

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY AND FUTURE DIRECTION

In the chapter, the monograph explored the major summaries, conclusions and recommendations that came out of the monograph with a view of wrapping up the monograph. The issue of land rights, compensation on improvements done on land targeted for acquisition and the legality of most land reforms Programmes has always been a thorn issue and the debate is often inconclusive. In the end, the monograph will recommend areas of further monograph based on areas that are key in tackling this matter but that were outside the scope of the monograph.

The development of constructive dialogue regarding compensation for former white colonial farmers for improvements on land earmarked for acquisition remains elusive, often clouded by strong emotions that hinder meaningful discussion. The widespread sentiment of entitlement to ancestral lands—viewed as a heritage by all Africans—fuels a persistent denial of compensation to these farmers. This stance is underpinned by the historical context of land dispossession, particularly the absence of compensation when white settlers forcibly seized land from native Africans through the Rudd Concession that did not provide any compensation for the lands appropriated by the British South Africa Company (BSAC).

Understanding the legality of the Rudd Concession is crucial, as it reveals that the agreement effectively stripped Africans of their land without any provision for compensation. The Concession's details indicate a deliberate effort to deprive Africans of their rightful ownership, perpetuating poverty and disenfranchisement. Furthermore, the Rudd Concession was characterized by dishonesty, exploiting King Lobengula's lack of awareness and relying on a verbal agreement that allowed the BSAC to manipulate the terms to their advantage.

Cecil John Rhodes and the BSAC capitalized on the geopolitical landscape established at the Berlin Colonial Conference (1884-1885) that set forth rules for European colonisation in Africa. Rhodes strategically utilised the Royal Charter to implement effective occupation through a cadre of European pioneers, thereby facilitating the exploitation of land and resources while systematically disadvantaging the indigenous population. The subsequent discussion of compensation in the contemporary context often overlooks the historical injustices embedded in prior land acquisitions.

The discussions surrounding later laws, such as the Land Apportionment Act (1930) and the Lancaster House Agreement, illustrate a continued imbalance in land rights. The Land Apportionment Act segregated Africans into unproductive lands, perpetuating cycles of poverty, while the Lancaster House Agreement limited African bargaining power and reaffirmed a "willing buyer, willing seller" framework that undermined the goals of land redistribution. The structure of these agreements favoured white landowners and delayed meaningful land restitution for the indigenous population, underscoring the necessity of applying Aristotelian concepts of restorative and corrective justice to rectify these historical inequities. The inclusion of Britain in any compensation dialogue is particularly contentious, given its historical role in granting the BSAC exclusive rights to the territory that has compounded the challenges faced by the indigenous population in reclaiming their land.

The Rudd Concession and the Royal Charter, while differing significantly in design—one concentrating on mineral rights and the other granting overarching control of Zimbabwe—both served to facilitate Cecil John Rhodes' annexation of the land later known as Southern Rhodesia. The Lancaster House Agreement further undermined the liberation struggle by failing to ensure the transfer of land from white minorities to indigenous Africans, thereby perpetuating

historical injustices inflicted by British settlers, including the forced removal of indigenous peoples and the imposition of foreign laws.

In response to these injustices, the postcolonial government initiated the Fast Track Land Reform Programme (FTLRP) to rectify land imbalances. However, the monograph questions the rationale for compensating white farmers for improvements made to their agricultural land, arguing that such compensation lacks legal justification. Disagreements have arisen between the Zimbabwean government and large-scale commercial farmers regarding this compensation, with the conclusion that white settlers should not receive any for improvements on acquired farms due to their inability to legally reclaim ownership amidst historical injustices. Additionally, the government's shift from a radical nationalist to a more neoliberal approach is reflected in Section 72 of the 2013 Constitution that removes the obligation to compensate former white farmers, suggesting that any compensation policy should undergo public review via a referendum, as it must align with the rights and freedoms protected under Chapter 4 of the Constitution.

The monograph underscores the historical injustices suffered by African indigenous people in Zimbabwe as a result of British colonisation, particularly through the forced removal from ancestral lands and the imposition of foreign legal frameworks. In response, the postcolonial government implemented the Fast Track Land Reform Programme (FTLRP) to address inequities in land distribution. The findings of this research emphasise the necessity of acknowledging these historical injustices and the significance of achieving equitable land distribution to foster social justice and rectify past wrongs.

Additionally, the monograph explored the contentious issue of compensation between the Zimbabwean government and displaced white farmers, questioning the justification for compensating these farmers for improvements made to their land, given the historical

context of land dispossession. It highlights a notable shift in governmental ideology from a radical nationalist approach under the Mugabe administration to a more neoliberal stance under the Mnangagwa government, raising concerns about the consistency of land reform policies in addressing historical injustices. The monograph advocates for establishing a reparations framework to address the displacement and loss of livelihoods experienced by indigenous populations, thereby acknowledging and redressing the enduring impacts of colonialism in Zimbabwe.

