcomings are viewed as not being enough... Arguments have been advanced about the union’s administrative and constitutional snags, which usually lead to unnecessary frictions and complaints between the two sides of the union.

These contestations are indicative of the different positionings and discourses (both dominant and otherwise) (Wetherell and Potter, 1992). The presence of such different ideological positions, particularly those related to power issues, are the issues that the continuous ideological processes of nation address.
4.2.3.4 Theme twelve: Arguments opposing Union

While certain problems were explicitly identified, namely in terms of structure, sidelining and power-sharing, there were arguments against the existence of Union. Anderson’s (1983) account of nation and nationhood emphasises the unity of nation and the strength of nationalist feelings. However, according to Billig (1995) and Barker (2000), in contemporary times, identities (such as nation) are always changing, contested and hybrid, ‘rather than fixed stable entities’ (Barker, 2000:200). In this era of increased contact across nations, the drive for national uniformity is challenged at times through narratives that oppose the ‘grand meta-narratives’ of a nation (Billig, 1995:133). This theme, while similar, differs from the themes relating to problems of Union’s structure and Articles of Union, and focuses on the general criticism of Union. In this theme (despite the discussion of various particular problems that account for how the Union is problematic), I intended to identify general criticism of Union (arguments opposing Union) as well as reasons for such criticism as represented in the two newspapers.

In the sample, this theme occurred in 45.5% of the units of the independent newspaper, The Citizen, and in 30.9% of the units of the government-owned, Daily News. Importantly, any criticism in the state-owned, Daily News has only occurred in recent years. For instance from 2005 to 2008, this theme occurred only in 8.7% of Daily News units while in 2009 to 2011 its frequency rose to 53.6% of units (see section 4.1.3.1). Clearly change to Union is generally not in the state’s interest and has been given limited space in the state-owned press. However, recent inclusion of criticism of Union in this state-owned Daily News may be attributed to the winds of multiparty system which have allowed more freedom of expression, and opportunity to question the Union (Daily News, 26 April, 2011:11).

The arguments that oppose Union occurred across the 22 relevant units of the sample of 66. In this theme, three arguments which oppose the Union were identified in the coverage namely the argument that relates to the legality of Union, a flawed argument regarding common history between the two parts of Union, and lack of anticipated development for the majority renders the Union meaningless.
First, the Union’s legality is disputed. Concerns are raised in both newspapers about the motives behind Union’s formation, arguing that it was formed ‘in a hurry and did not take all the important issues aboard’ (Daily News, 26 April, 2010:6). Additionally, the fact that the Union founders did not consider majority opinion or hold a referendum to establish whether people of the two sides approved the merger is criticised. The government-owned Daily News (26 April, 2009:4) article, ‘Articles of the Union “are key factors”’ gives an account of how the Union was formed ‘secretively’, involving very few people.

Discussions on the union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar were conducted “very secretly”. From the archival materials and the statements of those who were in the ‘corridors of power’ at the time, it would appear that not many people in the Tanganyika government or the Zanzibar Revolutionary Council knew what was happening. Apart from President Julius Nyerere of Tanganyika and President Abeid Amani Karume of Zanzibar, the only other people who might have been privy to those discussions were Mr Rashid Kawawa, Mr Oscar Kambona, Mr Job Lusinde, Mr Abdallah Kassim Hanga, Mr Abdul-Aziz Ali Twala and Mr Salim Rashid.

When these discussions were at an advanced stage, President Nyerere is said to have called in his Attorney-General at the time, British expert Mr Roland Brown, to draft a Union Agreement without anybody knowing…In the case of Zanzibar, the Attorney-General, Mr Wolf Dourado, is said to have been sent on a one-week ‘leave’ and instead a Ugandan lawyer, Mr Dan Nabudere… was brought in to advise Sheikh Karume on the draft submitted by Tanganyika.

In addition, further opposition to Union relates to its poor administration system to meet the demands of both, the Mainland and the Isles, as well as inadequate mechanisms for the public to discuss it (The Citizen, 26 April, 2011:2). It is thus argued that the poor administration system has not delivered on its promises and so renders the Union as inappropriate.

Second, the claim to a common history and historical connections between the two sides of Union is rejected; and it is thus argued that it is their different histories that make the Union experience incessant problems. The state-owned, Daily News (while in other articles recognises the presence of ‘common history’ for Zanzibar and Tanganyika), in this article, ‘Mwalimu’s cherished vision: The Union’ (Daily News, 26 April, 2009:3), points out the different histories of Tanganyika and Zanzibar.
The two countries of Tanganyika and Zanzibar were administered separately during all the
time of the colonial rule. When Tanganyika fell into German hands as a result of the Berlin
Conference of 1884-1885 that carved up Africa amongst the European powers, Zanzibar had
already fallen under Arab rule... But with Independence, each country retreated into its own
national shell, and what was agreed was the formation of the East African Common Services
Organisation... the circumstances in which the Union was formed raised a lot of questions,
many of which are still unanswered.

Consistent with this assessment that the two sides have different histories and that they were
‘married without considering all the shortcomings they had’ (The Citizen, 26 April, 2006:9), it is
argued that the Union ‘has never been a happy one’ (The Citizen, 26 April, 2006:9, ‘Opposition
should propose new Union strategies’).

The third argument that relates to this theme and which is covered more by the independent
newspaper, The Citizen is lack of anticipated development for the majority. Union is criticised as
‘meaningless’ for it has not brought anticipated economic and social development to the majority
on both sides (The Citizen, 26 April, 2010:2). It is argued that the political nature of the Union
has led to economic retardation. From its inception, it is argued, the Union was not intended to
be a political institution but economic and social entity like many others, such as the European
Union and the East African Community (The Citizen, 26 April, 2010:2) (This is however a
flawed argument as the economic is intrinsically political). Below, The Citizen (26 April, 2010:2)
extract further explains how the Union has failed to foster development for both sides, Tanganyika
and Zanzibar:

...the Union was meaningless if it did not bring about economic and social development on
both sides. What is the point of having the Union if the situation in the Mainland is as we
know it, a tiny minority of millionaires and an overwhelming majority of people who live on
less than a dollar per day, and in Zanzibar, where only about five per cent of the population
lives a decent life and 95 per cent don’t know where their next meal is going to come from?

This critique recognises the inequalities that exist in developing countries like Tanzania and
where the inequalities between the elite and the poor are stark. It is also a critique of capitalism
in terms of the poor or ‘the have nots’ and the ruling class (‘the haves’) (Richardson, 2007:3-6).
It is however interesting that none of them (newspapers) touch on the exact causes (such as
corruption as in many instances of this kind elsewhere) for this economic disparity between such
two groups.
Such arguments against the Union can be described in Billig’s sense (1995:27) as part of ‘the battle for nationhood’, a hegemonic struggle in which a part claims to speak for the whole. In this contestation there are arguments around the Value of Union (see category 2, section 4.2.2.) that work to affirm the nation and the nation’s rise, and then there are those that oppose it (as in this theme) and implicitly propose its demise (McCrone, 1998:174). Accordingly, these arguments present a different narrative through which different senses of identity or allegiance could emerge (Billig, 1995:132-133).

4.2.3.5 Theme thirteen: Articles of Union critiqued

As is the case with all nations, Tanzania is a geographical and legal nation and is situated within the world of nations (Billig, 1995:8). The existence and the legal and structural framework of the Union derives its authority and legitimacy from the so called Articles of Union (Shivji, 2008:94). The Articles of Union (see Appendices section, appendix 5) consisting of eight clauses became the domestic law of Tanzania when ‘Tanganyika and Zanzibar were united in one Sovereign Republic’ (Shivji, 2008:94). The Articles of Union also stipulate the ‘Union matters’ which are the preserve of the Parliament and Executive of the United Republic (see Chapter 1, section 1.2.6). These Articles of Union have been critiqued in the coverage of the Daily News and The Citizen.

Articles of Union are critiqued differently in the two newspapers. Of the 66 units that make up the sample, 21 of them addressed this theme. However, as in the case of the category of Problems Experienced, it is addressed more frequently in the privately-owned The Citizen (in 45.5% of its units) than in the state owned Daily News (in 29.1% of its units). The critiques include the recurring argument that, just as the legal foundations of the Union are the root cause for the endless squabbles between Tanganyika and Zanzibar, the Articles of Union are equally contentious (The Citizen, 2005:6). It is argued that from the Union’s inception, the Articles lacked adequate provisions to fortify the Union. For instance the nature of the Union formation is disputed. Particular questions are raised relating to what kind of Union government(s) the Articles initially provided for, whether one, two or three governments (Daily News, 26 April, 2011:11).
Also, it is argued that failure of the Articles to sustain the Union has introduced contentious issues. These include attempts to remove or to add more matters to the original ‘Union matters’. 

_Daily News_ (26 April, 2011:9) article, ‘The Union remains strong despite challenges’, points out:

Writing about the Union in 1999, a local scholar, the late Professor Haroub Othman, stated that the Union has always come under criticism. He said ‘Articles of Union’ provide for matters that would be under the Union arrangement. From the original 11 items in 1964, the list has now expanded to 23 with some people questioning the validity of such expansion.

Again, the _Daily News_ (26 April, 2010) article, ‘Union boat sails on despite stormy seas’ identifies particular concerns relating to Articles of Union (particularly on ‘Union matters’):

There have been in recent years, a campaign or, rather, movement that has threatened to shake the very foundations of the Union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar... Such a movement has been fiercely touting for the removal of ‘Oil and Natural Gas’ from the list of union matters, more say on deep sea fishing and empowerment of the Zanzibar Football Association (ZFA) to be able to join the world Soccer body, FIFA. As if that has not been enough cause for concern, there has been pressure to re-introduce use of passports for all the people travelling to Zanzibar, including citizens of the United Republic..... There has also been pressure, mainly from the Opposition in Zanzibar for the creation of the government of Tanganyika...

Linked to the above criticism of Articles of Union is the argument, particularly from Zanzibaris, that several matters have been added to the original eleven Union matters in the Articles of Union, which undermine the autonomy and identity of Zanzibar. The privately-owned _The Citizen_ (26 April, 2011:2) explains this as follows.

Most Zanzibaris said the original 11 articles were, over time, increased to 30 by last year. This, they observed, was intended to undermine the autonomy and identity of Zanzibar. Their statements follow complaints in the past about the formula of sharing revenues that ensures that 4.5 per cent goes to Zanzibar, a share which the Isles suggest should be raised to 10 per cent. The Union government, however, insists that such an increment would be too high and would be ready to settle for 5 per cent instead.

Likewise, complaints persist that the Union government exclusively bears all costs of collecting revenue in Zanzibar, through the Tanzania Revenue Authority. The structure of government has also been put under a microscope. The bone of the contention is that the Union deals with Union and non-Union matters that are lumped together.

Finally, in both newspapers, Articles of Union are also criticised because at Union’s inception, they were drafted secretively. It is argued that if the problems relating to the Articles are not
resolved, this could lead to the ‘withering away of Union’ (*Daily News*, 26 April, 2009:4), as noted in the previous theme.

Generally, the critiques of Articles of Union, as depicted in both newspapers (with the independent newspaper *The Citizen* addressing this theme more frequently), make two points pertaining to nationhood. First, the arguments contest the nation as currently structured, thus old or prevalent ways of defining or legitimating the nation are challenged and thus new definition(s) or nation(s) (communities) may be imagined (Billig 1995:147). Second, linked to this point, they are concerned with the ongoing process of the nation’s construction as a ‘recurrent activity’ (Billig, 1995:146) that involves practices such as ceaseless reinterpretations, rediscoveries and reconstructions.

### 4.2.3.6 Theme fourteen: divisive lines of identity

According to Schlesinger (1991), national identity is dependent on a repository, *inter alia*, of classificatory systems. In the first place, it allows ‘us’ to define ourselves against ‘them’—understood as those beyond the boundaries of the nation (Schlesinger, 1991:173-174) (see Chapter 2). Such a classificatory system may also reproduce distinction between ‘us’ and ‘them’ at the intra-national level in line with the *internal* structure of social divisions and relations of power and domination (Schlesinger, 1991:174). Additionally, it is argued by Billig (1995) that, after attaining independence, most nations have continuously sought to build a sense of nationhood and unify the multiple sub-national identities, including the ethnic groups that formed these nations. In this theme, I identify two sets of divisive lines of identity which relate to Union in the coverage of the privately-owned *The Citizen* and the state-owned *Daily News*, namely the divide between Unguja and Pemba, and Zanzibar and Tanganyika.

Of the 66 units that make up the sample, 15 of them addressed this theme. Two major patterns of divisive lines of identity relating to Union were described in this theme. First, there was a particular classification that defines Tanzanians (in the Union) in terms of two major opposing identities namely ‘Islanders’ and ‘Mainlanders’ (as also discussed earlier in 4.2.1.2). Consequently, these identities have led to continuous ‘inter union matter’ squabbles in terms of ‘the Islands versus the Mainland’ (*The Citizen*, 26 April, 2005:6).
Secondly, the two newspapers describe particular divisive lines of identity that exist specifically in Zanzibar, and which are viewed as threat to Union’s survival. These divisive lines of identity in Zanzibar also happen in two types namely historical divisive lines of identity and those which resulted from the Union itself (as products of the Union). With regard to the former, it is argued that there are long-time divisive lines of identity between people of Unguja Island (who consider themselves as ‘African progeny/Blacks’) against the people of Pemba Island (as ‘descendants of Arabs’) as explained in the Daily News (26 April, 2006:5).

