

**Catherine Boone**

# Legal empowerment of the poor through property rights reform: tensions and tradeoffs of land registration and titling in sub-Saharan Africa

**Article (Accepted version)  
(Refereed)**

**Original citation:**

Boone, Catherine (2018) Legal empowerment of the poor through property rights reform: tensions and tradeoffs of land registration and titling in sub-Saharan Africa. [Journal of International Development](#). ISSN 0954-1748 (In Press)

DOI: [10.1080/00220388.2018.1451633](https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2018.1451633)

© 2018 Taylor and Francis

This version available at: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/87485/>

Available in LSE Research Online: April 2018

LSE has developed LSE Research Online so that users may access research output of the School. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LSE Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute the URL (<http://eprints.lse.ac.uk>) of the LSE Research Online website.

This document is the author's final accepted version of the journal article. There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Legal empowerment of the poor through property rights reform:  
Tensions and tradeoffs of land registration and titling in sub-Saharan Africa

by

Catherine Boone  
Professor of Comparative Politics  
LSE

27 January 2017  
*forthcoming J. of Development Studies*

**Abstract:** Land registration and titling in Africa has been seen as a means of legal empowerment of the poor that can protect smallholders' and pastoralists' rights of access to land and other land-based resources. Land registration is also part of ethnojustice agendas in parts of Africa and beyond. Yet legal empowerment via registration and titling is also advocated by those who push for the market-enhancing and aggregate growth-promoting commodification of property rights, whereby market forces will transfer land out of the hands of smallholders and into the hands of "those who can make most efficient or productive use of it." This paper contrasts these different visions of legal empowerment, showing that each one, rather than offering a straight and clear path to pro-poor outcomes, entails powerful tensions and tradeoffs. Registration and titling often have powerful redistributive implications. This helps to explain why debates over land law reform in general, and over registration and titling in particular, have been divisive in some African countries. The analysis highlights some of the broader political, institutional, and economic forces that shape the design and outcomes of land law reforms that may be undertaken (in part) to promote legal empowerment of the poor.

**Acknowledgements:** The author is Professor of Government and International Development at the London School of Economics and Political Science. Earlier versions of these arguments appeared in Boone (2007) and Boone (2014). A draft was presented at the TrustLand Workshop at Gulu University in Gulu, Uganda, on 5 January 2016. I acknowledge the support of the LSE International Inequalities Institute and LSE Suntory and Toyota International Centers for Economics and Related Disciplines (STICERD) for research support in 2015 and 2016. Thanks to Rachel Gisselquist and the participants in the 7-8 Oct. 2016 UNU-WIDER "Addressing Group-Based Inequalities through Legal Empowerment" workshop for comments on an earlier version of this paper.

## Introduction

Strange bedfellows rally behind calls to promote registration and titling of the farmland and pasture that sustains 60%, perhaps more, of sub-Saharan Africa's population. Global actors at the vanguard of the neoliberal revolution rally behind land registration and titling: for them, titling transforms existing land rights into individualized, tradable assets that can circulate within a market economy, thus promoting economic growth by transferring land "into the hands of those who can use it most productively." Paradoxically, land rights formalization is seen by other land rights advocates as a way of *protecting* ordinary farmers and pastoralists from the threat of predatory states and markets: registration is seen as means of legal empowerment that enables the poor to defend their property rights. Human rights advocates promote registration as as means to legally-empower marginalized ethnic groups and indigenous peoples at risk of territorial encroachment and dispossession: it is part of ethno-justice agendas in parts of Latin America, Africa, and beyond. In policy advocacy, these positions may merge and blur, as they do in the work of Hernando de Soto (2000), who single-mindedly argues that titles empower the poor, and in some "rule-of-law" approaches that seek politically-neutral legal solutions to development challenges. This blurring happens because calls for legal empowerment by formalizing property rights almost always call for the formalization of *existing* rights, and assume that these rights are thereby strengthened and enhanced.

This paper argues that in fact, titling almost always involves a transformation and redistribution of rights. Almost inevitably, this produces shifts in the nature and locus of control over property, creating winners and losers, new risks and tensions, and tradeoffs. Despite apparent overlaps in some policy discourse, the different visions of legal empowerment through

registration and titling that are sketched out above -- commodifying land through registration and titling (à la de Soto), shoring up farmers' and pastoralists' rights, and institutionalizing ethnic entitlements -- are very different visions of how existing rights and control to land should be transformed, and for the benefit of whom. Drawing out these differences in the African context reveals tensions and trade-offs associated with legal empowerment via land registration and titling.

Part I places debates over reform of neocustomary land tenure in Africa in historical context. Part II identifies three positions in current advocacy of registration and titling. It begins with the default position of the World Bank, which has been the most consistent advocate of registration and titling in the post-colonial period (although debates go back much further). For the Bank and other advocates market-*promoting* titling and privatization, land commodification and enhanced transferability are the goal. Private property in land is the economic and institutional “gold standard.” The second position regarding registration and titling, quite different in its long-run implications from the first, is put forward by advocates of legal empowerment of the poor. For these actors, recognition and titling of existing user-rights is the key to securing today's smallholders and pastoralists from future dispossessions. This vision in market-*constraining*: the goal is to stabilize existing rural communities and protect Africa's peasantries. The third position is advanced in ethno-justice movements and promoted by indigenous rights activists. It recommends that African governments uphold historically-grounded land rights derived from communal membership (that is, communal, customary, or neocustomary land rights). Not only is it market-constraining, but it also institutionalizes a hierarchy of different types of land claims: it may elevate ancestral land claims over the claims of those who are currently occupying and using the land. In academic and policy advocacy, the first two positions often blur and overlap, as do the last two positions. Yet the different visions of titling and registration involve very different choices about the political structure of society, the nature

of citizenship, and the desirability of state recognition of group rights, and the scope of state authority.

Part III draws out these tensions and tradeoffs. It argues that in many, perhaps most, situations, any move toward registration and titling can imply *some sort* of dispossession or exclusion, heightening of societal tension, or exacerbation of inequality. I offer a glimpse of a few African cases in which these tensions and tradeoffs fueled outright conflict over land law reform. These cases underscore the extent to which variations in context, both national and subnational, shape the practical meaning of land law reform (including its uneven distributional effects across space, different user groups, communities and individuals, and wealthier and poorer land users). They also point to the inherently political nature of both land law reform, and of struggles around implementation and enforcement of changes in land law. The conclusion summarizes and looks beyond the land titling and registration agenda.

### I. Neocustomary tenure regimes as targets for reform

This paper focuses on registration and titling of non-registered rural land, often referred as land held under customary or neocustomary tenure. Land that is not registered and titled comprises about 90% of the total in sub-Saharan Africa, varying across subregions of the continent and by country.<sup>1</sup> These lands support about 60% of all households, as a cross-country average), and are the foundation of a range of agricultural, pastoral, and other livelihoods. They comprise the homelands, ancestral places, community lands and territories, and sites of residence of the vast majority of the population in most countries. In rural Africa, land and livestock are citizens' main assets. Moves to alter the legal, regulatory, and political status of land rights are

---

<sup>1</sup>Deininger 2003: xxiii. The history of large-scale land expropriation by white settlers in eastern and southern Africa -- especially in South Africa, Namibia, Zimbabwe, Mozambique, and Kenya -- means that the highest rates of land titling are in these subregions. Rates of land titling are very low across most of the rest of the continent.

thus matters of immediate and vital importance to the lives and livelihoods of some of the world's poorest populations.

It is difficult to sort out the various strands of argument in property rights debates in Africa without placing these ideas in larger historical and institutional context. Top-down initiatives to alter the "institutional context of agriculture" to achieve broader political and economic ends have a long history on the African continent. Colonial regimes claimed rights over all land under their domain at the dawn of the colonial era, and they used controls over land access to organize and discipline populations subjected to their overrule. What the Europeans called "customary land tenure" was a wide array of local tenure arrangements that evolved under colonial rule and were formally recognized by the colonial states.<sup>2</sup>

Where land was suitable for agriculture, the Europeans' vision in most places was to create African peasantries organized into officially-recognized "tribes" that would be governed via Indirect Rule by government-recognized chiefs and elders. Most African subjects were thus constrained to live in officially-delimited "tribal" territorial units, dependent upon chiefs for land-rights enforcement and adjudication, and tied to family-based units of agricultural production that produced for local needs and in many cases, for wider markets. In zones of smallholder export-crop production such as much of coastal economies of West Africa, African peasantries joined the ranks of the world's leading producers of coffee, cocoa, cotton, palm oil, and groundnuts. Even in zones of large-scale land expropriation by white settlers, the "African reserves" set up as the final destination for populations expelled from their family and/or ancestral lands were imagined as new tribal homelands for partially-self sufficient household producers who would live in communities firmly under the local control of chiefs. African land rights so recognized by government were institutionalized in what the Europeans called "customary" tenure.