The government should persist in its efforts to rectify historical land imbalances and ensure equitable land distribution by reassessing the compensation criteria for displaced white farmers, considering the historical context and objectives of land reform. This process must involve consultations with relevant stakeholders, including affected communities and the broader population of Zimbabwe. Aligning compensation with historical injustices promotes a more equitable distribution of resources by recognising the context of land ownership and creating criteria that are restorative rather than merely transactional. This approach embodies the principles of distributive justice, ensuring that those who have suffered the most from past injustices receive compensation that reflects their losses. Such measures not only address immediate grievances but also lay the foundation for long-term reconciliation and social cohesion, aiding in the healing of wounds inflicted by historical injustices.

The monograph underscores the necessity of involving the people of Zimbabwe in decision-making processes concerning land reform and compensation through public consultations and engagement with various stakeholders, including indigenous communities, farmers, legal experts, and civil society organisations. This inclusive approach ensures that the views and concerns of all parties are considered, aligning with Aristotle's emphasis on community and dialogue as essential for achieving justice. By amplifying all voices, the government can establish

a more democratic and participatory framework for land reform that enhances the legitimacy of the process and fosters trust among stakeholders. Ultimately, this inclusive public engagement can yield more just outcomes that respect the diverse experiences and needs of community members, reflecting Aristotle's vision of a fair and just society.

In light of the prolonged displacement, deprivation, segregation, and subjugation experienced by African indigenes in pre-independent Zimbabwe, the monograph advocates for the establishment of a reparations framework aimed at addressing historical injustices and providing redress for affected communities. Engaging experts in transitional justice and human rights is essential for developing an inclusive and comprehensive reparations programme. From an Aristotelian perspective, this aligns with the concept of corrective justice that emphasises restoring balance and addressing the full scope of harm caused by past injustices. Aristotle asserts that true justice requires acknowledgment of both material losses and the emotional and social impacts of injustice. By incorporating these elements into the reparations framework, policymakers can create a more effective response to community grievances, addressing immediate economic needs while also restoring dignity and agency, thereby contributing to a more just and equitable society.

The monograph highlights the need for a consistent government stance on land reform and compensation to ensure policy clarity and coherence. It recommends that the government articulate a clear position regarding land redistribution, compensation, and historical injustices, providing a stable framework to address these complex challenges while aligning policies with the long-term goals of social justice and equitable development. From an Aristotelian perspective, just governance necessitates transparency and accountability that are enhanced by well-defined policies. When stakeholders understand the guidelines

governing land redistribution and compensation, they are more likely to trust the process and its outcomes. This transparency not only fosters fairness but also empowers communities to hold the government accountable for its commitments. By consistently applying and clearly communicating these policies, the government can build trust and create a collaborative environment, ultimately leading to more just and equitable land reform outcomes that embody the principles of Aristotelian justice.

The monograph has emphasised the importance of ongoing research into the impact of land reform, the effectiveness of compensation mechanisms, and the long-term consequences of historical injustices. Such research is vital for informing policy development, implementation, and evaluation. From an Aristotelian perspective, this emphasis on continuous inquiry aligns with the concept of practical wisdom, or *phronesis* that underscores the necessity of learning from experience to make informed decisions. Aristotle maintained that just governance requires a commitment to reflection and adaptation. By establishing a robust monitoring framework, policymakers can evaluate how effectively compensation mechanisms meet their intended goals and address the historical injustices faced by communities. This iterative process of assessment and refinement will help ensure that land reform efforts achieve not only immediate objectives but also long-term social justice and equity, ultimately fostering a more just society that acknowledges and rectifies its past wrongs.

Future studies should focus on a longitudinal monograph to assess the long-term impacts of land reform in Zimbabwe. Studies should focus on examining the socioeconomic, environmental, and political consequences of land redistribution on both the affected communities and the broader society. This can provide insights into the effectiveness and sustainability of the land reform policies implemented.

Future studies should also explore existing reparations frameworks implemented in other countries that have faced historical injustices, displacement, and subjugation. Analyse the effectiveness, challenges, and outcomes of these frameworks to inform the development of a comprehensive and inclusive reparations programme in Zimbabwe.

Future studies should also focus on investigating the impact of land reform on agricultural productivity in Zimbabwe and assess changes in farming practices, agricultural output, and food security following the implementation of land redistribution policies, and to identify strategies to enhance agricultural productivity and support sustainable agricultural practices in the post-reform context.

Further research should also examine the social and cultural reintegration processes of displaced communities following land reform. Investigate the challenges and opportunities faced by these communities in rebuilding their lives, preserving cultural heritage, and re-establishing social ties within new settlement areas.