Unguja and Pemba Islands form Zanzibar. The people hailing from Pemba are in most instances considered as descendants of Arabs, who ruled the Islands with an iron fist, and those from Unguja consider themselves as of African progeny, who were subject to the harsh rule of Arabs. And that is where many analysts believe the bad blood begins between the two, the notion that they are two different peoples, and that one should always rule the other....

The Citizen editorial, ‘This Union is the strength of our nation’, (The Citizen, 26 April, 2005:6) concurs with the above view:

...the Isles have internal squabble to reckon with. In a word, Unguja versus Pemba... The people of Pemba have often expressed the feeling that they are being exploited and marginalised, not getting their rightful share of the economic and political resources. It is historical.

Agriculture is the islands’ economic backbone and cloves the main cash crop. Cloves are grown largely in Pemba, while the landlords live in luxury in Unguja. On the political plane, the pre-colonial mistrust and divide between ASP and ZNP parties are deeply entrenched, with neither CUF nor CCM ever able to win sufficient votes to form a majority government in successive polls since before independence.

Generally, the above argument indicates the existence, in current political parties, of historical divisive lines of identity between Pemba and Unguja which, during nationalist movement (pre-independence), were defined in terms of affiliations with particular political parties namely Zanzibar Nationalist Party (ZNP) for Pembas and Afro-Shirazi Party (ASP) for Ungujas (see Chapter 1, section 1.2.2). Presently, the ruling party, Chama cha Mapinduzi (CCM) is supported most in Unguja, while the leading opposition party in the Isles, Civic United Front (CUF) dominates Pemba (Daily News, 26 April, 2009:4, Daily News, 26 April, 2007:12, The Citizen, 26 April, 2005:6). It is thus argued that this ‘animosity’ between CUF and Zanzibar government
(i.e. CCM) has been a threat to Union because it signals disunity within Zanzibar and hence the Union (*The Citizen*, 26 April, 2010:8, *Daily News*, 26 April, 2009:4). Consequently, the Government of National Unity (established to allow power sharing between CCM and CUF) was formed after the 2010 general election to restrain this animosity between the two political parties (*Daily News*, 26 April, 2011:6).

Finally, the two newspapers describe that the Union itself has led to particular lines of identity among Zanzibaris. These are in terms of those who still support the Union and see it legitimate, against those who oppose it – arguing for ‘a free nation of Zanzibar’ (*Daily News*, 26 April, 2011:7). Below, the *Daily News* (26 April, 2011) article, ‘Some Zanzibaris are sceptical of the Union’, identifies these ‘anti-Union’ elements, but in conclusion the article argues the need to protect the Union, and labels the anti-Union elements merely ‘emotional youths’ (*Daily News*, 26 April, 2011:7):

As Tanzanians mark 47th Union Anniversary, sentiments calling for the separation of Zanzibar and Tanganyika from the union have been emerging particularly in Zanzibar. Unidentified group of youths and some Muslim clerics were in the forefront to demand the end of the union.

The anti-union voice gained momentum recently when the new union constitution draft bill was introduced for debate in Zanzibar on April 8-9, this year. A group of youths emerged and sung “*Muungano hatu-utaki...* (We do not want the Union)” displaying banners that denounce the Union... The visibly emotional youths, singing anti-union songs... displayed banners reading: “*We do not want the union; we want Zanzibar a free nation, no more Tanganyika’s colony ...*”

The divisions or range of identities that people adopt occurs in all nations. Such multiple and different identities can either be deployed to unify (construct) or fragment a particular nation.

### 4.2.4 Category four: Challenges Facing Union

#### 4.2.4.1 Theme fifteen: impacts of new global relationships

In his discussion of the impacts of ‘global forces’ on nations as well the imagining of nation, Billig (1995) argues that in contemporary times, the forces of globalisation in nations work against cultural homogeneity. Such forces are argued to not only erode differences between national cultures, but to also multiply differences within a nation (Billig, 1995:132).
Consequently, global forces have resulted in validating a ‘(global) life-style’ (that is one linked to consumption, rather than the national culture or life-style). The argument is that, global forces, whether endorsed by citizens as individuals or national governments, impose new ways of how nations are imagined. The globalising forces work to diminish differences and spaces between nations on one hand, and fragment the imagined unity within those nations on the other (Billig, 1995:132). To discuss this theme, this analysis focuses on identifying reference to global relationships and their impact on Union in the two newspapers.

This theme (with 36.4% of the units of The Citizen and 23.6% of the units of Daily News units addressing it), includes the argument that the re-introduction of the multiparty system whose in Tanzania in 1992 was impelled by global forces and has led to certain changes. In this case, the coverage presented contesting responses namely those which consider such changes as adverse, and others as positive to Union.

On one hand, with regard to positive impacts of global relationships to Union, it is argued that the multiparty system has attracted majority participation in the decision making process, more freedom of expression as well as openness and more voices to discuss the Union (The Citizen, 26 April, 2008:4, Daily News, 26 April, 2009:9, Daily News, 2011:7). Below, the Daily News (26 April, 2009:4) article, ‘Articles of the Union are “key factors”’, points out:

In this era of multiparty system and openness, it is even more important that matters are discussed and solutions founded on popular will. Of all the political parties that have been established since the abolition of the one-party system, only one, the Democratic Party, led by Rev. Christopher Mtikila, has come out strongly against the Union and called for its dissolution.

The negative impacts of global relationships to Union, identified mostly by the government-owned Daily News, include those changes in the Union (Tanzania) Constitution namely the removal of Zanzibar President from the Union’s vice president position (Daily News, 26 April, 2005:24, Daily News, 26 April, 2007:18). Other impacts of global forces on the Union include the consequences of the world economic system and the policies forged by the powerful northern or industrialised countries, particularly the United States, through international economic
institutions including the International Monetary Fund (IMF)\textsuperscript{12} (\textit{Daily News}, 26 April, 2005:19). It is argued that such forces do great damages to poor African countries and ‘threaten efforts towards African unity, freedom and dignity’ (\textit{Daily News}, 26 April, 2005:19). More particular, it is asserted that globalisation, as ‘an even more vicious form of imperialism’, engulfs and threatens African unity strategies, such as the Union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar (\textit{Daily News}, 26 April, 2010:8).

4.2.4.2 Theme sixteen: relevance of the present Union

This theme was amongst those that received least attention in both newspapers. Of the 66 units of this study’s whole sample, it occurred in 14 units (21.8\% of the units of the state-owned \textit{Daily News}, and 18.2\% of the units of the independent \textit{The Citizen}). It is concerned with the questioning of the relevance of the Union in contemporary Tanganyika and Zanzibar. It is important to note that it is reported that when Tanzania was under single party rule (1964 to 1992), questioning the Union was disallowed and it amounted to crime (\textit{The Citizen}, 26 April, 2008:4). The current multiparty system permits criticism of the Union and assessment of its merits and demerits.

It is argued that the factors and motives that necessitated the formation of Union in 1964 are irrelevant today and no longer adequately convincing. It suggests that the Union’s usefulness and legality are continuously queried by Tanzanians as is its relevance (\textit{The Citizen}, 26 April, 2009, \textit{Daily News}, 26 April, 2010:7). The Union is described as having been a ‘marriage’ of convenience in response to circumstances prevailing at the time, notably Nyerere’s intention to

\textsuperscript{12} The IMF (the International Monetary Fund) and the World Bank were set up during the end of the Second World War to rebuild the economies of Europe. However, due to economic/financial problems many African states encountered after their independence in 1960s, most of them (African states) opted for rescue by the IMF and the World Bank, and in effect, Western donor institutions took over as Africa’s bankers (Meredith, 2006:369). Through IMF and World Bank, many African (and other developing countries) obtain ‘structural adjustment’ programmes loans and other economic assistances whose conditions are arguably a threat to African political, social and economic systems. For instance, among the measures they stipulate in return for their assistance, the IMF and World Bank require governments to: devalue currencies, remove subsidies, reduce tariff barriers and lift restrictions on foreign investment (e.g. forcing developing countries to privatisate their economies and allow Western corporations free access to their raw materials) (Meredith, 2006:370). The then President of Tanzania, Julius Kambarage Nyerere was among the first African leaders to emerge as eloquent opponents of IMF/World Bank conditions until his retirement in 1985 (Meredith, 2006:370).
restrain Zanzibari communists like Kassim Hanga. It should not then be expected to retain its relevance (*The Citizen*, 26 April, 2009:4). Below, the privately-owned *The Citizen* (26 April, 2009:2) article, ‘Calls to renegotiate Union as Tanzania republic turns 45’, gives an explanation of why Union seems irrelevant presently.

... Most of the factors that necessitated the formation of the Union 45 years ago do not hold water today, and this necessitates fresh negotiations. If this is not done, the Union will continue to be seen by sections of the citizenry as irrelevant.

Thus the Union is described by some as problematic and its usefulness questioned (*Daily News*, 26 April, 2009:4, *Daily News*, 26 April, 2010:3). Both newspapers recognise that the Union fails to address certain issues in Tanzania and in ways it is deemed inappropriate or irrelevant. For instance, the contentious issue relating to what should be included in the list of Union matters (i.e. addition or removal of some matters to the original 11‘Union matters’) is one of the unresolved issues (*The Citizen*, 26 April, 2008:4).

Generally, the above arguments relate to how citizens contemplate their nation differently (Billig, 1995:156) and the grand meta-narratives and the old systems of truth (for instance the way in which Union was narrated during single party rule) hold less sway and is contested. Instead, a world of multi-narratives and different ideological positions and interests prevail (Billig, 1995:155).

4.2.4.3 Theme seventeen: shifts in and nature of leadership

In this theme, I address how the two newspapers describe shifts in leadership at different times in Tanzania since 1964. This theme was among those which occurred least often in both newspapers; it occurred in 14 units (21.2%) of the sample, 23.6% of the units in the *Daily News* and 9.1% in *The Citizen*).

Perhaps interesting to note is the manner in which current leaders (i.e. in the 2000s) are portrayed as not doing enough to protect or reinforce the Union. Both newspapers compare the former leaders and founders of Union, i.e. Nyerere and Karume with recent leaders. Former leaders are described positively as active in safeguarding the Union while recent leaders are portrayed as doing the opposite. The Union founders are explicitly endorsed as national symbols (Hall, 1992)
and national heroes (Berger, 2011) and it is proposed that the present leaders’ duty is to follow their example.

It is argued that, unlike the case with the former leaders, recent leaders are the root cause of the Union’s persistent problems. They neglect to perform ‘their central role’ of safeguarding the Union (Daily News, 26 April, 2006:4) which culminates in ‘unnecessary frictions and complaints by both sides’ (Daily News, April, 2006:5). Moreover, it is argued that recent leaders act inappropriately by contesting certain aspects of Union such as its structure (Daily News, 26 April, 2005:12). Some are described as destructive as they ‘want to kill the Union for their own ambitions’ (Daily News, 26 April, 2010:2). However, such accusations are not explicit about what these ‘leaders’ ambitions’ are and ways through which they are fulfilled (i.e. whether through corruption or any other means).

The current Tanzanian leaders are compared unfavourably to the former leaders, Nyerere and Karume, with their consciousness of being African and their political will for unity, as this ‘has been allowed to atrophy’ (Daily News, 26 April, 2005:21). They are seen as posing a threat to the success of strategies for African unity, including that of the Union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar. In contrast to the government-owned publication, in The Citizen (in which this theme was covered in only one article) the contemporary leaders are praised for giving more room for people to question, challenge and express particular views on Union, such as finding ways to improve the Articles of Union or the ‘Union matters’ (The Citizen, 26 April, 2008:4).

In assessing recent leaders’ efforts to sustain the Union, the coverage, particularly of the state-owned Daily News, tends to emphasise the need of recent leaders to follow examples of their predecessors’ position regarding Union.

4.2.5 Category five: Way Forward

4.2.5.1 Theme eighteen: the kind of Union people of Tanganyika and Zanzibar want to retain

This theme is concerned with the extent to which Tanzanians want to retain the Union, as well as the kind of Union they want to retain. Notably, this was the most recurrent theme in the Way
Forward category. Of the 66 units of the sample, it occurred in 44 units. Generally, more than 50% of the units of both newspapers shared the view that many Tanzanians still want the Union and proposed ways forward. 36 (65.5%) of the 55 units of the state-owned paper units covered this theme compared to 8 (72.7%) of 11 units of the independent-owned The Citizen. However, it is important to point out that in this theme both newspapers contradict themselves at different points by proposing different solutions as to the desirable form of Union might. Clearly, although the Union appears to be accepted by many Tanzanians, there exist varied and contesting positions relating to what structure should be embraced.

The first and most recurrent position relates to the need to have a stronger and improved Union, with a form or structure to be decided through ‘majority consent’ (Daily News, 26 April, 2007:17, Daily News, 26 April, 2005:14, The Citizen, 2008:4, Daily News, 26 April, 2008:10). Also, it is argued that Tanzanians want a stronger Union that boosts Tanzania’s integrity at national, regional and international level (Daily News, 26 April, 2005:20). It is proposed that it is only through a new Constitution that a stronger Union can be effected (Daily News, 26 April, 2011:12, Daily News, 26 April, 2011:4). The Daily News (26 April, 2007:18) article, ‘Opinions on union structure diverse’, describes the kind of Union most Tanzanians want.