In the so-called "tribal homelands" under indirect rule, colonial authorities decided not to demarcate parcels, register them in family or individual names, or issue titles. This is because

---

<sup>2</sup>Chanock 1998, Moore 1986, Mamdani 1996; Vail 1989, Boone 2014.

colonial rulers (a.) preferred to leave discretionary powers in these domains in the hands of their chosen local agents, chiefs recognized under Indirect Rule, (b.) believed that the rise of land markets would destroy "tribal solidarity" mechanisms upon which they relied to control rural populations, (c.) and feared that the rise of land markets would result in dispossession of the peasantry and the rise of floating populations -- dispossessed and/or proletarianized Africans in the countryside and the cities -- who would be a threat to colonial order. The "neo" in the term "neocustomary" tenure emphasizes the important role of the colonial state and colonial Indirect Rule in restructuring and codifying land rights in much of Africa.<sup>3</sup>

Strong tensions and tradeoffs arose around the feasibility and desirability of concerted state action to entrench the forms of neocustomary land tenure that were established across much of the continent under colonial Indirect Rule. Political, environmental, and economic pressures threatened the stability and sustainability of the forms of smallholder tenure that the colonial authorities relied upon as a political basis for ruling the countryside, and that many farming households relied upon for access to land, livelihoods, community, and a place to live.

Some of the structural economic weaknesses of the neocustomary land tenure regimes were clear in many areas from the 1940s, if not before. In response, land and registration and titling initiatives were proposed after WWII as ways to modernize land tenure regimes to address the low productivity of land and labor; low rates of investment, including low rates of utilization of purchased inputs like fertilizer and improved seeds; small size of production units and thus limited economies of scale, etc. Political strains arising from neocustomary tenure were also evident many places. Resistance to chiefs, objections to state-enforced tribalization, and demand for statutory and legally-transactable land rights emerged in at least some parts of almost all the

---

<sup>3</sup> Mamdani 1996, 2012.

African colonies. Yet colonial regimes eschewed the titling agenda, arguably for both political and economic reasons that resembled those that had influenced colonial regimes before the war.<sup>4</sup>

Most of the independent governments made very similar choices in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, either explicitly in land law or implicitly, by upholding and reproducing the existing land regimes (Boone 2014). African governments depended heavily on the political support of African smallholder farmers who claimed land entitlements in their ethnic homelands, and who backed political leaders who confirmed these land rights. Where governments settled new farming populations on lands under direct state administration (ie., outside regions of Indirect Rule), such as in the settlement schemes for African smallholders in Kenya's Rift Valley, it was politically convenient for governments not to title land. This kept land-users dependent on the politicians who guaranteed their access to farmlands to which they had no neocustomary claims.

In the 1960s and 1970s, agricultural productivity was increasing along with output in most countries. Bottom-up and endogenous processes of land tenure change, in particular toward greater exclusivity in land rights and the rise of vernacular land markets, were apace in zones where agriculture and pastoralism were more highly commercialized.<sup>5</sup> Gains in productivity and output were highly uneven, but urgency around the idea of systematic land registration and titling agenda was hard to muster.<sup>6</sup> Strong political and economic forces militated against such moves that could threaten smallholders' land security, access, and ties to the political leaders, territorial jurisdictions, and communities that connected them to the newly-independent African states. Call for gradualism and reliance on endogenous, bottom-up processes and tenure evolution prevailed, especially given "the great political sensitivity of the issue" (Platteau 1996: 29).

---

<sup>4</sup> The World Bank was very much part of this discussion from 1960 onward. In an analysis of land policy in Tanzania, Askew, Owens, and Stein (2010: 2) write that "While a major Bank policy stance on land reform was not fully established until 1975, earlier individual country economic reports noted complications arising from existing land institutions. For instance in Tanzania (then Tanganyika), the 1961 report on economic development identified existing land codes as a limiting factor on long-term economic development, yet it also acknowledged that the transition from traditional communal to formal individual title could result in a large class of landless peasants. The report notes that 80% of land is under "native law and custom" that is not static or uniform." Williams 1981; Amanor 1999.

<sup>5</sup> See Ensminger 1997: 171-3; Chimhowu and Woodhouse 2006; Mathieu 1997; Joireman 2011.

<sup>6</sup> Bruce and Migot-Adholla 1996: 262; Platteau 1996: 30.



By the 1980s, however, structural constraints on agricultural development began to seem more acute. Many countries were net food importers. During the "lost decades" of the debt crisis and the SAP-aggravated economic decline that ensued, agriculture and pastoralism received little, if any, sustained policy attention, outside investment, or government assistance. By the mid-1990s, smallholder agriculture had been starved of state support for well over a decade and a half. Landlessness and food insecurity were on the rise in many regions.<sup>7</sup>

New initiatives to promote systematic land registration and titling gained momentum in the 1990s. The thrust and counter-thrust of these initiatives was defined by the all-pervasive pressure of neoliberal reform.<sup>8</sup> Long-standing arguments about the need to reform land tenure regimes were fueled by a new zeal for neoliberal orthodoxies, and by renewed interest in revitalizing agriculture. Many African countries undertook to rewrite land law as part of "second-generation" structural adjustment (see Wily 2001, 2003; Boone, 2007: Table 1). The World Bank and other international lenders/donors were major players. Their priority was titling and registration of small holdings to "bring these assets into the market."<sup>9</sup> By the 2000s, with arrival on the scene of new investors with voracious appetites for land and sub-soil resources, many national governments seemed to grow visibly impatient with smallholder agriculture and to throw their weight behind registration and titling as a way to accelerate the commodification of land,

---

<sup>7</sup> Jayne 2014.

<sup>8</sup> See Alden Wily 2003 for land law reform in Africa in the 1990s. As Kay (2016: 511, citing Blomley 2004: 614) explains, property is a central concept in neoliberal governance. "Neoliberalism is, in part, a language of property -- a return to central axioms of 18th century liberalism which locates private property as the foundation for individual self-interest and optimal social good." Privatization, enclosure, boundary drawing, new regulatory roll-outs, and roll-back of preexisting rules are "central tenets of neoliberal policy-making... [This involves] "framing and reframing of what counts as property."

<sup>9</sup> The World Bank's lending portfolio for land-related projects expanded dramatically in the 1990s. "While in FY 1990-94 only 3 stand-alone land projects were approved, the number increased to 19 (\$0.7 B commitment) and 25 (\$1B commitment) in the 1995-99 and 2000-04 periods, respectively. In 2004, land and land-related projects ... alone amount[ed] to \$1B and, following the lead of the Bank, other donors are now addressing land issues much more vigorously in their programs as well" (World Bank, 2005). By 2009 there were 34 World Bank Land Administration projects in sub-Saharan Africa (Askew, Owen, and Stein, 2010: 4, from the WB Project Database 2010). See Alden Wily 2003, Boone 2007, Moyo and Yeros 2007.

privatization of land by domestic elites and investors, and the rise of agribusiness in regions of their countries that were deemed propitious for large-scale agriculture.<sup>10</sup>

Counter-forces also mobilized around land in the 1990s and 2000s (Manji 2001). Civil society in Africa, both national and international, was reinvigorated by the political liberalizations of the decade. Political liberalization opened the door to public airings of long-simmering conflicts and historical grievances over land, some of which were played out in the electoral arena and/or gained strength from rule-of-law and initiatives to promote the legal empowerment of the poor. The end of apartheid in South Africa and the land tenure reforms that followed its wake were one of the most visible manifestations of this process. Growing anxieties about the specter of smallholder dispossession, about ecological disaster born of climate change and wanton raw-materials extraction, and about the marginalization and persecution of ethnic minorities, especially indigenous peoples (in Africa, especially pastoralists), also contributed to political pressure for and interest in legal reform -- in not only the "modernization," but also the "democratisation," of land rights. Large-scale land-related civil conflict in many parts of the continent, from Sierra Leone and Liberia to DRC, Rwanda, and Kenya, showed that agrarian social tensions, including acute inequalities and smallholders' vulnerability to arbitrary dispossession, were risks to social and political order. Sara Berry (2002: 638-9) explained that "[e]vidence of growing land pressure and increasing [land] conflict has prompted some observers to argue that land reform, once considered a low priority on a continent with plenty of land to go around, is now a matter of urgency." The rising specter of dispossession of smallholders and pastoralists in the face of rising conflict, rising land values, demographic pressure, on-going commodification, growing land-hunger of "outsiders" and investors of all stripes, and myriad other pressures on ordinary land-users created momentum for land law reform.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> See Stein and Cunningham (2015).