Some critics claim that the best form of the Union can either be one, two or three-government system, but should reflect the reality of life and the people of the two sides must be treated on equal footing.

Also, it is argued that the resources of the entire United Republic of Tanzania, such as oil and minerals, including diamonds, gold and tanzanite should benefit all Tanzanians (Daily News, 26 April, 2008:5). More particular, the Union should uphold the principles of the Arusha Declaration (see Chapter 1) on socialism and self-reliance and stop ‘dreaming about getting help from outside’ which will thus make Tanzania stronger economically, socially and politically as nation (Daily News, 26 April, 2005:19-21).

Secondly, both newspapers also propose maintaining the present two-government structure. It is postulated that having either one government or three governments may weaken or destroy the Union. As the Tanzania mainland is so much larger than Zanzibar, the latter could be swallowed
by the former (Daily News, 26 April, 2011:8). However, both newspapers propose certain measures to improve this structure, namely (re)recognising Tanganyika’s identity and autonomy in similar ways to Zanzibar currently; and that Zanzibar concerns (see 4.2.3.2), which include Zanzibar’s demand to enjoy her autonomy in international affairs and her identity preserved, be addressed (Daily News, 26 April, 2005:25, The Citizen, 26 April, 2005:6, Daily News, 26 April, 2011:8).

Thirdly, both newspapers propose a federal (single) government structure, ‘which was the dream of founders of Union’, that would strengthen Union and nation as one country (and not as two countries apart), and deal with exploitation and distribution of resources problems (The Citizen, 26 April, 2010:4). It is further argued that a Union with a federal government structure is the sole means to solve the chronic problems which keep arising due to the present two-government structure (Daily News, 26 April, 2008:5).

Generally, these descriptions share a common view: maintaining the Union regardless as to form or structure, while differing in terms of Union structure at different moments. The significance attributed to maintaining the Union can be understood in terms of how national hegemony (here being the Union), and its ‘grand narratives’ and aspects work in society (Blommaert, 2005). In this case, the Union is accepted by both newspapers as appropriate, thus indicating this as hegemonic position and is accepted as indicative of the totality of Tanzania’s social or political system, which is accepted by most members in this system. According to Blommaert (2005:158), such national hegemony stands for the ‘cultural’, ideational aspects of a particular system. It narrates the ‘grand narratives’ characterising its existence, structure, and historical development. It penetrates the whole fabric of societies or communities, resulting into normalised, naturalised patterns of thought and behaviour; and becomes a sort of ‘common sense’. Accordingly, national hegemony is the process that is always in the making and thus ideological work is an ongoing necessity (Croteau and Hoynes, 2000:164). Therefore, these particular representations that relate to the kind of Union people of Tanganyika and Zanzibar want, while unstable, indicate the continuous ideological work for sustaining this national hegemony (Union).
**4.2.5.2 Theme nineteen: proposals for dissolution of Union**

This theme links to the Arguments against Union theme. In contrast to the previous theme, the theme ‘Proposals for dissolution of Union’ presents arguments (and attempts) on the part of some people of Tanganyika and Zanzibar advocating for the dissolution of Union. Unlike the arguments in which both problems of Union were identified and then certain solutions to sustain it were presented (see 4.2.3), this theme identifies the position that denounces the Union and advocates for its termination. The idea of Union as desirable (the hegemonic view) is contested. However, of the 66 units of this study’s whole sample, only 9 (13.6%) units covered this theme (and it occurred in only 10.9% of the units of the *Daily News*, and 27.3% of the units of *The Citizen*). This implies that rejection of Union is arguably not a position endorsed by government in particular, but nor is it by the independent press.

Predominant here was the rejection of Union. In 1984, certain Zanzibari leaders made an unsuccessful attempt to sabotage the Union, an act that led to then Zanzibar President Aboud Jumbe to step down (*Daily News*, 26 April, 2007:9). More recently, during the process of collecting views about the new Constitution bill, some Zanzibaris rejected the Union (*Daily News*, 26 April, 2011:7, ‘Some Zanzibaris are sceptical of the Union’). Zanzibaris’ rejection of the Union is premised on the argument that Union has resulted in Zanzibar being ‘colonised’ by Tanganyika, and thus they want a ‘free Zanzibar’ (*Daily News*, 26 April, 2011:7). It is also claimed that Union has led to the poor state of economy in the Isles as well as a drop in living standard and deterioration of social services (*Daily News*, 26 April, 2011:6).

Another reason for dissolving the Union, as described in the coverage of the two newspapers, relates to its problems. It is argued that since its inception the Union has experienced unresolved problems (for example, Zanzibar’s concerns, administrative squabbles such as quarrels related to Union-matters, Tanganyikans’ feeling that Union has not helped them at all but ‘they spend a lot of their taxes to keep the Isles afloat’) (*The Citizen*, 26 April, 2005:6)). These arguments are used to advocate for its dissolution (*Daily News*, 26 April, 2009:2).

Additionally, the privately-owned *The Citizen* reports that some on both sides of Union advocate for the Union’s dissolution for the purpose of entering the East African Federation (EAF). This
regional cooperation is comprised of East African countries namely Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Rwanda and Burundi. Those advocating for this argue for the dismantling of Union to pave way for a more extended Union (and for Zanzibar to enter the EAF as a separate country) (*The Citizen*, 26 April, 2006:9, see the printed article in full in Appendices section, appendix 2a). It is further asserted that it is better for a nation to join this federation on its own (with a single government) as this makes the terms of cooperation clearer than presently, where Tanzania appears to be comprised of two countries (*The Citizen*, 26 April, 2006:9).

**4.2.5.3 Theme twenty: miscellaneous issues**

This theme serves as a hold-all for a variety of issues reported in both *The Citizen* and *Daily News* which relate to Union but do not specifically fall under any of the identified themes above. Of the 66 units of the sample, 22 units (33.3%) were included in this theme. It occurred in 19 units of the government-owned *Daily News* and in 3 units of the privately-owned *The Citizen*. The issues raised have significance for Union and its present state of affairs. Most aspects included here adopt a position that relates to sustaining the Union.

One of the issues relates to the writing of a new Constitution. It is argued that, there is a need to rewrite Tanzania’s Constitution so that it accommodates the political and economic reforms taking place presently (*Daily News*, 26 April, 2005:24). It further proposed that there is a need for ‘reviewing all provisions and practices that amount to contradictions and controversies’ in the current Constitution (*Daily News*, 26 April, 2006:10, *The Citizen*, 26 April, 2009:4). The article of the government-owned *Daily News* (26 April, 2006:10), ‘Many want Union to stay’, proposes:

There should be constitutional process as there is a need for revisiting constitutional framework and give a fresh start to union politics in general.

Subsequently, in 2011 Tanzania embarked on the process of writing a new Constitution (arguably following various calls, particularly in the press, which demanded this process, as mentioned above). The process is to be completed in 2014 and the new Constitution will accordingly be made law (*Daily News*, 26 April, 2011:13, ‘New Constitution to further strengthen the Union’, *Daily News*, 26 April, 2011:4, ‘Union likely to feature in new Constitution debate’).
Another issue included in this theme relates to significance of Union Day. It is pointed out that Union Day (26 April) should be used significantly to reflect not only the Union’s achievements but also its challenges (Daily News, 26 April, 2005:4, Daily News, 26 April, 2009:2). On this day, the Union’s past should be contemplated and used ‘as the baseline for charting the future’ (The Citizen, 26 April, 2005:6). This argument recognises that a national day is usually regarded as a significant occasion when ‘the state celebrates itself’ (Billig, 1995:44) and suggests that relating to existence of this particular nation may be proposed as a way forward.

Additionally, both newspapers urge Tanzanians and the government of the United Republic of Tanzania in particular to uphold the bodies established by the government to deal specifically with and resolve disputed Union issues. These bodies include a fully fledged ministry under the Union’s Vice President’s Office that deals with Union affairs and a special committee (co-chaired by the prime minister of the United Republic of Tanzania and Zanzibar chief minister) to oversee smooth functioning of Union affairs (Daily News, 26 April, 2006:4, Daily News, 26 April, 2007:4, Daily News, 26 April, 2007:18, Daily News, 26 April, 2008:9, Daily News, 26 April, 2011:2, The Citizen, 26 April, 2011:8).

4.3 Conclusion

This chapter has presented the findings of this study. It offers a discussion of both quantitative and qualitative (thematic) content analysis of the representations of Union in The Citizen and Daily News newspapers coverage of Union Day (2005-2011). The final chapter draws the threads together and summarises the key issues raised in this analysis and proposes certain areas for further research.
CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSION

5.0 Introduction
Without any question, the manner and the implications of the Union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar is the most misunderstood aspect of Tanzania’s political development. It may not matter very much when foreigners get confused, but unfortunately there are many times when Tanzanians themselves appear to misunderstand it (Julius Nyerere in Stephen, 2010:5).

This study has been concerned with the representations of the Union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar in the press, particularly in The Citizen and Daily News newspapers. This chapter presents a brief overview of what the study set out to achieve and the methods it employed before presenting a summary of the key issues that arose from this study. It also suggests areas for further research as far as the focus of this study is concerned. This study set out to investigate the representations of Union in the Union Day coverage of two Tanzanian newspapers, the privately-owned The Citizen and the government-owned Daily News. This chapter focuses on this study’s major findings which aimed at addressing the question and goals of this study.

5.1 Overview
The central research question that impelled this research was, ‘How has the Tanganyika-Zanzibar Union been represented in The Citizen and Daily News newspapers from 2005 to 2011?’ This question is premised on the recognition of the press’s considerable power to select particular issues for inclusion in the news coverage and to define or frame these issues, thereby validating particular understandings and identities as well.

While there is a considerable literature on the Union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar (that formed the United Republic of Tanzania), there is currently no substantial study of how the press engages with this issue (Union). Therefore, this study was undertaken to make a modest contribution to the scholarly work pertaining to the Tanzanian news media, specifically as it relates to the framing and critique of Union in Tanzania.
It focuses on discourses regarding nationhood and thus is informed by theories relating to collective and cultural identities inclusive of national identity. Crucially, it recognises nation as an ideological construct, or an imagined community in Anderson (1983)’s terms. The study worked within a broad cultural and media studies framework and was informed by a constructionist approach to representation that conceptualises culture as a ‘constitutive’ process (Hall, 1997:2). Consistent with this approach, representation is conceptualised as discursive. Language enables the representations of reality that are also shaped by the processes of production and consumption as well as by the broad political and social contexts they inhabit (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002). This approach proposes that representations are not transparent reflections of a world ‘out there’, but a product of historically and culturally specific understandings of the world, and therefore contingent (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002:103). Through their repetition, representations propose ways in which people might understand and make meaning in everyday life.

In line with the position of nation as a construct, the study also incorporated discussion on ideology as ‘discourses that categorise the world in ways that legitimate and maintain social patterns’ (Wetherell and Potter, 1992:95). These discourses or sets of representations and the ideological work they perform are central to how a nation is (continuously) constructed or contested. This research recognises the presence of contesting ideologies, both dominant (national hegemony) and others, and thus allows for the presence of a range of ideological positions in the texts considered and in the press in general.

Additionally, this study drew on theories of agenda-setting (the ability of news media to influence the salience of topics on the public agenda) and framing (McCombs, 2006), as well as theories of the press (Christians et al, 2009). The analysis was informed by normative theories of the press (Christians et al, 2009). If they include the facilitative, radical, monitorial and collaborative roles, the two roles namely monitorial (which overlaps with the familiar press role of watchdog or guardian of the public interest through which the media have no ties with governments) and collaborative (where the media partner with the government) were useful in this case because the study intended to probe the extent to which the selected newspapers
perform these roles in their construction and framing of the Union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar as nation on Union day.

The study used both quantitative and qualitative (thematic) content analysis as the combination of the two methods produced a general, comprehensive and representative picture of the coverage (Bryman, 1996:136) of Union. Qualitative (thematic) content analysis was particularly deployed to probe the particular themes and patterns regarding the Union coverage; as well as the role of how these themes are framed in *The Citizen* and *Daily News* as far as the representation of the Union as nation on the Union Day is concerned. The sample of the coverage of the two publications, *The Citizen* and *Daily News* newspapers, on 26 April of 2005 to 2011 was purposively selected. As mentioned earlier, both are published in English which is also the official language of instruction in Tanzania from secondary level upwards. The *Daily News*, the oldest newspaper in Tanzania, was selected as the only remaining state-owned one that publishes in English (Bourgault, 1995:166, Mfumbusa, 2010). *The Citizen*, a privately-owned paper, has a comparatively wide circulation (Mfumbusa, 2010:160). Both are considered as among Tanzania’s more credible newspapers that in relation to adherence to ethics (Media Council of Tanzania, 2011:1). Also, the time frame from 2005 to 2011 was selected as this coincides with the existence of *The Citizen* which was launched in August 2004 and thus the first time it covered Union day was on 26 April 2005 (Mwananchi, 2011).

The quantitative content analysis of the study’s findings identified that the two newspapers differed in terms of total number of units on Union, with *The Citizen* at 11 units (4 editorials and 7 feature articles) and the government-owned newspaper *Daily News* at 55 units (4 editorials and 51 feature articles). This finding points to the fact that the *Daily News* engaged in issues of Union to a much greater extent, publishing numerous articles and editorials on Union. In this way the *Daily News* collaborates effectively with the state in the construction of nationhood consistent with the way that state media are usually deployed to undertake ideological or discursive work intended for achieving and promoting national hegemony (Billig, 1995:27). Additionally, this points to how the government deploys the news media, a powerful genre of communication, to promote its own ‘propaganda’ or version of reality and hence shape the behaviour of the public in its favour (Richardson, 2007:181). Propaganda in this sense implies
‘the deliberate and systematic attempt to shape perceptions, manipulate cognitions, and direct behaviour to achieve a response that furthers the desired intent of the propagandist’ (Jowett and O’Donnell, 1992:4). These findings further point to the attitude of the government-owned, *Daily News* with regard to Union: it arguably takes a fairly defensive line – defensive of the current dispensation and there is no entertainment really of changes to address (Union) problems.

The qualitative (thematic) content analysis produced a range of interesting findings which are summarised and then discussed critically here. It had been anticipated that, in line with the characteristic of developmental media, the state-owned *Daily News* was likely to assume a collaborative role. However, as it was assumed that the privately-owned, *The Citizen* might adopt a monitorial role in framing and constructing Union as nation, it was surprising to note that it too endorsed the collaborative stance to a certain extent. Thus, both newspapers adopted a collaborative role which is consistent with the development journalism tradition that endorses an informal partnership with the state by playing ‘a positive role’ in the process of development (Christians et al, 2009:201). This is due to the revealed fact that in the coverage’s most recurrent theme: ‘Leadership roles on the Union’, both newspapers coverage presented ‘protection of the Union’ as the duty of leaders. In so doing, they endorsed the state’s objectives of embracing the Union, strengthening it and addressing its problems in line with what the Constitution of the United Republic of Tanzania stipulates (see Chapter 4, section 4.2.1.1).

Although the two newspapers assumed the collaborative role most, by identifying certain problems of the Union, they adopted a monitorial role to a varying extent. This is due to the fact that monitorial role also acknowledges the notion of nation states, and involves identifying certain problems and making the press a forum for diverse views (Christians et al, 2009:142). However, at the end, it was apparent that the press is not that robust in Tanzania arguably because a long period of (government) control (under single party rule as mentioned earlier in Chapter 1) might have left its mark. Consequently, there is no searing critique or exposure (the watchdog stance of ‘barking’ when leaders are perceived to be acting against the public interest through practices such as corruption) (Christians et al, 2009:146). Although there is a mention of an escalating gap between the poor or ‘the have nots’ and the ruling class (‘the haves’) (see Chapter 4, section 4.2.3.4), corruption and corrupt leaders are unnamed. Instead, reference is
merely made to bad leadership. This press’s reluctance to name and shame arguably has its roots in a development journalism approach that is premised on a ‘national-building’ notion and thus any critiques (to leaders) are softened as they are viewed as threats to the ‘advantageous Union’ (*The Citizen*, 26 April, 2005:6). Recently however, the society in general seems to oppose this tendency (in which bad deeds are covered under the auspices of the ‘national building’ notion). Accordingly, this analysis depicted a certain recent trend of an increase in attention to the discussion of problems experienced by Union (see Chapter 4, section 4.1).

The analysis of the findings of this study’s entire sample further revealed that Union coverage was centred on particular themes. Apart from the ‘Leadership roles in the Union’ theme as the most frequently occurring theme, the other five most frequently occurring themes included ‘Identities of Tanganyika and Zanzibar and their citizens in Union’; ‘Positive value attributed to Union’; ‘Arguments for retaining Union’; ‘Founders of Union’; and ‘Factors that prompted Union’. Significantly, ‘Proposals for dissolution of Union’ theme was the least frequently covered theme in this study’s whole sample. This suggests that this particular theme is either avoided or considered inappropriate, as neither in the government’s interest nor in the majority Tanzanians’ interest. Thus, both publications tend to emphasise the ‘supra-national’ identity (Billig, 1995:133) and minimally endorse the challenges or reasons given against such identity.

However, the analysis does reveal a particular trend of increased attention by the privately-owned *The Citizen* to problems experienced by Union. In *The Citizen* coverage of Union across the time spans namely 2005-2008 and 2009-2011 there was significant increase in the occurrence of themes of one particular category, namely Problems Experienced. This escalation in debates (from one period to another) was apparent in these themes namely ‘Arguments opposing Union’; ‘Structure of Union as problematic’; ‘Sidelining of one part of Union’; ‘Power sharing problems’ and ‘Divisive lines of identity’ (see Chapter 4, section 4.1.3.2). This trend validated the argument that more extensive political and constitutional debates that probe the Union question have occurred in Tanzania in recent years, which take up the concerns about problems that have been given articulated. This shift in coverage can also be seen as a response to the liberalisation whereby opposition to Union’s existence, which was formally disallowed, is now permissible in the press (Othman, 2006:61). Generally, this tendency is consistent with the conceptualising of
collective identities within a constructivist approach which underpins this study. Identities are not stable entities, but in flux in relation to the ideas and experiences of individual subjects. There exists contesting positions which pull in different directions and thus provide sets of representations which people will mediate and which will potentially inform their subject positions in relation to them (Hall, 1992:277, Barker, 2000:170). There is evidence of such tensions in the body of texts considered during this time period.

Additionally, the thematic analysis unveiled particular representations of the two sides of Union and identities of their people (namely Tanganyikans, Zanzibaris or Isles people, Tanzanians) which presented the different positions and contentious issues in this Union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar. These contentious issues relating to identities of the people of the two sides are thus consistent with this study’s premise that nation is a construct, and various continuous processes are involved to construct (or contest) it. In line with this position, this provides the possibility of shifts in subject positions (Woodward, 1997:15) for a nation is a product of various historical processes which are not ‘naturally’ occurring phenomenon but contingent historical-cultural formations (Barker, 2000:197).

However, despite such described contentious issues relating to Union, this study has established that a considerable large number of units in each newspaper (more than 50% of each newspaper’s units) shared a common view that many Tanzanians still want the Union, and thus propose certain form(s) it should adopt. This was apparent in ‘The kind of Union people of Tanganyika and Zanzibar want to retain’ theme (one of the most recurrent themes in the Way Forward category) (see Chapter 4, section 4.2.5.1). Both newspapers’ emphasis on this particular strand on Union and their proposals of the form(s) it should adopt can generally be understood in terms of the press’s agenda setting and framing strategies. Thus, the two papers are setting an agenda that narrates the Union, and through which the nation should be understood. It is from these representations which relate to maintaining the Union and its different proposed structures that this study concludes that Union, and its ‘grand narratives’ remains the dominant or hegemonic ideology in Tanzania. Accordingly, this dominant ideology has become a general phenomenon characterising the totality of Tanzania’s social or political system and ascribed to by many. However, this study recognised the existence of other (resistant) ideological positions
that contest this national hegemony (Union). Accordingly, the contesting position is presented but it is recuperated to reinforce the dominant position and in this way the press attempts to paper over the cracks. This is in less unsurprising than it might appear at first sight, because after all the press and the journalists too are (continuously) constructed as national subjects.

This study has undertaken this research within certain limitations which need to be made explicit. It has confined itself to the Union coverage in a particular time frame (from 2005 to 2011) on Union Day. It has also limited its attention to two of the prominent Tanzanian newspapers, namely the state-owned *Daily News*, and the privately-owned *The Citizen* on Union. Generally, this research was limited by scope of the thesis requirements.

5.2 Scope for further research
While this study has considered one aspect of the press in Tanzania, it is evident that the scholarship on the Tanzanian media is relatively slight still and that it would be valuable to gain deeper understanding of the media in the Union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar particularly in relation to the areas of journalism, nationhood, law and politics in general. In particular, with regard to this Union, it is arguably important to further investigate the practices of the news industry in Tanzania in relation to democratic processes and government accountability. Accordingly, this would require engaging media practitioners such as editors and journalists to probe the reasons for the inclusion and exclusion of certain issues relating to Union. Also, further studies could valuably investigate the extent to which people of both sides (Tanganyika and Zanzibar) endorse (or do not endorse) the Union, and if they have constitutional means to do so. Additionally, it was apparent in this analysis that both newspapers (their articles in particular) tended to be acritical and non-investigative in nature. This is arguably because of limited editorial independence as a consequence of the influence of media owners, the laws of the land, especially those related to media, as well as of the political system in general. Therefore, further research with regard to such constraints on critical reportage should be undertaken in order to inform further in-depth debates to facilitate more probing commentary.

Importantly, a scarcity of scholarly work relating to the press and its role in relation to nationhood, particularly in African countries, suggest the need for more studies in order to chart
what has been happening. With regard to nationhood, Africa has witnessed secessions, as well as certain kinds of unions resembling the Union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar, most of which did not endure. Such attempts by post independent African countries to form unions or federations, particularly in 1960s, included between Mali and Mauritania, Senegal and Gambia to form Sene-Gambia, as well as Guinea and Guinea Bissau to form Guinea-Bissau (Wa Simbeye, 2010:7). More recently, Sudan as a nation has allowed a secession of its southern part. This has resulted into the formation of two nations namely Sudan (whose citizens are mostly Muslims) and Southern Sudan (whose citizens are mostly Christians). It is thus important that more studies relating to nationhood and the press are undertaken so as to add to the academic-base knowledge in Africa and the world at large.

To this end, this study has recognised the importance of a critical media in Tanzania and other countries in order to further the democratic projects. Freedom of expression is fundamental to this endeavour, as is good governance and accountability in order to work towards social justice. As the media are powerful actors in shaping understandings and influencing attitudes, they must also provide a forum for public criticism and the representation of contesting positions that encourages tolerance and diversity of ideas.
APPENDICES

Appendix 1(a) Daily News feature article, 26 April, 2005:25: ‘Critical focus on Union Structure’
Appendix 1 (b): A sample analysis of the *Daily News* feature article (appendix 1a above)

*2005: Daily News: ‘Critical focus on Union structure’ (pg. 25). By Mb enoko Munyaga*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories &amp; Descriptions</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Analysis (coded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HISTORY &amp; DESCRIPTIONS</strong></td>
<td>Factors that prompted the Union</td>
<td>• For African Unity; starting by moving towards a unitary government where Tanganyika and Zanzibar would cease to exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of Union</td>
<td>o A two-government structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Identities of Tanganyika & Zanzibar, and their citizens | Citizens’ identity:  
- ‘Tanganyikans’ and ‘Zanzibaris’ respectively.  
- ‘Mainlanders’ (i.e. Tanganyikans).  
- The two states’ identity:  
  • Zanzibar’s internal autonomy remains  
  • Zanzibar as a ‘small partner’ in the Union  
  • Tanganyika (and its identity) ceased to exist after 1964 (Tanganyika was swallowed).  
- Tanzania mainland as a ‘big partner’ in the Union |
| Founders of Union | o **Julius Nyerere** *(him alone mentioned)* as its founder, and the Union is probably his biggest unfinished business. |
| Leadership roles on the Union | • To improve the Union and work on the complaints, regarding the Union, from both sides of the Union. |
| Extra (non-political) issues |

| **VALUE OF UNION** | Positive value | • The most enduring merger of two sovereign states in Africa. |
| Arguments for retaining Union | o Because a break-up of the Union would be tragic leading to socio-economic disruption. |

| **PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED** | Arguments opposing Union | • ‘Unknown kind of Union’ (the Court in the treason case of 2000 failed to define this Union; they said it was neither unitary nor federal but some form of union). |
| Structure of Union as problematic | o The current structure is problematic because it ‘killed’ the autonomy/identity of Tanganyika (while that of Zanzibar remained). |
| Sidelining of one part of Union | • Mainlanders hardly have business opportunities in Zanzibar due to cultural and economic reasons (But Zanzibaris have more unlimited business opportunities in the mainland). |
| Power sharing problems | o Although Zanzibaris are fewer than mainlanders (1 million vs. 40+million), they have more leadership chances, not in fair proportion to the comparative populations above. |
| Articles of Union critiqued |

| **CHALLENGES FACING UNION** | Relevance of the present Union |
| Shifts in and nature of leadership | o Some recent leaders (e.g. the then Chief Justice Francis Nyalali -in 1990s), unlike Nyerere and Karume who opted for two-government, have suggested the formation of the three-government structure. |

| **WAY FORWARD** | Proposals for dissolution of Union |
| The kind of Union people of Tanganyika and Zanzibar want to retain | • The terms of partnership must be made clear to all  
• With a two-government structure, but, (unlike the current one) that **recognises Tanganyika’s identity** and autonomy as it is for Zanzibar currently. (A-three-government structure would kill the union because one partner is too big, and another small). |

| Miscellaneous issues | }
Our Union has come of age

The United Republic of Tanzania has come of age. And it is for a fact. There are many examples to illustrate this point. Tanzanians born on April 26, 1964—the day the People's Republic of Zanzibar and the Republic of Tanganyika formally united—were yesterday celebrating the 41st birthday. A human being at 41 years is a grown-up person. This yardstick alone justifies grand celebrations.

But there is another way of explaining the pride Tanzanians find in the United Republic. Leaders of yesterday knew and explained sincerely the meaning and importance of uniting Africans. But from experience, they finally learned how costly unity was. It was easy to talk about uniting Africans but very difficult to unite independent African countries in which they live.

It is for this reason that Tanzanians remain the only people who walk tall and talk on this score on our continent. For Tanzania is still the only enviable living example of unity in Africa. This is a big deal. It is something to cherish.