<sup>11</sup> See Kydd et al (2004) on stabilizing smallholder agriculture.

Advocates of legal empowerment of the poor in Africa through land rights registration have thus joined debates and policy-processes around land tenure reform that have a long and complex pedigree.<sup>12</sup> In the 1990s and 2000s, political and policy discussions included highly disparate sets of actors pushing very different interests, and different visions of legal reform around land.<sup>13</sup> In Part II, I sketch out three poles in the debate: the agenda centered on promotion of private property rights, the effort to institutionalize user rights, and the campaign to reinforce community rights. Part III identifies tensions and trade-offs inherent each of these agendas.

## Part II: Three visions of "legal empowerment" via registration and titling

### A. Land Registration and Titling for Individualization and Commodification

The World Bank has been a consistent advocate of land registration and titling.<sup>14</sup> The theory is that individualization of control and disposition of land (as in rights of freehold title) will create private property which can be bought, sold, and mortgaged according to market logics and incentives. Mortgaging land can create a flow of new capital in the form of credit that can finance modernization of production techniques, new inputs, and intensification. Once land is a full commodity, labor will soon follow, and capitalist production units and production processes will emerge. Land passes into the hands of the most productive users, small units are consolidated into larger holding, and economies of scale are achieved. Individualization, titling, transferability of land rights, and the state's ability to exercise eminent domain through transparent, legal processes also opens the door to African and international investors who seek land for real estate development, large scale commercial agriculture (such as horticultural and biofuel production), new infrastructure, and tourism projects.

---

<sup>12</sup> See also Peters 2004.

<sup>13</sup> Platteau (1996) and McAuslan (1998) highlighted these tensions in the 1990s.

<sup>14</sup> See World Bank 1989: 90, 100-104; Deininger and Binswanger 1999.

Herbst wrote in 2000 that “individual freehold is the avenue that many African countries are attempting to pursue.” Since the mid-2000s, this does appear to be the case. Kenneth Elbow et al of the University of Wisconsin-Madison Land Tenure Center wrote in 1996 that “the majority of African countries are increasingly favoring individualized landholdings as economies based on the production of commodities become more developed, as populations and land pressures increase, and as international donors [like the World Bank] support widespread legal reform.”<sup>15</sup> During the 1990s and 2000s, “nearly two dozen African countries proposed de jure land [law] reform that extended [the possibility of] access to formal, freehold land tenure to millions of poor households.”<sup>16</sup> Land law reform in Zambia in 1995, Uganda in 1998, Côte d’Ivoire in 1998 and 2015, and Malawi in 2002, and Kenya in 2012 are explicit in aiming to clear the way for full registration, titling, and commoditization of farmland.

The most internationally-prominent advocate of land titling, Hernando de Soto (2000), linked this market-promoting vision to smallholder (or peasant) farming via arguments about legal empowerment of the poor.<sup>17</sup> De Soto argued that customary or neocustomary tenure keeps the poor “locked out” of the market economy. Lack of land titles deprives the poor of opportunities to mortgage their land (or houses), and thus of the opportunity to turn their “dead assets” into cash and capital. Lack to title also prevents the poor from selling their assets, and thus preventing them from capturing the rising value that comes from activated land markets and property holders’ ability to buy and sell legally. In this vision, registration and titling puts African smallholders on equal footing with capitalist businessmen who can take full advantage of markets to buy, sell, borrow, and invest. “Dead assets” that are locked up in small, unproductive parcels can be freed to gravitate to higher-return activities elsewhere. The local culmination of this process is gradual transfer of land rights via the market to capital-rich actors, and gradual

---

<sup>15</sup> Elbow 1996 as cited by Herbst (2000:182).

<sup>16</sup> Ali, Deininger, and Goldstein, 2014: 1.

<sup>17</sup> See Cotula and Mathieu 2008 on the “formalization agenda.”

concentration of land ownership in the hands of those who can invest to achieve optimal economies of scale in production and commercialization.

Incremental scenarios by which legal rights are secured initially at low cost, with the option of more formal (expensive) titling in the future, are now built-into land law and policy in many African countries, including Tanzania, Uganda, and Côte d'Ivoire. Whether the "customary rights" certification programs underway in Tanzania, and provided for in the 1998 land laws in Uganda and Côte d'Ivoire, fall into the market-promoting category is a matter of great political debate. Some see these programs a stepping stone to land privatization, while others stress their potential to protect family smallholdings.

#### B. Secure the Use-Rights of Farmers to Stabilize the Peasantry

In the African context, user-rights securisation strategies gained tremendous momentum in the 1990s, in part in a reaction against the vision of market-led dispossession of small-scale African farmers and pastoralists. In agricultural areas, the goal of user-rights securisation programs is to shore-up and protect the land access and use rights of the small farmers now cultivating the land (including and often especially women). To extend a contrast made by Colin Leys (1996: 137), whereas the privatization/commodification strategy envisions a process whereby African farming comes to look more and more like large-scale commercial farming in the United States, those advocating legal recognition of small farmers' use rights envision African countryside organized along the small-holder farming models of Taiwan and Japan. Advocates argue that user-rights securitization would protect the poor from arbitrary dispossession by the government, powerful local elites (including politicians and neo-traditional authorities), and other land-grabbers; by reducing costly and disruptive land conflicts with neighbors and extended family members, and strengthening the position of women in such conflicts; and by enhancing incentives for investment and agricultural intensification on family farms. Holding clear, formal, and state-enforced (legally-enforced) land rights could also help promote rental and leasing

markets which would benefit ordinary land holders (and those seeking access to land), and could help make some kinds of investment and new technology adoption less risky for ordinary farming families.

Some advocates of user right securisation see this as a stepping-stone to titling and full commodification, as in the market-promoting vision mentioned above. The user-right vision I am describing now aims at a different goal: it aims to *constrain*, rather than promote, markets in land in order to strengthen family agriculture.<sup>18</sup> This is to be achieved by constraining the mortgageability and transferability of land rights. Some do so with spousal consent clauses, but this is a low bar.<sup>19</sup> Others subject sales to the consent of both spouse and children.<sup>20</sup> Some may subject sales of registered land to approval by a local land board, as was the case in Kenya from the 1970s with lands in the Rift Valley settlement schemes (a mechanism that was used to ward off foreclosures and evictions under Moi in the 1980s). Ethiopia makes the registered lands of smallholders completely non-alienable.<sup>21</sup> As Lavers explains (2012: 6 [ms page]), the government has sought to guarantee usufruct rights for smallholders in the politically-critical highlands (the

---

<sup>18</sup> As I reported in an earlier version of this research (Boone 2007), in 2003, Senegal's Conseil National de Concertation et de Coopération des Ruraux found that many smallholders in the groundnut basin supported registration and titling if this could be done in a way that strictly *limited* the transferability of land rights (CNCR 2003: 3, 6, 8-9).

<sup>19</sup> Tanzania's Certificates of Customary Right of Occupancy (CCROs) are an example. As Stein and Cunningham 2015 write (2015:2), Tanzania's 1999 Village Land Act fully recognized established user rights and placed them on an equal footing as statutory or granted rights. Under this law, elected Village Assemblies were empowered to manage village lands. In the period since 2004, Tanzania initiated two large-scale pilot programs (one directly sponsored by the World Bank, the other designed and run in cooperation with De Soto's Institute of Liberty and Democracy in Lima) to delimit the boundaries of village lands, and then to register, survey, and title individual holdings therein via the issuance of Certificates of Customary Rights of Occupancy, or CCROs. From 2011, has been possible to obtain CCROs for group holdings. Askew, Owens and Stein (2010: 16, 18) reported that by mid-2010, the World Bank program had delivered 6,800 titles to village offices, and that 17,500 CCROs had been delivered under the ILD-affiliated initiative. Villagers are encouraged to register spouses' names on the land certificates.

<sup>20</sup> In Uganda, after long debate, Museveni assented to the Land (Amendment) Act of 2004, which reinforced the (weak) land-transaction sanction powers of family members (wives and children) that existed in the market-promoting 1998 Land Act. (Gay 2016).

<sup>21</sup> See Deininger, Ali and Alemu, 2011. They define the non-alienability feature of Ethiopia's programme as a departure from traditional approaches to land titling (2011: 312). They report that Ethiopia's land registration program was one of the largest in the world: between 2005 and 2010, Ethiopia registered more than 20 million parcels of rural land to some 6 million households (2011: 315). This followed a similar program implemented in the Tigray region in 1998.

political base of the ruling EPRDF), "arguing that land privatisation would lead to distress sales and displacement of the peasantry."