Tanzania is not only in existence. It is going strong—contrary to what detractors and ill-wishers say. It is valued and needed, in earnest, by Tanzanians. At individual or organisational levels, people who think they cannot effectively do what they badly need to do on the Mainland quickly rush to their leaders to serve their interests in unison. They have that opportunity, that right, because of the Union.

Today, Tanzanians have more areas of co-operation—practically in all branches of national life—compared to when the Union was created. The call to solve the 'Union problems' is proof of how informed Tanzanians value the Union as political entity and its inherent benefits to all Tanzanians.

A day like yesterday must be used to reflect not only on the achievements of this unique unity but also the challenges. The biggest challenge is to strengthen the Union without weakening its pillars. This is something Tanzanians must understand, especially leaders at the national level—and this includes leaders in opposition parties.

In strengthening the Union, the main consideration must be preserving the identity of Zanzibar. Unity has a price!
Appendix 1 (d): A sample analysis of the *Daily News* editorial (appendix 1c above)

2005: (Editorial): *Daily News*: ‘Our Union has come of age’ (pg. 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Analysis (coded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HISTORY &amp; DESCRIPTIONS</td>
<td>Factors for Union</td>
<td>• African Unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure of Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Identity of Zanzibar should always ‘be preserved’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Founders of Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership roles in the Union</td>
<td>• To strengthen the Union without weakening its pillars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Preserving the identity of Zanzibar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extra (non-political) issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUE OF UNION</td>
<td>Positive value</td>
<td>• The only enviable living example of unity in Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A pride of Tanzanians; something to cherish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• In the Union, Tanzania has been stronger as a nation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A ‘grown-up’ Union (it has come of age).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arguments for retaining Union.</td>
<td>• Union gives Tanzanians of both sides more areas of cooperation in all branches of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• It offers opportunity and right for mainlanders to serve their interests (e.g. jobs) in the Isles and vice versa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Union is valued and needed, in earnest, by Tanzanians (a call to solve Union problems is a proof how informed Tanzanians value the Union as a political entity and its benefits to all Tanzanians).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED</td>
<td>Arguments opposing Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure of Union as problematic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sidelining of one part</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power sharing problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articles of Union critiqued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divisive lines of /identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHALLENGES FACING UNION</td>
<td>Relevance of the present Union</td>
<td>• Former leaders (‘leaders of the past’) knew and explained sincerely the meaning and importance of uniting Africans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shifts in and nature of leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts of new global relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAY FORWARD</td>
<td>Proposals for dissolution of Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The kind of Union people of Tanganyika and Zanzibar want</td>
<td>• That preserves the identity of Zanzibar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous issues</td>
<td>• Union Day must be used to reflect not only the achievements of this unique unity but also the challenges.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 (a): *The Citizen* feature article, 26 April, 2006:9; ‘Opposition should propose new Union strategies’

The Tanzanian Union is 42. We can be proud of the achievements, both positive and negative. Whatever were the motives of the quick decision made by both Nyere and Leuwre to form the Union, we are satisfied that it still exists.

The union was formed just 106 days after the Zanzibar Revolution. It has taken more than the age of the union to effectively consider the formation of the East African Federation. Many people consider that a formation of a federation or union should first take into consideration the economic benefits of the countries concerned.

It is said that such unions should consider the fundamentals of custom union, tax administration, economic policies, and a common market, whereby free movement of the factors of production including people (labour) and investment should be considered before any political union or federation is formed.

But in Zanzibar, these were not considered at all. In fact, it took more than a decade for Tanganyika to freely visit Zanzibar. In the union survived.

Our union was based on political will of both the people and their leaders. What has been missing in East Africa is political will. Nyere has long suggested a fast track to the federation. This was before Tanganyika became independent. He wanted to push the union first so that the entire African economy, boundary, political and social problems would be sorted out within the premises of the union.

The Tanganyika and Zanzibar marriage has never been a happy one. But it has survived the test of time. We married without considering all the shortcomings we had.

On the other hand, leaders who formed the present EAC are taking more time to dwell on economic issues rather than taking into account the political will of the people.

The question is one. Do we need to federate? If so, what should we do to achieve the goal? Do we first solve individual country problems and then unite or vice versa?

West Germany and East Germany became a federation just after the fall of Berlin Wall. But there were big differences on the level of development in almost all spheres including political, democracy, economic, trade, social, level of technology and others.

But because of strong political will to have one united Germany, the Eastern people were willing to foraks employment to enhance unity.

There were no such considerations we are now having in the formation of the East African Federation.

One group which could make the fire of politics in the status of the present union in relation to the EA Federation is the opposition parties. They have much to scrutinize. They have to inform the people on the benefits of the Federation and propose ways on how we can enter into such an union as an already unified country.

The opposition can propose that Zanzibar enters the union as a separate country because obviously security, policing and defense departments will become federal matters. With Burundi, Rwanda and Zanzibar the Federation will have three big countries and three small countries.

We shall simply break the union very honourably so as to pave way for a bigger union. What is wrong with this idea? We in Tanzania have a history of breaking up two political parties. IANU and ASP to ceremonially launch CCM as a stronger party.

If we are not willing to break the union, then it is much better to have a single government and enter the Federation as Tanzania with one government, which can give some special internal powers to Zanzibar.

After all, the union with Zanzibar was never an economic union but a political one.

The aim of this message today is to suggest to the politicians like Mbobe, Lipumba, Mrema, Mbata, and Choyo to concentrate on educating people on the future of union, and the need for an early formation of federation. We should not leave all ideas with CCM and then come lamenting while some things go wrong. The political parties are registered to polite daily and not only during elections.
### Appendix 2 (b): A sample analysis of *The Citizen* feature article (appendix 2a above)

2006: *The Citizen*: ‘Opposition should propose new Union strategies’ (pg.9). By A Correspondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories &amp; Descriptions</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Analysis (coded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **HISTORY & DESCRIPTIONS** | Factors that prompted the Union | • Towards African Unity  
  • Political will of both the people (of Tanganyika and Zanzibar) and their leaders. |
|                           | Structure of Union | |
|                           | Identities of Tanganyika & Zanzibar and their citizens | |
|                           | Founders of Union | • Nyerere and Karume as leaders who ‘made quick decisions to form the Union’ |
|                           | Leadership roles in the Union | o To concentrate on educating people (of Tanzania) on the future of Union  
  o To propose ways on how Tanzania could enter in the East African Federation herself as a united country. |
|                           | Extra (non-political) issues | |
| **VALUE OF UNION** | Positive value | o Tanzanians are proud of the Union’s achievements, both positive and negative  
  o Tanzanians are satisfied with the Union, thus it still exists. |
|                           | Arguments for retaining Union | • It is based on both people’s (Tanganyika and Zanzibar) and their leaders’ political will. |
| **PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED** | Arguments opposing Union | • The Tanganyika and Zanzibar marriage (Union) has never have been a happy one because ‘we married without considering all the shortcomings we had’. |
|                           | Structure of Union as problematic | |
|                           | Sidelining of one part of Union | |
|                           | Power sharing problems | |
|                           | Articles of Union critiqued | |
|                           | Divisive lines of identity | |
| **CHALLENGES FACING UNION** | Relevance of the present Union | |
|                           | Shifts in and nature of leadership | |
|                           | Impacts of new global relationships | |
| **WAY FORWARD** | Proposals for dissolution of Union | • For the purpose of entering the East African federation, that comprises of Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Zanzibar Burundi and Rwanda, the Union could be broken to pave way for a ‘bigger Union’ (thus Zanzibar to enter the EAF as a separate country, for it is better to enter, each country, as one government). |
|                           | The kind of Union people of Tanganyika and Zanzibar want to retain | o To have only one government so that it becomes appropriate to enter the East African federation/Union, as ‘real’ one country |
|                           | Miscellaneous issues | |
Tanganyika, Zanzibar union here to stay

Today, the people of Tanzania mark 42 years of political marriage between the sovereign countries of Tanganyika and Zanzibar. That these two states were willing to surrender their sovereignty and form Tanzania—the country which we are proud of today—is testimony to the gift of vision of its founders. 42 years are by all means, not a short period. At that age, people already have grown up children and might even be having grand children.

We are referring to the duration of the Union to signify the fact that it has endured a lot of challenges since its inception.

In fact, during its first decade of existence, people used to murmur here and there that it was going to collapse within no time.

The international press was also not left behind as it also projected the picture that the Union was doomed from the start.

Given that picture, we have to accept that the act of initiating and actualizing the Union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar was an act of bravery.

Mwalimu Nyerere was always tried whenever people questioned the legality of the Union. He used to quip that it was a shame that people were quick to accept boundaries demarcated by the colonial masters and were ridiculing the borders set by two independent African countries.

It was this tenacity of the founding fathers that made them brave through stormy political waters.

Had it been that this union was the work of two individuals only, then it would surely have died a long time ago.

When Zanzibar President Abdal Amani Karume was assassinated, his successor took the same line and even went as far as uniting the ruling political parties of Tanganyika and Zanzibar.

Since his assassination, four Zanzibar presidents have taken turns to rule the Spice Islands peacefully and had served until the end of their tenure of office.

The incumbent President of the Isles, Mr Amani Karume, is the fifth successor to the founding leader, and by coincidence, happens to be his son.

Likewise on the Mainland, two presidents have ruled after Nyerere stepped down. The incumbent, Mr Jakaya Mrisho Kikwete, is the third leader after Mwalimu.

All this shows that had it not been that this Union comes from the people, then it would long have been dead and buried.

Its founders, Mwalimu Nyerere and Sheikh Karume, have passed away, but their legacy still continues.

This is the Union that has proved that the African people are indeed one.

The historical links between Tanzania Mainland and the Spice islands date back thousands of years, and the migration of people from one part to another had been the norm for centuries.

The history of slave trade did bind the inhabitants of this part of Africa even more closely and in fact, sealed their fate through the baptism of fire they underwent at the hands of slave traders.

This is how fine gold is made. It must first be smelted in a furnace so that it melts, cools down and crystallizes.

This is also the theory of political unions.

It therefore means that all the trials, which the Union is currently passing through, and those of the past, will eventually make it stronger as years pass by because this is history in the making.

The important thing is to address any technical problems that keep arising as government leaders of both sides of the Union execute their tasks.
### Appendix 2 (d): A sample analysis of *The Citizen* editorial (appendix 2c above)

2006: (Editorial): *The Citizen*: ‘Tanganyika, Zanzibar Union here to stay’ pg. 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Analysis (coded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HISTORY & DESCRIPTIONS              | Factors that prompted the Union                                        | ▪ The historical links between Tanzania mainland and the Spice Islands that date back thousands of years (and the migration of people from one part to another had been the norm for centuries; the slave trade even did bind the inhabitants of these two parts more closely).  
  ▪ For African Unity                |
| Structure of Union                  |                                                                        |                                                                                 |
| Identities of Tanzania & Zanzibar    |                                                                        |                                                                                 |
| & their citizens                    |                                                                        |                                                                                 |
| Founders of Union                   |                                                                        | ▪ Citizens identity: ‘The people of Tanzania’                                    |
| Leadership roles in the Union       |                                                                        | ▪ The Union is the gift of vision of its founders i.e. Nyerere and Karume; it was an act of bravery by these founding fathers.  
  ▪ Though they have passed away, their legacy still continues. |
| Extra (non-political) issues        |                                                                        | o To address any technical problems which keep arising regarding the Union.      |
| VALUE OF UNION                      | Positive value                                                         | o It has endured a lot of challenges since its inception; and thus is now a ‘grown up union’.  
  o It is a proof that the African people are indeed one. |
| Arguments for retaining Union       |                                                                        | ▪ It comes from the people and not merely leaders/founders.  
  ▪ Union is the history in the making; thus the trials it is currently passing through, and those of the past, will make it stronger as years pass by. |
| PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED               | Arguments opposing Union                                               |                                                                                 |
| Structure of Union as problematic   |                                                                        |                                                                                 |
| Sidelining of one part of Union     |                                                                        |                                                                                 |
| Power sharing problems              |                                                                        |                                                                                 |
| Articles of Union critiqued         |                                                                        |                                                                                 |
| Divisive lines of identity          |                                                                        |                                                                                 |
| CHALLENGES FACING UNION             | Relevance of the present Union                                         |                                                                                 |
| Shifts in and nature of leadership  |                                                                        |                                                                                 |
| Impacts of new global relationships |                                                                        |                                                                                 |
| WAY FORWARD                         | Proposals for dissolution of Union                                     |                                                                                 |
| The kind of Union people of Tanzania & Zanzibar want to retain | o ‘A stronger one’                                                      |                                                                                 |
| Miscellaneous issues                |                                                                        |                                                                                 |
### Appendix 3 (a): *The Citizen* feature articles’ authors (2005-2011): female authors versus male authors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Number of feature articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Salma Said</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Elias Mhegera</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ray Naluyaga</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dismas Lyassa</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Polycarp Machira</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of male authors: 4 (80%)</th>
<th>Feature articles by male authors: 4 (80%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of female authors: 1 (20%)</td>
<td>Feature articles by female authors: 1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of authors: 5</td>
<td>Total feature articles: 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 (b): *Daily News* feature articles’ authors (2005-2011): female authors versus male authors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Number of feature articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Assah Mwambene</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gabby Mgaya</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Charles Nzo Mmbaga</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Chaby Barasa</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Masato Masato</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ichikaeli Maro</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ali Uki</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mboneko Munyaga</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Julius Nyerere</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Faraja Mgabati</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Kilasa Mtambalik</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Jiang Alipo</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Issa Yussuf</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Deogratias Mushi</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Gasirigwa Sengiyumva</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Iman Mani</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Mangengesa Mdimi</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Karl Lyimo</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Dassu Stephen</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Richard Mngazija</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Finnigan wa Simbeye</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Beniel Seka</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Orton Kiishweko</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Prudenciana Temba</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Sebastian Mrindoko</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Pius Rugonzibwa</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Nasongelya Kilyinga</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Andy Cons</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Alvar Mwakyusa</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of male authors: 26 (89.7%)

Feature articles by male authors: 44 (91.7%)

Total number of female authors: 3 (10.3%)

Articles by female authors: 4 (8.3%)

Total number of authors: 29

Total number of articles: 48
Appendix 4: Theme by theme analysis and issues therein
Theme 1: Leadership roles in the Union

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme occurrences in 7 years</th>
<th>Issues mentioned and the most emphasised one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong>&lt;br&gt;47 in 51 articles (92.2%)</td>
<td>1. To have good (political) will to protect, promote and strengthen the Union and national unity (‘at any cost’) for the good of every Tanzania (23 times=30.7%)&lt;br&gt;2. Encouraging people’s (of the two countries) interactions (socially e.g. sports, politically and economically) (5 times=6.7%)&lt;br&gt;3. Mobilising people’s support and participation in the Union by educating them on the importance of Union (8 times=10.7%)&lt;br&gt;4. Promoting tourism as a way to strengthen Union and vice versa (promote Union to strengthen tourism industry) (1 times=1.3%)&lt;br&gt;5. To address Union problems e.g. any complaints by any of the part (Zanzibar or Tanganyika) on Union related issues (Union matters), Union administrative and constitutional shortcomings, amicably and through joint and open/free discussions. (27 times=36%)&lt;br&gt;6. To maintain, evaluate and guard the Union’s achievements of the last more than forty years (since it was formed) and use them to improve its future (3 times=4%)&lt;br&gt;7. Preserving the identity of Zanzibar in the Union and address its particular concerns (2 times=2.7%)&lt;br&gt;8. To work, to be elected and to stay in power in accordance with the Union’s or Tanzania’s Constitution (2 times=2.7%)&lt;br&gt;9. To seriously address main issues regarding the situation in Zanzibar i.e. the historical identity problems between Pemba and Unguja people (2 times=2.7%)&lt;br&gt;10. To involve experts, such as forming commissions, from both sides of Union to deal with sensitive national matters such as the new constitution making (2 times=2.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong>&lt;br&gt;7 in 7 articles (100%)</td>
<td><strong>Total emphasis in 10 issues: 75 times</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News editorials (2005-2011):</strong>&lt;br&gt;4 in 4 editorials (100%).</td>
<td><strong>The most emphasised issue:</strong> To address Union problems e.g. any complaints by any of the part (Zanzibar or Tanganyika) on Union related issues (Union matters), Union administrative and constitutional shortcomings, amicably and through joint and open/free discussions. (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen editorials (2005-2011):</strong>&lt;br&gt;4 in 4 editorials (100%).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theme 2: Identities (naming) of Tanganyika and Zanzibar and their citizens in the Union

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme occurrences in 7 years</th>
<th>Issues mentioned and the most emphasised one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong> 47/51 articles (92.2%)</td>
<td>a. <strong>Citizens identities</strong> 1. Tanzanians (34 times =53.1%) 2. Zanzibaris/people of Zanzibar (19 times=29.7%) 3. Islanders/Ile people (5 times =7.8%) 4. Mainlanders/Mainland people (2 times=3.1%) 5. Tanganyikans (2 times=3.1%) 6. People of the two sides (2 times=3.1%) Total emphasis in 6 issues: 64 times The most emphasised issue: ‘Tanzanians’ (53.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong> 6 in 7 articles (85.7%)</td>
<td>b. <strong>Names/ ‘Identities’ of the two states:</strong> 1. Zanzibar as a smaller partner/ country in the Union (3 times=9.1%) 2. Zanzibar remains autonomous (internal autonomy) or semi autonomous, with its own government, president and legislature (11 times=33.3%) 3. Both Zanzibar and Tanganyika (‘the two partners’) remain sovereign and never lost their identity, their names: Tanzania mainland and Zanzibar (6 times=18.2%) 4. Zanzibar has in the recent years expanding its autonomy including having its own Flag and National Anthem and more expansion is due to the birth of the Government of National Unity (CCM &amp; CUF) (3=9.1% times) 5. Zanzibar benefits from the economic and political clout of mainland (1 times=3.1%) 6. Zanzibar is ‘inferior’ and is muzzled by the mainland (3 times=9.1%) 7. Tanganyika, and its government which was ‘deleted’ by Parliament of the United Republic of Tanzania on 25.04.1964, is completely absorbed in Tanzania government (3 times=9.1%) 8. The mainland, unlike Zanzibar, is a calm side with a peaceful atmosphere, despite a large number of ethnic groups (2 times=6.1%) 9. Zanzibar is a complex entity that needs due attention for it has withstood politics of hatred, reprisals and racial tensions (1 times=3.1%) Total emphasis in 9 issues: 33 times The most emphasised issue: Zanzibar remains autonomous... (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News editorials (2005-2011):</strong> 4 in 4 editorials (100%).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen editorials (2005-2011):</strong> 4 in 4 editorials (100%).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theme 3: Founders of Union

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme occurrences in 7 years</th>
<th>Issues mentioned and the most emphasised one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong></td>
<td>- Julius Nyerere (President of Tanganyika) and Abeid Aman Karume (President of Zanzibar) as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 in 51 articles (72.5%)</td>
<td>1. Architects (‘crafters’) of the Union who set its good and strong foundations. (7 times=12.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong></td>
<td>2. Leaders who were ‘major players’ (‘prime movers’) in the Union formation and were committed to the Articles of the Union even after 1964 (5 times=9.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 in 7 articles (85.7%)</td>
<td>3. Fervent believers of African unity and participants of Pan-Africanism movement; they are ‘symbols of unity’. (7 times=12.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News editorials (2005-2011):</strong></td>
<td>4. Founders and founding fathers of Union and Tanzania. (18 times=32.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 in 4 editorials (50%).</td>
<td>5. Leaders who made ‘quick’ and ‘wise’ decision to form the Union. (4 times=7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen editorials (2005-2011):</strong></td>
<td>6. Union is the gift (‘noble treasure’) of their vision or dream and the product of their amicable agreement, and their legacy still continues. (5 times=9.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 in 4 editorials (100%).</td>
<td>7. The powers of the two in their countries, and personal and political interests are the means that led to the Union. (5 times=9.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. The two leaders who signed the Union agreement on their own, without any referendum (‘the deal between the two leaders alone’). (4 times=7.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total emphasis in 8 issues: **55 times**

**The most emphasised issue:** Founders and founding fathers of Union and Tanzania. (32.7%)
### Theme 4: Factors that prompted the Union

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme occurrences in 7 years</th>
<th>Issues mentioned and the most emphasised one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong> 37 in 51 articles (72.5%)</td>
<td>1. Pan-Africanism and African Unity (<em>27 times</em>=37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong> 3 in 7 articles (42.9%)</td>
<td>2. Long time historical interactions (social, political etc) between Tanganyikans and Zanzibaris (<em>25 times</em>=34.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News editorials (2005-2011):</strong> 4 in 4 editorials (100%)</td>
<td>3. Security reasons for independent Tanganyika and Zanzibar after 1964 revolution (<em>6 times</em>=8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen editorials (2005-2011):</strong> 2 in 4 editorials (50%)</td>
<td>4. Cold war rivalry (super powers interests) (<em>7 times</em>=9.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Power interests and amicable agreement between the ‘founding fathers of Union’ i.e. Nyerere and Karume (<em>4 times</em>=5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. To promote social, economic and cultural development of both sides (<em>1 times</em>=1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. To promote world peace (<em>1 times</em>=1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Political will of both the people of Tanganyika and Zanzibar and their leaders (<em>1 time</em>=1.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total emphasis in 8 issues: **72 times**

**The most emphasised issue:** Pan-Africanism and African Unity (37.5%)
Theme 5: Structure of Union

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme occurrences in 7 years</th>
<th>Issue (s) mentioned and the most emphasised one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong>&lt;br&gt;32 in 51 articles (62.7%)</td>
<td>1. Two-government structure: United Republic of Tanzania government and the Government of Zanzibar (a ‘lose’ structure for the two countries not to lose their identities) (42 times = 100%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong>&lt;br&gt;6 in 7 articles (85.7%)</td>
<td>Total emphasis in 1 issue: 42 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News editorials (2005-2011):</strong>&lt;br&gt;3 in 4 editorials (75%)</td>
<td>The most emphasised issue: Two-government structure: United Republic of Tanzania government and the Government of Zanzibar (100%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen editorials (2005-2011):</strong>&lt;br&gt;1 in 4 editorials (25%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Theme 6: Extra (non-political) issues in cementing the Union

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme occurrences in 7 years</th>
<th>Issues mentioned and the most emphasised one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Daily News Feature articles** *(2005-2011):*  
15 in 51 articles (29.4%) | 1. Sports, before 1964 and after, cement the Union by refreshing the long established ties (and help to strengthen a sense of brotherhood) between the two sides i.e. Tanganyika and Zanzibar. *(7 times = 46.7%)* |
| **The Citizen Feature articles** *(2005-2011):*  
1 in 7 articles (14.3%) | 2. Tourism (i.e. cooperation in tourism between the two sides of Union) is the industry that mostly cements the Union, and gives Tanzania highest foreign exchange earnings/income. *(1 time = 6.7%)* |
| **Daily News editorials (2005-2011):**  
1 in 4 editorials (25%). | 3. Social interactions such as intermarriages between couples from both sides over the centuries to date, and common culture of people of the two sides such as Kiswahili language have cemented the blood relations of the Mainlanders and Zanzibaris and make the Union permanent. *(6 times = 40.0%)* |
| **The Citizen editorials (2005-2011):**  
0 in 4 editorials (0%). | 4. Religion cements the Union as it plays a positive and active role in keeping nationals from the Isles in touch with those on the Mainland. *(1 times = 6.7%)* |

**Total emphasis in 4 issues: 15 times**

**The most emphasised issue:** Sports, before 1964 and after, cement the Union by refreshing the long established ties (and help to strengthen a sense of brotherhood) between the two sides i.e. Tanganyika and Zanzibar. *(46.7%)*
Theme 7: Positive value attributed to Union

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme occurrences in 7 years</th>
<th>Issues mentioned and the most emphasised one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong> 47 in 51 articles (92.2%)</td>
<td>1. A unique Union as a longest surviving, strong and successful (grown-up, ‘the most enduring merger’) one despite tribulations it has faced; and shining and enviable example of unity in Africa and the world which has boosted Tanzania’s integrity, voice and strength as nation. (E.g. it has maintained peace, tranquillity and political stability of the country and region; it enabled Tanzania to stand steadfast in the liberation struggle of the Southern African states, and has enabled good governance). <em>(46 times=59.7%)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong> 5 in 7 articles (71.4%)</td>
<td>2. The pride and ‘noble treasure’ (‘one of the greatest wonders in the African political landscape’) of Tanzanians, and proof to Africa that African Unity, given the good and political will, could be done. <em>(15 times=19.5%)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News editorials (2005-2011):</strong> 4 in 4 editorials (100%).</td>
<td>3. A union that came to restore and strengthen the long-time established good and close links between the people of Tanganyika and Zanzibar and most Tanzanians still want it. <em>(7 times=9.1%)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen editorials (2005-2011):</strong> 4 in 4 editorials (100%).</td>
<td>4. The Union is going stronger and has brought in a lot of social, economic and cultural achievements to both sides <em>(9 times=11.7)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total emphasis in 4 issues: **77 times**

**The most emphasised issue:** A unique Union as a longest surviving, strong and successful (grown-up, ‘the most enduring merger’) one, despite tribulations it has faced; and shining and enviable example of unity in Africa and the world which has boosted Tanzania’s integrity, voice and strength as nation. *(59.7%)*
### Theme 8: Arguments for retaining Union

#### Theme occurrences in 7 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>4th to 11th Issues</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News Feature articles</strong></td>
<td>45 in 51 articles</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen Feature articles</strong></td>
<td>5 in 7 articles</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News editorials</strong></td>
<td>4 in 4 editorials</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen editorials</strong></td>
<td>4 in 4 editorials</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Issues mentioned and the most emphasised one

1. The Union has to be retained because it is the people’s integration, not merely leaders’ integration; there is prevailing good will of majority Tanzanians (‘sufficient Tanzanians’ voices of reasons/consensus’) who still want it, and leaders’ political will to protect and sustain it. (18 times=22.8%).