In contrast to formalisation policies designed to displace village agriculture to promote agribusiness, registration scenarios that aim at securisation of smallholder user-rights often envision local-level land administration and governance institutions that could empower rural communities and their members to govern their own assets locally. Most optimistically, land tenure reform could provide a basis for building of new secular political institutions at the local level, and vesting these with some autonomy vis-à-vis the center, and perhaps making them democratic. This was the ideal that guided the Shivji Commission recommendations that helped shape debate over the 1999 Village Land Act in Tanzania. Tanzania's law was founded upon the user-rights principle, and aimed at explicit institutionalization and secularization of local land administration (Mallya 1999; Palmer 1999). It did not aim to be market-creating and was envisioned as creating conditions for local self-governance and democracy.

Proponents of the user-right securisation position often do not address the question of how land tenure regimes centered on user-rights would be sustained over time in the face of changes such as the growth of extended families, on-going socio-economic differentiation in rural communities, and/or continued adverse shifts in national and international regulatory contexts for smallholder agriculture. As I have argued elsewhere (Boone 2007), this is at least partly due to the recognition that the full political implications of user-right strategies would vary a great deal across space. Such open-endedness in the policy prescription (and in specification of the end goal) is one reason why the user-rights approach is often considered to be a flexible and practical way forward. Proponents of user-rights securisation see this kind of intervention as simply ratifying a *status quo* land distribution (although this may not be the case, as argued below).

### C. Strengthen Communal Rights for Ethnojustice and Territorial Autonomy

Those who advocate for the formalization in law of the ancestral, communal or customary rights of "culturally distinct" ethnic or indigenous communities are generally seeking legal protection for a status quo in which a "natural community" manages its own resources in ways that promote group solidarity and some degree of economic autonomy.<sup>22</sup> The contemporary demand is for state recognition of ethnic claims to collective ownership of ancestral territories and some if not all of the natural resources therein, as well as rights to indigenous self-governance. In the African context, such demands can closely parallel political calls for legally-affirming ethnic land rights that were institutionalized under colonial Indirect Rule (or extending such rights to groups not yet recognized by the state).<sup>23</sup>

International advocates of legal recognition and official registration of communities' neocustomary rights cut their teeth on Latin American and Central American cases in the 1980s. They gained considerable policy traction in Africa in the 1990s (Hodgson 2011), sometimes dovetailing with reform agendas centered on decentralization and community-based national resource management. In Senegal and Burkina Faso, decentralization programs of the 1990s reinforced the land prerogatives of established communities and of long-standing local elites.<sup>24</sup> New land laws in Niger (1993) and Côte d'Ivoire (1998) bolstered communal rights that *circumscribed* market forces, recognized the claims to property of those claiming to be autochthonous, and offered renewed state recognition neocustomary authorities. These legal innovations were designed to affirm the kinds of land entitlements that were institutionalized under colonial indirect rule. In debates over Uganda's 1998 land law, Baganda nationalists pressed to vest authority over land in Baganda land boards. Their aim was to defend Bagandan land rights against government encroachment and current land users ("squatters") who were to be

---

<sup>22</sup> See Anthias (2016) on Bolivian indigenous communities' quest for territorial recognition as the basis of a range of rights, including land rights, and for political autonomy that exceeds autonomy over land. See also Engle 2010, Brinks 2016.

<sup>23</sup> As for example in the case of the Ogiek in Kenya. See Di Matteo, forthcoming.

<sup>24</sup> Kaag 2001; Ouedraogo 2001: 1; Ribot 2004. The World Bank considered a pilot land titling program for Senegal that would commence in FY2005 (World Bank 2003:23). The plan was eventually dropped and titling proposals did not resurface in Senegal for over a decade.



protected by the 1998 law's (and the 2007 amendment's) proposed recognition of tenants' rights (user rights) (Joireman 2007, Green 2006, Kjaer 2016: 11, Gay 2016).

Yet another set of demands for legal recognition of “communal rights, defined as cultural, ethnic, or ancestral rights,” emerged in Africa in the 1990s and early 2000s: those of pastoralists. Representatives of some pastoralist peoples, such as the Maasai in Tanzania, joined the international indigenous rights movement to press their demands for legal recognition of their territorial claims, to put an end to land expropriations and expulsions, to assert rights to cultural self-determination. The economic goal is livelihood security through preservation of the viability of transhumant livestock management systems (Hodgson 2011: 70 *inter alia*).

Legal efforts to institutionalize community rights and group management of natural resources almost always entail efforts to formalize membership criteria, group decision-making and accountability mechanisms, and territorial jurisdictions (or boundaries). This entails *inter alia* efforts to constrain indigenous, cultural, or ethnic leaders whose authority rests in part on extra-legal sources legitimacy (hereditary or religious legitimacy, for example), even though this may cut against the traditional character of the authority that advocates of cultural autonomy seek to preserve.<sup>25</sup> In Africa there is the specter of deepening the balkanization of national territory into separate ethnic homelands.

### Part III. Tensions and Trade-offs

---

<sup>25</sup> Kenya's Community Land Law of 2016 opened the door to high degrees of secularization of the "registered groups" that can extract land from domains formerly managed by county councils as "Trust Lands" -- these lands can now be registered and titled as "community lands" held corporately by a group of named (listed) members. Community lands are to be managed by elected individuals who act as the group's agents, and who are supposed to abide by decision-making rules (formal meetings, quorum, voting) stipulated by law. Here the issue of "group identity" seems to be resolved in allowing a definition of "group" that is separated from culture or cultural distinctiveness.

Rather than offering a straight and clear path to pro-poor outcomes and to the mitigation of ethnic inequalities, the assignment and formalization of property rights in land can generate powerful tensions and tradeoffs. As the discussion below shows, this is because (1) the different land rights registration agendas entail different visions of the relations between individuals, communities, and the state; and (2) each land registration and titling path entails some sort of redefinition and redistribution of rights, creating winners and losers (albeit different ones).

#### A. Land individualization and privatization: Tensions and tradeoffs

Privatization's implications for the (re)distribution of land rights can be understood in terms of market effects and broader political, legal, and property effects. In terms of market effects, it is true that privatization would create winners. Winners will be those able to expand their holdings, defend them in court, borrow and invest successfully in their landholdings (or sell their land and invest the proceeds in an alternative, sustainable livelihood). Yet markets expose the poor and politically-vulnerable people to high risks of loss of property, either through the market itself, through legal maneuver, or perhaps through the government's increased latitude to exercise eminent domain and lawful eviction.

How property loss happens via market effects is easy to see. The mechanism is distress sales, due to economic recession, bad harvest, illness or death in the family, or calamity, whether through mortgage default or not. This is, after all, the historical path to land consolidation in the US, much of Europe and elsewhere, in the absence of explicit market restraints (such as homestead or other laws against foreclosure and eviction) designed to safeguard the homes and property of the poor. Markets offer many chances for opportunistic behavior, and tend to favor strong market actors: those with the capital, know-how, and information to protect and expand their property rights, and to buffer themselves against risk.

Privatization's implications for ordinary farming communities cannot be understood in terms of exposure of individually-held parcels to land market risks only. Great asymmetries of

political and legal power also work to favor the strong. "Subversion of justice by the strong" may well be the norm rather than the exception.<sup>26</sup>

Individualization may cause dispossession by what Ha-Joon Chang (2007: 22-3) calls the "coverage problem" -- ie., it does not recognize all existing forms of property or rights-holders. Neocustomary land tenure systems that prevail in most of sub-Saharan Africa are built around land rights that are multiple and overlapping.<sup>27</sup> Systematic, market-promoting registration and titling spells the demise of the commons, or land held by collectivities and governed by them (for eg., community grazing land, watershed, forests, sacred sites, water-access areas, etc.). Not only do groups (eg. members of extended families) claim shared rights to particular lands, but also rights themselves are complex bundles (eg. of rights to farm, graze animals, hunt, gather wood, access water points, transverse, etc) that give different classes of persons different kinds of access at different times. *Individualization* of control over a parcel of land, by definition, dispossesses the holders of multiple and overlapping rights to that land.<sup>28</sup> Where communal rights and land management systems (for example, community management of the commons and unallocated farmland) prevailed in the earlier period, losers would include community members, members of extended families, and future generations. Erosion of these familial and community level entitlements may impose the highest costs on precisely those least likely to hold onto their property through market mechanisms. At the same time, land privatization undermines other aspects of the social safety net function of community and (neo)customary ties.

---

<sup>26</sup> Glaeser, Ponzetto, and Shleifer (2016: 22) report that "in the WJP general survey [of 2015], respondents in developing countries see courts as among the least trusted institutions, and judges and magistrates among the most corrupt officials." On corruption in the legal profession itself, see Manji 2012, Joireman 2011; Askew, Maganga, and Odgaard 2013.

<sup>27</sup> For example, land cultivated by a household may be opened to other community members for post-harvest grazing; a community's reserve land may be subject to legitimate claims from multiple claimants; an extended family may have exclusive control over land, but individual family members may own crops (or trees, grazing rights, forest-collection rights, watering rights, etc) upon that land. See Downs and Reyna, 1988 and Bassett and Crummey, 1993.

<sup>28</sup> See Atuahene on expanding the legal definition of "takings" to cover these sorts of losses (2016).

Changes that erode communal coherence and structure enhance the economic autonomy of individuals vis-à-vis extended families, community leaders, and the community at large. This is indeed sometimes the intended effect. The argument appears explicitly in the advocacy of those who see titling and registration as a way to help free women from the patriarchal biases of neocustomary land land. Women's movements in Uganda, for example, have called for "rights-based" land systems that "improve women's ability to buy, own, sell, and obtain titles on land" (Tripp 2004:1-2). The World Bank's Frank Byamugisha (2013) and others have also advocated for registration and titling as a route to legal empowerment of women.

Where the process of land law reform has played out in the public sphere in African countries, many of the market risks associated with market-promoting individualization are cast in stark relief. Major issues that emerge time and time again have to do with the security of existing rights, especially for the poor, and of communal claims. In Zambia, Malawi, Senegal, and Kenya, proposed or enacted measures to accelerate privatization of land have encountered strong protest from defenders of existing users' land rights. In central Senegal, small-scale farmers and *Organisations Paysannes* joined the Conseil National de Concertation et Coopération des Ruraux (CNCR) to oppose the government's market-promoting land law reform in 1998. The CNCR's stark argument against the reform was "We will not [simply] disappear."<sup>29</sup> Chiefs in Zambia argued against the socially-disruptive and -disintegrative impact of the land individualization thrust of the 1995 Zambia Land Act, contributing to the largely-successful opposition to implementation of the law in the 1990s. (Mbinji 2006: 33). In 2010, parliamentarians from northern Uganda resisted systematic certification and individualization of land because they saw it as opening the door to government-facilitated land-grabbing by powerful locals and outside investors (Gay 2016: 584, Kjaer 2015).<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Tamba 2004; CNCR nd.

<sup>30</sup> As Kjaer (2015: 12) explained, in both northern Uganda and Buganda, many people do not so much assess the [1998 land] act as it looks on paper, but more its politics, and they fear that the act can be used as

## B. Registration of user-rights to protect peasant holdings: Tensions and tradeoffs

Securitization of user rights is the top priority for many international and Africa-based advocates for smallholder farmers. Such strategies seek to shelter smallholders from predatory markets and arbitrary dispossession and eviction. Some policies provide for incremental paths to full individualization and title, and some securisation programs build-in mechanisms for progressive and democratic political reform at the local level.

Yet as in the case of market-promoting reforms, movement from neocustomary rights to the registration of individual or household user-rights would strip land of (part of?) its connection to ancestral and extended-family rights, contributing to the erosion of communal/kinship bonds. Even if the market were held at bay, registration is highly likely to contribute to the break-up of complex interdependencies around community- and family-level resource sharing and use.

Formal institutionalization and secularization of local governance and land administration, as provided for by the 1999 Tanzanian Village Land Act mentioned above, is designed to address this possible trade-off between "communal" and individualized land management. Yet in Tanzania, there was acute debate over whether a democratic, or a bureaucratic-authoritarian, form of government would take hold at the local was a matter of acute debate. Some were optimistic that the Tanzania land law could expand local democratic control over land management, since the village assemblies with land prerogatives would be elected, open to local participation (rather than centrally-controlled), and be easier for villagers to monitor and sanction (Manji 2001). Issa Shivji was pessimistic on this front, fearing that registration of villages and users rights would greatly enhanced the power of the state at the expense of communities.

“The most striking feature of the two [land] bills is the enormous powers over the ownership, control, and management of village land placed in the hands of the Ministry [of Lands], and through the Ministry, the Commissioner. The Commissioner has even

---

excuse for the government to grab land." See also Joireman 2011. Do and Iyer (2008) found in a study of rural Vietnam that politically-connected households were the most likely to have land titles.

greater powers over reserved and general land. The role of more elective bodies, like the village assembly, as been virtually done away with” (Shivji 1999, cited by Manji 2001:334).

One of the most striking ways in which registration of village lands has expanded state power is by solidifying state control over lands not included in the village circumscriptions. As Stein and Cunningham (2015) argue, by delimiting village territories in Tanzania, the government has "freed up" lands outside these limits for allocation outside investors. In some cases, they argue, authorities appear to have drawn village limits to deliberately excise choice tracts from the village domain so that these could be leased for international agribusiness ventures.<sup>31</sup> When surveyors and lawyers operate on behalf of powerful actors, and where information asymmetries favor well-connected elites, outcomes that impose great costs on existing users and established communities may be achieved without explicit illegality or corruption.

User rights can also conflict with ancestral or communal rights. In some situations, upholding user-rights means overriding the rights of those who claim ancestral rights, rights as “original inhabitants” or first-comers, or neocustomary rights. Users may be in-migrants (settlers, strangers, foreigners, newcomers, tenants, sharecroppers) who have displaced, moved-in alongside, or entered into farming contracts with indigenes. Tenancy and contracting arrangements are common in zones of commercialized smallholder agricultural production in many parts of West Africa. In settings in which "users" do not have general social recognition as legitimate possessors or "owners" of the land, the titling of user rights can imply a radical exertion of state power to transfer rights from "indigenous inhabitants" to in-migrants, settlers, or newcomers. It would also usurp the right of the “natural community” to govern land.

---

<sup>31</sup> Drawing on the work of Linda Engström 2013, they describe a Kigoma, Tanzania case in which, as part of the formalization process, a village's land was surveyed by the regional commissioner. Nearly 7700 hectares were carved out of the village and put into the general land category, and thus available to investors. The “new” border was moved away from the river which is now outside the village. A joint Belgian-Tanzanian company obtained a 99 year lease covering 4258 hectares and has called upon the police to evict unauthorized users from this space. The process has been contentious.

In some of sub-Saharan Africa's bitterest political struggles over land rights, user rights have been pitted against communal rights. The tension between user-rights and neocustomary rights was in full display in the debate over the 1998 Uganda Land Act. Conflict arose over the government's move to register and title user-rights as the first step in a process that would lead straightforwardly to the full individualization and commodification of land. Buganda petitioners, politicians, and local government councilors mounted broad opposition to the 1998 law. The Land Act promised to securitize user rights by registering the land rights of farmers who had occupied a parcel of land for 12 or more years without paying rent. (See Kjaer 2016:14.) Buganda leaders saw this as an outright expropriation of Buganda lands in favor of pro-government Rwandans who had settled on their lands during the long years of unrest and civil war. Buganda leaders demanded that control over Buganda land be vested in a regional-level land board, which would act on behalf of the Buganda king, the Kabaka, in his role as trustee of Buganda lands. The Ugandan government resisted, arguing that creating a Buganda Regional Land Board in Mengo would "revive historical conflicts and rivalries in respect of land" (Green 2006: 383). Joireman (2005: 11) wrote that "parliamentary debate over the [1998 land act] was vigorous, inciting such great controversy over the specifics of the Land Act that the government feared civil unrest."

### C. Registration of communal and ethnic land rights: Tensions and tradeoffs

William Munro (1998: 40) argued that in Africa, the land tenure regime pegs the state to either the individual or the community. Where land ownership is registered in the name of a descent-based group, the state is pegged to the community, defined as a territorial entity, an administrative jurisdiction, and a political collectivity that is nested within a wider polity. In the ethno justice vision, these political collectivities are recognized as the natural, constituent units of modern nations that the postcolonial state seeks to bring into being.

Critics of the ethnojustice land agenda (Mamdani 1996, Ribot 1999, Branch 2011) stress the extent to which a land tenure regime that institutionalizes ethnic territories as subnational jurisdictions can consolidate "local states" that may be insulated from pro-democratic and progressive political currents and possibilities that may prevail in the wider political arena of the secular state.<sup>32</sup> The reach of the the national state, rule-of-law, and a national democratic institutions may be compromised by the presence of local states whose legitimacy and efficacy is judged in part on their ability to reproduce the the "natural community." Local authorities cannot be truly democratic, Mamdani argues, because their authority is at least partly derived from, and exercised through, non-democratic principles or practices.

Along with local states comes sub-national citizenship, identities, rights and duties, and legal entitlements that are reserved for those whose status as indigenous is confirmed by the local community, and by extension, the state itself. Those not indigenous to a given locality would have some second-class status therein: they would lack not only the economic but also the political rights of indigenes. This form of local citizenship competes with the project of developing truly national citizenship.