2. Union is the best way to be in as unified people and formalises/makes official and strengthens the historical and beneficial relationships (economic, social and political) between Zanzibaris and Tanganyikans (‘it is not only political but also a social and cultural thing’). (12 times=15.2%)

3. The Union leads the country to more development (benefits) and better life such as improved social services, avails Tanzanians especially youths with economic and social (equal) opportunities such as to work in sectors like tourism industry in either side of the Union, peace and stability. (28 times=35.4%)

4. The Union has to be maintained because a break-up of this merger would be tragic leading to socio-economic disruption. E.g. Union makes Tanzania to remain a state of peace, tranquillity and good governance, without the Union things will be different-as in other African countries with political instability (Tanzanians’ strength rests on the Union e.g. without Union the situation between the two islands Pemba and Unguja will be shaky). (7 times=8.9%)

5. Union is an important means to avoid new form of external domination or any external threats and exploitation. (2 times=2.5%)

6. It is absurd for Tanzanians to break ‘the unique Union’ considering that many regions of the world are now pressing for economic, social and cultural integration to solve their common problems. (9 times=11.4%)

7. The Union should stay because the two partners (Tanzania mainland and Zanzibar) have been able to solve – and continue to solve – the few snags that have arisen along the way. (2 times=2.5%)

8. The Union should be maintained on the ground of the legal backing given to it by the Union founding fathers namely Julius Nyerere and Abeid Karume. (1 times=1.3%)

Total emphasis in 8 issues: **79 times**

**The most emphasised issue**: The Union leads the country to more development (benefits) and better life such as improved social services … (35.4%)
Theme 9: Structure of Union as problematic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme occurrences in 7 years</th>
<th>Issues mentioned and the most emphasised one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong>&lt;br&gt;26 in 51 articles (59.9%)</td>
<td>1. The present structure is not accepted/preferred by some Tanzanians for it is ‘rigid’ and does not accommodate the requirements and reforms taking place (e.g. introduction of government of National Unity in Zanzibar e.tc); it is the ‘Union’s basic problem and source of other Union problems’; two governments is like having two countries apart. (18 times=56.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong>&lt;br&gt;5 in 7 articles (71.4%)</td>
<td>2. The present structure is problematic because it ‘killed’ the autonomy/ identity of Tanganyika, while that of Zanzibar remained. Thus a proposal to form three-government structure, including of Tanganyika; or a federal (one government) set-up. (6 times=18.8%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News editorials (2005-2011):</strong>&lt;br&gt;1 in 4 editorials (25%).</td>
<td>3. It makes Zanzibar overshadowed; inferior e.g. Zanzibar cannot international agreements. Zanzibaris also argue that the structure favours the Mainland, and is an obstacle to the Isles’ economic development (it does not address Zanzibar’s concerns/interests). (6 times=18.8%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen editorials (2005-2011):</strong>&lt;br&gt;1 in 4 editorials (25%).</td>
<td>4. The present structure favours Zanzibaris in terms of leadership (ministerial) positions in the Union government (1 time=3.1%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. As the Union government is also the government for the mainland in non-Union matters, thus brings a problematic impression that the mainland is the Union. (1 time=3.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total emphasis in 5 issues: **32 times**

**The most emphasised issue:** The present structure is not accepted/preferred by some Tanzanians for it is ‘rigid’ and does not accommodate the requirements and reforms taking place (it is the ‘Union’s basic problem and source of other Union problems’); two governments is like having two countries apart. (56.3%)
Theme 10: Sidelining of one part of Union

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme occurrences in 7 years</th>
<th>Issues mentioned and the most emphasised one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong> 23 in 51 articles (45.1%)</td>
<td>1. Zanzibar, in the present Union set-up, is swallowed and muzzled by Mainland; it is not fairly involved in a number of decisions (economic, political) on national/Union issues e.g. it was not adequately involved in the process of adding Union matters; (‘Union has retarded Zanzibar’s development’). (13 times=39.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong> 4 in 7 articles (57.1%)</td>
<td>2. Zanzibaris complain of unfair distribution of Union benefits such as local resources, revenues, jobs, and foreign grants and loans (the 4.5 share it gets is too little); that Mainlanders are more favoured. (14 times=42.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News editorials (2005-2011):</strong> 0 in 4 editorials (0%).</td>
<td>3. Mainlanders hardly have business opportunities in Zanzibar due to cultural and economic reasons (But Zanzibaris have more unlimited business opportunities in the mainland); mainlanders also complain of not getting a ‘good deal’ from the Union, that they spend a lot of their taxes to keep the Isles (Zanzibar) afloat; Zanzibar is a ‘burden’ to them. (6 times=18.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen editorials (2005-2011):</strong> 2 in 4 editorials (50%).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total emphasis in 3 issues: <strong>33 times</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The most emphasised issue:</strong> Zanzibar, in the present Union set-up, is swallowed and muzzled by Mainland; it is not fairly involved in a number of decisions (economic, political) on national/Union issues e.g. it was not adequately involved in the process of adding Union matters; (‘Union has retarded Zanzibar’s development’). (39.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Theme 11: Power sharing problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme occurrences in 7 years</th>
<th>Issues mentioned and the most emphasised one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong> 15 in 51 articles (29.4%)</td>
<td>1. The constitution and administrative regulations on the identity of each state in the Union and how (Union) powers are to be shared by the two sides (e.g. cost sharing and decision making on Union matters, administration of trade between the two sides, budgetary allocations) are problematic leading to complaints from both sides. (16 times=53.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong> 6 in 7 articles (85.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News editorials (2005-2011):</strong> 1 in 4 editorials (25%)</td>
<td>2. Zanzibar president is not accorded due status in the Union set-up as the one attends Union cabinet meeting as a minister without portfolio. (2 times=6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen editorials (2005-2011):</strong> 2 in 4 editorials (50%)</td>
<td>3. Mainlanders complain that Zanzibaris have more leadership chances (ministers, Members of Parliament) in the Union, not in a fair proportion to their population; compared to mainlanders i.e. Zanzibaris are fewer than mainlanders (1 million versus more than 40 million respectively). (3 times=10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Zanzibar is overshadowed by mainland in the global arena; thus it wants to be recognised and act (alone) on issues related to foreign relations such as having its own Foreign Affairs ministry, signing international deals, joining the East African Community (not under the umbrella of the United Republic of Tanzania). (9 times=30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total emphasis in 4 issues: 30 times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The most emphasised issue:** The constitution and administrative regulations on the identity of each state in the Union and how (Union) powers are to be shared by the two sides (e.g. cost sharing and decision making on Union matters, administration of trade between the two sides, budgetary allocations) are problematic leading to complaints from both sides. (53.3%)
### Theme 12: Arguments opposing Union

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme occurrences in 7 years</th>
<th>Issues mentioned and the most emphasised one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong> 17 in 51 articles (33.3%)</td>
<td>1. Union’s legality is questionable: what motives were behind its formation; Union founders did not hold any referendum (majority opinion) to establish whether people of the two sides preferred it (it was formed ‘secretly’ between Nyerere and Karume); it was formed in a hurry without seriously considering all issues involved. (12 times=54.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong> 5 in 7 articles (71.4%)</td>
<td>2. Islanders criticise and blame the Union government and Union in general for ruining Zanzibar’s economy and that Zanzibar is muzzled by the Mainland; to Mainlanders, Zanzibaris are overburdening them (some Tanzanians claim it has not helped them at all. (5 times=22.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News editorials (2005-2011):</strong> 0 in 4 editorials (0%).</td>
<td>3. The Union is criticised that it will always have problems because the two partners (Zanzibar and Tanganyika) are never the same as claimed by many; they have different histories such as were administered separately during all time of colonial rule – Tanganyika under European powers, Zanzibar under Arab rule. (1 time=4.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen editorials (2005-2011):</strong> 1 in 4 editorials (25%).</td>
<td>4. The Union is irrelevant today; factors and circumstances that necessitated its formation in 1964 do not hold water today; and its foundation has been distorted by current leaders e.g. some more 11 Union matters in the Articles of Union have been ‘secretly’ added to the original 11 matters. (2 times=9.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. The Union is meaningless for it has not brought about economic and social development to majority in both sides e.g. minority (5 per cent) in the Mainland have decent life, while 95 per cent in both sides do not know where their next meal is going to come from. (Reason: from its inception Union was not meant to be a political institution but economic and social institution). (1 time=4.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Union is a problematic entity, considering its plentiful problems that have existed for long because of, among things, poor administration and that the public is not given enough room to discuss it. (1 time=4.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total emphasis in 6 issues:** 22 times

**The most emphasised issue:** Union’s legality is questionable: what motives were behind its formation; Union founders did not hold any referendum (majority opinion) to establish whether people of the two sides preferred… (54.5%)
Theme 13: Articles of Union critiqued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme occurrences in 7 years</th>
<th>Issues mentioned and the most emphasised one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong></td>
<td>1. The reasons and root causes for squabbles between Tanganyika and Zanzibar over the years are the Union matters contained in Articles of Union and thus have failed to sustain the Union e.g. a need to remove or add some matters such as removal of Oil and Natural Gas, addition of/creation of Tanganyika government (change of Union structure). (<strong>13 times=54.2%</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 in 51 articles (31.4%)</td>
<td>2. It is argued that the additional matters to the original 11 Union-matters were added without the consent of Zanzibar ('the addition was an intention to undermine autonomy and identity of Zanzibar). (<strong>7 times=29.2%</strong>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong></td>
<td>3. Articles of Union are all criticised as, questions are raised relating to what kind of Union government(s) the Articles initially provided for, whether one, two or three governments (<strong>4 times=16.7%</strong>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 in 7 articles (57.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News editorials (2005-2011):</strong></td>
<td>Total emphasis in 3 issues: <strong>24 times</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 in 4 editorials (0%)</td>
<td><strong>The most emphasised issue</strong>: The reasons and root causes for squabbles between Tanganyika and Zanzibar over the years are the Union matters contained in Articles of Union thus Articles of Union have failed to sustain the Union (<strong>54.2%</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen editorials (2005-2011):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 in 4 editorials (25%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theme 14: Divisive lines of identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme occurrences in 7 years</th>
<th>Issues mentioned and the most emphasised one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong> 9 in 51 articles (17.6%)</td>
<td>1. Union issues and problems are laid and contested in the lines of or between being ‘Islanders’ and (against) ‘Mainlanders’. (1 time=7.1%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong> 1 in 7 articles (14.3%)</td>
<td>2. In Zanzibar, there are lines of divide (termed as ‘a threat/challenge to Union’) between people of Unguja (‘African progeny’/ ‘Blacks’) and/against Pemba (‘descendants of Arabs’); a divide since pre-independence political parties ASP, Afro-Shirazi Party versus ZNP, Zanzibar Nationalist Party respectively), which are now transferred/translated into CCM-Chama cha Mapinduzi (the Tanzania’s ruling party) versus CUF, Civic United Front (the opposition party) on Unguja and Pemba respectively. (11 times=78.6%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News editorials (2005-2011):</strong> 2 in 4 editorials (50%).</td>
<td>3. The Union has brought about divisive lines in Zanzibar in terms of/between those, who support the Union and see it legitimate against those who oppose the Union for ‘Zanzibar’s interests’ or for ‘a free Zanzibar nation’. (2 times=14.3%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen editorials (2005-2011):</strong> 3 in 4 editorials (75%).</td>
<td>Total emphasis in 3 issues: 14 times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The most emphasised issue:** In Zanzibar, there are lines of divide (termed as ‘a threat/challenge to Union’) between people of Unguja (‘African progeny’/ ‘Blacks’) and/against Pemba (‘descendants of Arabs’); a divide since pre-independence political parties ASP, Afro-Shirazi Party versus ZNP, Zanzibar Nationalist Party respectively), which are now transferred/translated into CCM-Chama cha Mapinduzi (the Tanzania’s ruling party) versus CUF, Civic United Front (the opposition party) on Unguja and Pemba respectively. (11 times=78.6%)
Theme 15: Impacts of new global relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme occurrences in 7 years</th>
<th>Issues mentioned and the most emphasised one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News Feature articles</strong> (2005-2011): 13 in 51 articles (25.5%)</td>
<td>1. Multiparty politics, (re) introduced in 1992, led to changes in the Union/Tanzania Constitution (e.g. removal of Zanzibar President from the vice presidency of the Union government), changes in the entire political system and have attracted more freedom of expression (‘demand of majority involvement in decision making’) and more voices questioning the Union (‘others calling for its dissolution’ e.g. DPP political party chairperson, Christopher Mtikila). <em>(16 times=88.8%).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen Feature articles</strong> (2005-2011): 3 in 7 articles (42.9%)</td>
<td>2. Policies of powerful countries (such as USA) and/through international and trading institutions and economic systems bring about great damages to poor African countries (including Tanzania) and threaten efforts towards African unity, freedom and dignity. <em>(1 time=5.6%).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News editorials (2005-2011):</strong> 0 in 4 editorials (0%).</td>
<td>3. Globalisation as a global phenomenon, an even more vicious form of imperialism engulfs and threatens African unity and strength strategies, inclusive the Union. <em>(1 time=5.6%).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen editorials (2005-2011):</strong> 1 in 4 editorials (25%).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total emphasis in 3 issues: **18 times**

**The most emphasised issue:** Multiparty politics, (re) introduced in 1992, led to changes in the Union/Tanzania Constitution (e.g. removal of Zanzibar President from the vice presidency of the Union government), changes in the entire political system and have attracted more freedom of expression (‘demand of majority involvement in decision making’) and more voices questioning the Union (‘others calling for its dissolution’ *(88.9%).*).
### Theme 16: Relevance of the present Union