Dilemmas that communal or community-based property rights regimes pose for the modern state emerged starkly in post-apartheid South Africa. In the late 1990s, the Department

---

<sup>32</sup> This critique overlaps with critiques of consociationalism, colonial Indirect Rule, and other institutional constructs that allot representation on an ethnic basis and divide-up national territories into ethnic subregions – e.g., the effect of "hardening" identities and artificially creating group boundaries (thus perhaps laying institutional bases that structure future conflict along these very boundary lines; creating incentives for continued ethnic identification and disincentives for the strengthening of national identities and national legal and political norms and rules; creating subnational citizenship hierarchies in which "ethnic homelands" contain populations of disenfranchised ethnic outsiders or second-class citizens who are not members of the titular ethnic group. It also overlaps with critiques of "neocustomary" authority as patriarchal, and at odds with individual rights in a myriad of other ways as well. Some analysts may also highlight the market-constraining and rent-generating aspects (as for example in restricting land ownership and land transactions to ethnic insiders) of these tenure systems.



of Land Affairs experimented with transferring land ownership rights in “communal areas” to groups that coalesced to form legal entities (such as Communal Property Associations).<sup>33</sup>

“Multiple problems and conflicts emerged in the test cases: Could land be transferred to ‘tribes,’ as some groups demanded? In [that] case, how could the state ensure democratic decision-making, principles of equity, and rights of due process? In some cases, one group within the community expressed support for traditional structures but was opposed by others who preferred ‘democratic’ structures. ...Another challenge was the definition of what constituted a democratic majority -- where did the boundaries of the group lie, particularly in situations where smaller and larger groups were in conflict?” (Cousins 2002: 89, cited also in Boone 2007).

At the same time, legal recognition of communal rights can legitimate rules of land access that discriminate along the lines of ethnicity, gender, age, religion, or other ascriptive status. Ribot (2004) critiqued land law reform strategies that shore-up neotraditional authority and neotraditional institutions as anti-democratic.<sup>34</sup>

The tension between neocustomary (or communal) rights and user rights lies at the heart of Côte d’Ivoire’s 1998 land law. Although the law was originally envisioned by some of its drafters in the 1990s as a move that would both securise smallholder rights and set in motion a long and gradual process of commodification and privatization of land, it was interpreted very differently by the Gbagbo regime that came to power in 2000. The law not only bars non-nationals from registering acquired land rights, but in the hands of the Gbagbo regime, it was also envisioned as a tool to promote the land rights of autochthones over those of all others (Boone 2009). The law gave responsibility for certifying landholdings (which could then be registered and eventually, titled) to committees of village-level chiefs and elders whose mandate was to certify the claims of those holding neocustomary or ancestral rights to the land. The *initial allocation of rights* was thus to be done on the basis of autochthony. User-rights clearly lost out to rights based on communal membership.

---

<sup>33</sup> On this, see also Kepe (1999) on “the problem of defining community.”

<sup>34</sup> Anthias's (2016) case studies of “The New Extraction” in Bolivia suggest that realization of indigenous autonomy via state-recognized communal control over natural resources may empower local leaders to act as brokers vis-à-vis outsiders, and that as brokers, they may be relatively unconstrained when it comes to leasing-out or otherwise contracting-out community assets. Mechanisms of downward accountability are not necessarily guaranteed.

The shift in the distribution of power over the land proved to be politically-explosive in the south-central and southwestern parts of Côte d'Ivoire, where massive immigration since the 1950s had created a regional population comprised largely (at perhaps the 50% level) of non-indigenes who had spearheaded the creation of smallholder coffee and cocoa plantations all across the southwest. The "re-traditionalization" or neo-traditionalization of the land rights allocation process effectively dispossessed in-migrants to Côte d'Ivoire's southwest on a massive scale, contributing decisively to the outbreak of civil conflict in the 1999, armed rebellion in 2002, and paralysis of the county until 2011 (Chauveau 2000: 113-4). With the coming to power of Alassane Ouattara in 2011, the tables were turned. Conflicts that pit holders of user-rights against customary rights holders continue to burn in Côte d'Ivoire.

Echoes of these struggles are heard in Kenya today. Kenya's new 2010 constitution and subsequent implementing legislation have created 47 counties to which many central government functions are to be devolved. The accompanying 2012 Land Act declares that all land in Kenya be registered by 2012. Both moves have been hailed as reforms that will empower ordinary citizens and small landholders to fight corruption, predatory politicians, and land grabbers. Among the first conflicts to arise in the land domain, however, were precisely conflicts over whether devolved administration of land rights would shore-up the land claims of those currently farming the land, including those who purchased land in earlier decades (titleholders or not), or whether the new county powers should be used to restore land to members of the titular (or majority) ethnic group in each county.<sup>35</sup>

Does land rights registration and titling uphold the rights of those farming the land today, or those with neocustomary or ancestral claims? This painfully divisive debate is very close to the surface in all three countries today. The cases underscore the point that the decision to register rights does not resolve the logically-prior matter of who the legitimate rights-holders actually *are*.

---

<sup>35</sup> See Boone et al. (2016) on the autochtony discourses around land in Kenya's new counties.

## Conclusion

This paper has argued that very different visions of political and economic order may converge and blur in policy proposals that advocate for legal empowerment of the poor through land titling and registration. Each generates tensions, tradeoffs, and risks, although these cut in different ways. Framing contrasts draws out some of these downside risks and potential conflicts. These dilemmas are inescapable when contemplating transformation "of the institutional context of African agriculture" or landholding more generally. Any assignment and registration of rights will involve some redistribution of rights and transformation in the nature of the rights themselves. This helps to explain why land registration and titling proposals and policies have been divisive in many African countries.

The dilemmas and tradeoffs are compounded by the limits of legalism itself.<sup>36</sup> A system of assigning and politically-recognizing property claims or rights will be embedded in markets (national and global, be they formal or informal, competitive or rigged), a larger political system, and a legal order. Legal empowerment solutions cannot protect against any of these, and in some ways may heighten ordinary farmers' and pastoralists' exposure to political, economic, and legal risk.<sup>37</sup> Four points about these tensions, tradeoffs, and risks can be summarized here.

The first is that registration and titling do not protect the poor against the market. To protect against market risk, safeguards like homestead laws; zoning; and restrictions on eviction, credit, mortgaging, leasing, etc. need to be designed with this social purpose in mind. Policies and regulations that govern the ways in which smallholder agriculture and pastoralism are incorporated into larger national, regional and international economies also need to be designed to achieve this social purpose.

---

<sup>36</sup> See Joireman 2011, Colin 2013: 430; Manji 2012, and Kennedy 2006, who frames the problem as "the risk of overestimating the ease with which social purposes can be achieved through law" (2006: 106).

<sup>37</sup> Stein and Cunningham (2015: 8): "The idea that formalization is the best route to prevent land grabbing is a simple one which abstracts from the real power dynamics embedded in rural Africa."

Second is that empowerment solutions do not protect against the state and the law in contexts of great power asymmetries and economic inequalities, and where legal systems are "systematically biased against the poor."<sup>38</sup> Legal systems, like markets, are not inherently benign or neutral. The implementation of legal empowerment rules and procedures, even if designed to be pro-poor, may not be in the hands of those who embrace this objective. Deininger et al. are correct when they point out that land registration does not dispose of the risk of exposure to the "larger policy environment."<sup>39</sup> Experience in Africa and beyond shows that powerful actors will use both the market *and the law* for land grabbing.<sup>40</sup>

Third is that in most places -- that is, where de facto privatization of commodification of land is not present -- existing land tenure regimes are comprised of multiple, overlapping claims to land. These existing multiple and overlapping claims are embedded in *institutions* -- lineage, familial, neocustomary, chieftaincy, patriarchal, age-sets, etc. Collective and many secondary claims, as well as the institutions in which they are embedded, are weakened by registration and titling, and likely to be extinguished by full commodification of land.

Fourth and lastly, the land tenure status quo in many parts of contemporary Africa is a tenuous and contentious one: in many places, it is unstable and is built of *conflicting* claims around land. Land law reform is thus not neutral, necessarily welfare-enhancing for all those affected, or even necessarily pareto optimal. Reform has *redistributive* effects. It thus cannot be separated from inherently political choices about whose property rights the states will enforce; the desired extent of bureaucratization, secularization, and democratization of political authority; the scope and content of local and national citizenship; and the scope and limits of the market. Basic questions of political order, and the social purposes of politics, law, and the market are at stake

---

<sup>38</sup> Binswanger and Deininger 1997: 1964.

<sup>39</sup>

<sup>40</sup> See Manji 2006, 2012. All three visions of land registration, as Platteau 1996: 42 suggested, entail expansion and intensification of the role and presence of the state in land administration. State agents and agencies must not only supervise, enforce, and adjudicate contracts, etc., but also regulation land valuation, registration itself, demarcation, and presumably taxation.

(Boone 2014). Open acknowledgement of these complexities means that advocacy for legal reform cannot be separated from much wider, but fundamentally national, political processes and debates.

This means that land registration as a one-size-fits all strategy is not necessarily "better than nothing." As Jean-Philippe Colin (2013: 430) writes, there are still "very large debates around registration and titling, with different views on many points, including the respective roles of the state and communities in the processes of formalisation and enforcement, the nature and content of rights to formalise, and their individual or collective character." He adds that empirical evidence from Africa often sheds doubt on the effectiveness of land registration as a strategy for reducing tenure insecurity and conflict, and for securing the land rights of the poor. Context matters: this includes the nature of the prevailing land tenure regimes, national and subnational political regimes, socio-economic and legal environments, and existing distributions of power, resources, and market opportunity.<sup>41</sup>

Some land rights activists and scholars seek to avoid a narrow focus on land registration and titling -- what Ha-Joon Chang (2007: 21-23) characterized as "property rights reductionism" - - and advocate instead for broader strategies aimed at enhancing rural communities' capacity for collective action in defense of shared interests in complex and often changing national contexts.<sup>42</sup> Such capacities may be enhanced by local conflict resolution, building institutional capacity at the local level, and bridging local social and political cleavages. Economic empowerment via ecosystem revitalization and improved opportunities to participate in local, regional, and international markets on advantageous terms -- that is, going beyond defensive strategies and toward economic rebuilding -- is also necessary to the success of the empowerment agenda.

### Reference List

---

<sup>41</sup> Domingo and O'Neil 2014: 4-5; Waldorf 2016.

<sup>42</sup> See for example Cotula and Mathieu 2008; Waldorf 2016; Gauri and Meru, *forthcoming*.

Ali, Daniel Ayalew, Matthew Collin, Klaus Deininger, et al. 2014. "The Price to Empowerment: Empirical Evidence on Land Titling in Tanzania," World Bank Development Research Group Agriculture and Rural Development Team, Policy Research Working Paper WPS6908, Washington, DC: The World Bank (June).

Alden Wily, Liz. 2001. Reconstructing the African Commons,' *Africa Today*, 48: 77-99.

Alden Wily, Liz. 2003. *Governance and Land Relations: A Review of Decentralization of Land Administration and Management in Africa*. London: International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), June.

Amanor, Kojo Sebastian. 1999. *Global Restructuring and Land Rights in Ghana: Forest Food Chains, Timber, and Rural Livelihoods*. Nordiska Afrikainstitutet Research Report n. 108.

Anthias, Penelope. 2016. Indigenous Peoples and the "New Extraction": From Territorial Rights to Hydrocarbon Citizenship in the Bolivian Chaco," Forthcoming (2016), 'Indigenous peoples and the new extraction'. Special issue 'Open Veins Revisited' N. Fabricant (ed.) *Latin American Perspectives*.

Askew, Kelly, Faustin Maganga and Rie Odgaard. 2013. "Of Land and Legitimacy: A Tale of Two Lawsuits," *Africa* 83 (1): 120-141.

Askew, Kelly, Kate Owens, and Howard Stein. 2010. "The World Bank and Land Titling in Rural Tanzania," a paper presented at the 2010 Annual Meetings of the African Studies Association, 18-20 November, San Francisco.

Atuahene, Bernadette. 2016. "Takings as a Sociolegal Concept: An interdisciplinary examination of involuntary property loss," *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 12:15.1-15.27.

Bassett, Thomas and Donald E. Crummey, eds. 1993. *Land in African Agrarian Systems* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press).

Benjaminsen, T. and Sjaastad, E. 2008. "Legal Empowerment for Local Resource Control: Securing Local Resource Rights within Foreign Investment Projects in Africa." London, IIED.

Berry, Sara. 2002. "Debating the land question in Africa," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 44/2 (October): 638-668.

Binswanger, Hans P. and Klaus Deininger. 1997. "Explaining Agricultural and Agrarian Policies in Developing Countries." *Journal of Economic Literature* 35: 1958-2005.

Boone, Catherine. 2007. "Property and Constitutional Order: Land Tenure Reform and the Future of the African State," *African Affairs* 106 (Oct.): 557-86.

Boone, Catherine. 2014. *Property and Political Order in Africa: Land Rights and the Structure of Politics* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Boone, C., Alex Dyzenhaus, Seth Ouma, James Kabugu Owino, Catherine Giteri, Achibe Gargule, Jackie Klopp, and Ambreena Manji. 2016. Land Politics under Kenya's New Constitution Counties, Devolution, and The National Land Commission, LSE Department of International Development Working Paper 178 (October).

Branch, Adam. 2011. *Displacing Human Rights: War and Intervention in Northern Uganda* (Oxford University Press).

- Brinks, Daniel. 2016. Access to what? Legal agency and access to justice for indigenous peoples in Latin America. A paper presented at the 7-8 October 2016 UNU-WIDER workshop on "Addressing Group-Based Inequality through Legal Empowerment."
- Bruce, John W., and Shem E. Migot-Adholla (eds). 1994. *Searching for Land Tenure Security in Africa* (Washington, D.C. and Debuque, Iowa: The World Bank and Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company).
- Byamugisha, F. F. 2013. *Securing Africa's land for shared prosperity: a program to scale up reforms and investments*. World Bank Publications.
- Chang, Ha-Joon. 2007. "Institutional Change and Economic Development: An Introduction," in H-J Chang, ed., *Institutional Change and Economic Development*. London: Anthem Press and UNU-WIDER, pp. 1-14.
- Chanock, Martin. 1998. *Law, Custom, and Social Order: The Colonial Experience in Malawi and Zambia*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann. First published in 1985 by Cambridge University Press.
- Chauveau, Jean-Pierre. 2000. 'Question foncière et construction nationale en Côte d'Ivoire,' *Politique Africaine*, 78: 94-125.
- Chimhowu, Admos and Phil Woodhouse. 2006. "Customary vs Private Property Rights? Dynamics and Trajectories of Vernacular Land Markets in Sub-Saharan Africa," *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 6/3 (July): 346-371.
- Colin, Jean-Philippe. 2013. "Securing rural land transactions in Africa: An Ivoirian Perspective." *Land Use Policy* 31: 430-440.
- Conseil National de Concertation et de Coopération des Ruraux (CNCR). 2003. 'Réflexion des Organisations Paysannes sur la Réforme Foncière: Compte Rendu de l'Atelier Régional de Diourbel/Louga, Bambey, 2003' (unpub. ms., 17 pages, Dakar: CNCR).
- Conseil National de Concertation et de Coopération des Ruraux (CNCR). n.d. 'Le CNCR dans le cyclone de la privatisation de la SONACOS: Partenariat ou jeu de cache cache?' document posted on [www.cncr.org](http://www.cncr.org), accessed 7 July 2004.
- Cotula, Lorenzo and Paul Mathieu, eds. 2008. *Legal Empowerment in Practice: Using legal tools to secure land rights in Africa*. London: International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) and UN Food and Agriculture Organization (UNFAO).
- Cousins, Ben. 2002. 'Legislating Negotiability: Security, Equity, and Class Formation in Africa's Land Systems,' in Kristine Juul and Christian Lund (eds), *Negotiating Property in Africa* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann), pp. 67-106.
- De Soto, H. 2000. *The Mystery of Capital: Why Capitalism Triumphs in the West and Fails Everywhere Else*. New York: Basic Books.
- Deininger, K. 2003. "Land Policies for Growth and Poverty Reduction." World Bank Policy Research Report 26384 (June).
- Deininger, K. and H. Binswanger. 1999. 'The Evolution of the World Bank's Land Policy,' *The World Bank Research Observer*, 14, 2, pp. 247-76.
- Deininger, Klaus, Daniel Ayalew Ali, and Tekie Alemu. 2011. "Impacts of Land Certification on Tenure Security, Investment, and Land Market Participation: Evidence from Ethiopia," *Land Economics* 87(2), May: 312-334.

Di Matteo, Francesca. forthcoming. "Community Land in Kenya as a matter of Policy Making, Social Mobilization, and Struggle over legal entitlement," ms. to be presented at LSE Land Politics Workshop, 1. Feb. 2017.

Do, Quy-Toan and Iyer, Lakshmi. 2008. "Land titling and rural transition in Vietnam," *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 56: 531-579.