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme occurrences in 7 years</th>
<th>Issues mentioned and the most emphasised one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Daily News Feature articles (2005-2011):**<br>12 in 51 articles (23.5%) | 1. The factors and motives for the Union in 1964 are claimed to be irrelevant today thus more questions of its usefulness and legality. (E.g. some critics blame the Union’s founders Nyerere and Karume for the present Union’s shortcomings). *(7 times=41.2%).*  
2. The (re)introduction of multiparty system since early 1990s and its situations makes the Union treated differently (and even more criticised, it demerits and merits assessed) and viewed as ‘problematic’ as compared to the past (under one party rule) when questioning the Union amounted to crime. *(8 times=47.1%)*  
3. The addition of more 11 Union matters (in the present Union) to the original 11 set in 1964 has made the Union attract more voices of dissatisfaction, especially from Zanzibar, and implies how it fails to meet the current situation. *(2 times=11.7%)* |
| **The Citizen Feature articles (2005-2011):**<br>2 in 7 articles (28.6%) | Total emphasis in 3 issues: **17 times**  
**The most emphasised issue:** The (re)introduction of multiparty system since early 1990s and its situations makes the Union treated differently (and even more criticised) and viewed as ‘problematic’ as compared to the past (under one party rule) when questioning the Union amounted to crime. *(47.1%)*  
| **Daily News editorials (2005-2011):**<br>0 in 4 editorials (0%) | |
| **The Citizen editorials (2005-2011):**<br>0 in 4 editorials (0%) | |
### Theme 17: Shifts in and nature of leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme occurrences in 7 years</th>
<th>Issues mentioned and the most emphasised one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong> 11 in 51 articles (21.6%)</td>
<td>1. Recent leaders appear to contest/challenge the Union, particularly demanding reforms to its structure. (E.g. the group of MPs known as G-55, in 1980s, and issues that were raised in 1990s). <em>(2 times=16.7%)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong> 1 in 7 articles (14.3%)</td>
<td>2. Current African (Tanzanian in particular) leaders’ consciousness of being Africans and political will for unity, as compared to the former ones such as Nyerere, Karume, Nkrumah of Ghana and, has been allowed to atrophy; something as a threat to the Union. <em>(2 times=16.7%)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News editorials (2005-2011):</strong> 2 in 4 editorials (50%).</td>
<td>3. The persisting problems of the Union are mostly caused by the recent leaders for they have not worked out well (‘they are not playing their central role in safeguarding the Union’) culminating into unnecessary frictions and complaints (‘some of them want to kill the Union for their own ambitions/interests’). <em>(6 times=50%)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen editorials (2005-2011):</strong> 0 in 4 editorials (0%).</td>
<td>4. Unlike in the past, current leaders have given more chance and room for people to question and express their views on the Union e.g. Union is among the issues likely to feature in the course of writing a new Constitution in 2012; and reforms such as on addressing the divide between Pemba and Unguja are taking place. <em>(2 times=16.7%)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total emphasis in 4 issues: **12 times**

**The most emphasised issue:** The persisting problems of the Union are mostly caused by the recent leaders for they have not worked out well (‘they are not playing their central role in safeguarding the Union’) culminating into unnecessary frictions and complaints (‘some of them want to kill the Union for their own ambitions/interests’). *(50%)*
Theme 18: The kind of Union people of Tanganyika and Zanzibar want to retain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme occurrences in 7 years</th>
<th>Issues mentioned and the most emphasised one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong></td>
<td>1. In terms of structure, a Union of three-government structure: the United Republic of Tanzania government (Union government), the government of Tanganyika and the government of Zanzibar. (7 times=11.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 in 51 articles (64.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong></td>
<td>2. The present two-government structure to be maintained, but, it should recognise Tanganyika’s identity and autonomy it is for Zanzibar currently and Zanzibar concerns to be addressed e.g. (Zanzibar to enjoys its autonomy in internal affairs and its identity preserved); also other matters must be resolved e.g. Articles of Union. (It should not be a three or one-government structure as it will weaken or kill the Union because one partner i.e. Tanzania mainland is too big, while Zanzibar is small – ‘it may be swallowed’). (17 times=28.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 in 7 articles (85.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News editorials (2005-2011):</strong></td>
<td>3. A Union of a single-government (federal) structure so as to solve the chronic problems which have kept arising in the current structure, and be appropriate to act on various local and global matters as one country. E.g. entering the East African Federation/Union as ‘real’ one country. (7 times=11.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 in 4 editorials (75%).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen editorials (2005-2011):</strong></td>
<td>4. A Union decided by all Tanzanians (majority’s consent) / ‘people-centred Union’); a stronger and improved Union (e.g. through amendment or re-writing of Constitution), either of one, two or three governments but it should reflect the reality of life, allow democratic processes and the people of the two sides must be treated on equal footing e.g. resources found in the country (Tanzania) must benefit both sides; it must boost Tanzania’s integrity at national, regional and international level. (27 times=45.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 in 4 editorials (50%).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen editorials (2005-2011):</strong></td>
<td>5. A Union that embraces the principles of the Arusha Declaration on Socialism and Self-reliance and stop dreaming about getting help from outside thus making Tanzania stand stronger economic, social and political as the nation (united one). (1 time=1.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total emphasis in 5 issues: **59 times**

**The most emphasised issue:** A Union decided by all Tanzanians (majority’s consent) / ‘people-centred Union’); a stronger and improved Union (e.g. through amendment or re-writing of Constitution), either of one, two or three governments but it should reflect the reality of life, allow democratic processes and the people of the two sides must be treated on equal footing e.g. resources found in the country (Tanzania) must benefit both sides; it must boost Tanzania’s integrity at national, regional and international level. (45%)
Theme 19: Proposals for dissolution of Union

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme occurrences in 7 years</th>
<th>Issues mentioned and the most emphasised one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Daily News Feature articles (2005-2011):</em> 6 in 51 articles (11.8%)</td>
<td>1. Over the years some Zanzibaris keep expressing their rejection to the Union (e.g. Zanzibar leaders’ attempt to sabotage Union in 1984) due to the claim that, in the Union, Zanzibar is being muzzled (‘colonised’) by the mainland and its economic development deteriorated, and that many of the Isles’ concerns are not dealt adequately. <em>(6 times</em>(^{\textbf{75%}}*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Citizen Feature articles (2005-2011):</em> 3 in 7 articles (42.9%)</td>
<td>2. For the purpose of entering the East African Federation-EAF, which comprises of Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Burundi and Rwanda, the Union could be broken to pave way for a ‘bigger Union’ (thus Zanzibar to enter the EAF as a separate country, for it is better to enter, each country, as one government). <em>(1 time</em>(^{\textbf{12.5%}}*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Daily News editorials (2005-2011):</em> 0 in 4 editorials (0%).</td>
<td>3. Some Tanzanians advocate for Union’s dissolution because of its ‘endless’ problems that have arisen over the years, e.g. Zanzibar concerns and administrative and other ‘Union matters’ issues, and because some Mainlanders feel it has not helped them at all. <em>(1 time</em>(^{\textbf{12.5%}}*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Citizen editorials (2005-2011):</em> 0 in 4 editorials (0%).</td>
<td>Total emphasis in 3 issues: 8 times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The most emphasised issue:** Zanzibaris keep expressing their rejection to the Union (e.g. Zanzibar leaders’ attempt to sabotage Union in 1984) due to the claim that, in the Union, Zanzibar is being muzzled (‘colonised’) by the mainland and its economic development deteriorated, and that many of the Isles’ concerns are not dealt adequately. *(75\%)*.
Theme 20: Miscellaneous issues (future of Union/Tanzania nation or nationhood)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme occurrences in 7 years</th>
<th>Issues mentioned and the most emphasised one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong></td>
<td>1. There is a need to re-write the Union Constitution to accommodate the political and economic reforms taking place presently, resolve contentious issues, and review provisions in the present constitution that amount to contradictions and controversies. (6 times=33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 in 51 articles (31.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen Feature articles (2005-2011):</strong></td>
<td>2. Union Day should always be used to reflect on the achievements of ‘this unique unity’ and the challenges it faces, and chart its future (also some use this to express their denunciation to the Union). (4 times=22.2%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 in 7 articles (14.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily News editorials (2005-2011):</strong></td>
<td>3. There should be a continuous existence of the bodies dealing with Union issues/problems, these include the recent established fully fledged ministry under the Vice-President’s Office that specifically deals with Union affairs and the new established committee (co-chaired by the prime minister of the United Republic of Tanzania and the Zanzibar chief minister) to oversee smooth functioning of Union affairs. (8 times=44.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 in 4 editorials (75%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Citizen editorials (2005-2011):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 in 4 editorials (50%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total emphasis in 3 issues: **18 times**

**The most emphasised issue:** There should be a continuous existence of the bodies dealing with Union issues/problems, these include the recent established fully fledged ministry under the Vice-President’s Office that specifically deals with Union affairs and the new established committee (co-chaired by the prime minister of the United Republic of Tanzania and the Zanzibar chief minister) to oversee smooth functioning of Union affairs. (29.7%)
THE ARTICLES OF UNION\textsuperscript{13} between

THE REPUBLIC OF TANGANYIKA

AND

THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF ZANZIBAR

WHEREAS the Government of the Republic of Tanganyika and of the Peoples’ Republic of Zanzibar, being mindful of the long association of the peoples of these lands and of their ties of kinship and amity, and being desirous of furthering that association and strengthening of these ties and of furthering the unity of African peoples, have met and considered the union of the Republic of Tanganyika with the Peoples’ Republic of Zanzibar:

AND WHEREAS the Governments of the Republic of Tanganyika and of the Peoples’ Republic of Zanzibar are desirous that the two Republics shall be united in one Sovereign Republic in accordance with the Articles hereinafter contained:-

It is therefore AGREED between the Government of the Republic of Tanganyika and of the Peoples’ Republic of Zanzibar as follows:-

(i) The Republic of Tanganyika and the Peoples’ Republic of Zanzibar shall be united in one Sovereign Republic.

(ii) During the period from the commencement of the union until the Constituent Assembly provided for in Article (vii) shall have met and adopted a Constitution for the united Republic (hereinafter referred to as the interim period), the united Republic shall be governed in accordance with the provisions of Articles (iii) to (vi).

(iii) During the interim period the Constitution of the united Republic shall be the Constitution of Tanganyika so modified as to provide for-

\textsuperscript{13}This document of the Articles of Union was extracted from Shivji (2008:261).
(a) a separate legislature and executive in and for Zanzibar from time to time constituted in accordance with the existing laws of Zanzibar and having exclusive authority within Zanzibar for matters other than those reserved to the Parliament and Executive of the united Republic;

(b) the offices of the two Vice-Presidents one of whom (being a person normally resident in Zanzibar) shall be the Head of the aforesaid executive in and for Zanzibar and shall be the principal assistant of the President of the United Republic in the discharge of his executive functions in relation to Zanzibar;

(c) the representation of Zanzibar in the Parliament of the United Republic;

(d) such other matters as may be expedient or desirable to give effect to the united Republic and to these Articles.

(iv) There shall be reserved to the Parliament and Executive of the united Republic the following matters-

(a) The Constitution and Government of the united Republic.

(b) External Affairs.

(c) Defence.

(d) Police.

(e) Emergency Powers.

(f) Citizenship.

(g) Immigration.

(h) External Trade and Borrowing.

(i) The Public Service of the united Republic.

(j) Income Tax, Corporation Tax, Customs and Excise.

(k) Harbours, Civil Aviation, Posts and Telegraphs.

And the said Parliament and Executive shall have exclusive authority in such matters throughout and for the purposes of the united Republic and in addition exclusive authority in respect of all other matters in and for Tanganyika.

(v) The existing laws of Tanganyika and Zanzibar shall remain in force in their respective territories subject:-

(a) to any provision made hereafter by a competent legislature;
(b) to such provision as may be made by order of the President of the united Republic for the extension to Zanzibar of any law relating to any of the matters set out in Article (iv), and the revocation of any corresponding law of Zanzibar;

(c) to such amendments as may be expedient or desirable to give effect to the union and to these Articles.

(vi) (a) The first President of the united Republic shall be Mwalimu Julius K. Nyerere and he shall carry on the Government of the united Republic in accordance with the provisions of these Articles and with the assistance of the Vice-Presidents aforesaid and of such other ministers and officers as he may appoint from Tanganyika and Zanzibar and their respective public services.

(b) The first Vice-President from Zanzibar to be appointed in accordance with the modifications provide for in Article 3 shall be Sheikh Abeid Karume.

(vii) The President of the united Republic in agreement with the Vice-President who is head of the Executive in Zanzibar shall:-

(a) Appoint a Commission to make proposals for a Constitution for the united Republic.

(b) Summon a Constituent Assembly composed of Representatives from Tanganyika and from Zanzibar in such numbers as they may determine to meet within one year of the commencement of the union for the purpose of considering the proposals of the Commission aforesaid and to adopt a Constitution for the united Republic.

(viii) These Articles shall be subject to the enactment of laws by the Parliament of Tanganyika and by the Revolutionary Council of the Peoples’ Republic of Zanzibar in conjunction with the Cabinet of Ministers thereof, ratifying the same and providing for the Government of the United Republic and of Zanzibar in accordance therewith.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF Julius K. Nyerere, the President of the Republic of Tanganyika and Abeid Karume, the President of the People’s Republic of Zanzibar, have signed these Articles, in duplicate, at Zanzibar, on this twenty-second day of April, 1964.
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