Domingo, Pilar and Tam O'Neil. 2014. "Overview: The Political Economy of Legal Empowerment: Legal Mobilisation Strategies and Implications for Development," UK Overseas Development Institute ODI Report, June.

Downs, R. E. and S.P. Reyna, eds. 1988. *Land and Society in Contemporary Africa*. Hanover and London: University of New Hampshire and University Press of New England.

Elbow, Kent et al., 1996. *Country Profiles of Land Tenure: West Africa* (Madison, Land Tenure Center, 1996).

Engle, Karen. 2010. *The Elusive Promise of Indigeneous Development: Rights, Culture, Strategy*. Duke University Press.

Engström, Linda. 2013. "Contradictory Biofuel Investments," Nordic Africa Institute post, Uppsala: NAI. 17 April. <http://www.nai.uu.se/news/articles/2013/04/17/111904/index.xml>

Ensminger, Jean. 1997. "Changing Property Rights: Reconciling Formal and Informal Rights to Land," in *Frontiers of the New Institutional Economics*. John N. Drobak and John V. C. Nye, eds. San Diego, London, Boston: Academic Press: 165-196.

Gauri, Varun and Vivek Maru. forthcoming. *Bring Law to Life : Community Paralegals and the Pursuit of Justice*. New York? Cambridge University Press.

Gay, Lauriane. 2014. "A 'Hot Cake': The Land Issue in the Buganda Kingdom during Uganda's 2011 Elections" in Sandrine Perrot, Sabiti Makara, Jerome Lafargue, and Marie-Aude Fouéré (eds). *Elections in a Hybrid Regime: Revisiting the 2011 Uganda Elections*. Kampala: Fountain Publishers.

Gay, Lauriane. 2016. "A la recherche de l'hégémonie: La fabrique très politique des politiques publiques foncières en Ouganda sous le régime du NLM. Entre changement et inertie." PhD dissertation, University of Montpellier, Ecole Doctorale Droit et Science Politique, Unité de Recherche ART-Dév., December.

Glaeser, Edward L, Giacomo A.M. Ponzetto, and Andrei Shleifer. 2016. "Securing Property Rights," National Bureau of Economic Research NBER Working Paper 22701. Cambridge, MA: NBER, September.

Green, Elliott. 2006. "Ethnic Politics and Land Tenure Reform in Central Uganda," *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, 44, 3 (2006): 370-388.

Herbst, Jeffrey. 2000. *States and Power in Africa* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).

Hodgson, Dorothy. 2011. *Becoming Maasai, Indigenous: Postcolonial Politics in a Neoliberal World* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press).

Jayne, T.S. et al. 2014. "Land Pressures, the evolution of farming systems, and development strategies in Africa: A synthesis," *Food Policy* 48: 1-17.



- Joireman, Sandra. 2005. "Enforcing New Property Rights in sub-Saharan Africa: The Uganda Constitution and the 1998 Land Act' (a paper prepared for the conference on "Comparative Constitutionalism and Rights: Global Perspectives," Durban, South Africa, 10-13 December 2005.
- Joireman, Sandra. 2007. Enforcing New Property Rights in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Ugandan Constitution and 1998 Land Act. *Comparative Politics*, 39 (4), July, pp. 463-480.
- Joireman, Sandra. 2011. *Where There is No Government: Enforcing Property Rights in Common Law Africa* (Oxford U. Press).
- Kaag, Mayke. 2001. *Usage foncier et usage dynamique sociale au Sénégal: L'histoire d'un bas fond et de ses defricheurs* (Amsterdam: Rosenberg Publishers).
- Kay, Kelly. 2016. Breaking the bundle of rights: Conservation easements and the legal geographies of individuating nature." *Environment and Planning A*, 48/3: 504-522.
- Kennedy, David. 2006. The "Rule of Law," Political Choices, and Development Common Sense," in David M. Trubek and Alvaro Santos, eds., *The New Law and Economic Development: A Critical Appraisal*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 95-173.
- Kepe, Thembele. 1999. 'The problem of defining "community:" Challenges for the land reform programme in rural South Africa,' *Development Southern Africa*, 16, 3, pp. 435-446.
- Kjear, Anne Mette. 2016. "The political incentives of implementing land reform in Uganda," Draft paper for the Trust/Land workshop, 6-9 January 2016, Gulu.
- Kydd, Jonathan, Andrew Dorward, and Jamie Morrison. 2004. 'Agricultural Development and Pro-Poor Economic Growth in sub-Saharan Africa: Potential and Policy,' *Oxford Development Studies*, 32, 1 (2004), pp. 37-57.
- Lavers, T. 2012. "'Land Grab' as development strategy: The political economy of agricultural investment in Ethiopia," *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 39 (1): 105-132.
- Leys, Colin. 2009. *The Rise and Fall of Development Theory*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Mallya, Ernest T., 'Civil Society and the Land Question in Tanzania (first draft)' (Department of Political Science and Public Administration, University of Dar es Salaam, December 1999, published by Institute of Development Studies (IDS), UK, 2000. Posted at [www.eldis.org/static/Doc10844.htm](http://www.eldis.org/static/Doc10844.htm), accessed 1 June 2005).
- Mamdani, Mahmood. 1996. *Citizen and Subject*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mamdani, Mahmood. 2012. *Define and Rule: Native as Political Identity*. Harvard U. Press.
- Manji, Ambreena. 2001. 'Land Reform in the Shadow of the State: The implementation of new land laws in Sub-Saharan Africa,' *Third World Quarterly*, 22, 3: 327-42.
- Manji, Ambreena. 2006. 'Legal Paradigms in Contemporary Land Reform,' *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, 44, 1: 151-165.
- Manji, Ambreena. 2012. Lawyers, Politics, and Public Land in Kenya," *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 53/3: 467-92.
- Mathieu, Paul. 1997. "La sécuritisation foncière entre compromis et conflit," in *Démocratie, Enjeux Fonciers, et Pratiques Locales in Afrique*. P. Mathieu, Pierre-Joseph Laurent, and Jean-Claude Willame, eds. Paris: L'Harmattan: 26-44.

- Mbinji, Joseph. 2006. 'Getting Agreement on Land Tenure Reform: The case of Zambia,' in Esther Mwangi (ed), *Land Rights for African Development: From Knowledge to Action* (Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research, United Nations Development Project, and International Land Coalition (CGIAR/UNDP/ILC), Collective Action and Property Rights (CAPRI) Policy Brief.
- McAuslan, Patrick. 1998. 'Making Law Work: Restructuring Land Relations in Africa,' *Development and Change*, 29, 3 (1998), pp. 525-552.
- Moore, Sally Falk. 1986. *Social Facts and Fabrications: 'Customary' Law on Kilimanjaro, 1880-1980*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moyo, Sam and Paris Yeros, eds. 2007. *Reclaiming the Land: The Resurgence of Rural Movements in Africa, Asia, and Latin America* (London: Zed Books).
- Munro, William A. 1998. *The Moral Economy of the State: Conservation, Community Development, and State Making in Zimbabwe*. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Quedraogo, Hubert. 2001. 'Law and Community Based Property Rights in West Africa,' *Common Property Resource Digest*, 57 (2001), pp. 1, 5.
- Palmer, Robin. 1999. Independent Review, Land Issues, East Africa, Aug.
- Peters, Pauline. 2004. 'Inequality and Social Conflict over Land in Africa,' *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 4, 3, pp. 269-314.
- Platteau, Jean-Phillipe. 1996. 'The Evolutionary Theory of Land Rights as Applied to Sub-Saharan Africa: A Critical Assessment,' *Development and Change*, 27, 1 (1996), pp. 29-85.
- Ribot, Jesse C., 'Decentralization, Participation, and Accountability in Sahelian Forestry: Legal Instruments of Political-Administrative Control,' *Africa*, 69, 1 (1999), pp. 23-43.
- Ribot, Jesse C., *Waiting for Democracy: The Politics of Choice in Natural Resource Decentralization* (Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, September 2004).
- Stein, Howard and Samantha Cunningham. 2015. "Formalization and Land Grabbing in Africa: Facilitation or Protection?" Paper to be presented at the conference Harvard Law School IGLP Doha Santander Grants 'Land Grabs in Africa: Economic Imperialism?' Africa Land Grabbing International Conference and Workshop Dschang, Cameroon, 3-7 August 2015. Forthcoming in Amin George Forji and Imoro Razak Jaha, eds. *Land Grabs in Africa: Economic Imperialism? Critical Contributions to a New Paradigm* (forthcoming)]
- Shivji, Issa G., 'Protection of peasants and pastoral rights in land: a brief review of the bills for the Land Act 1998 and the Village Land Act 1998,' paper presented to the Parliamentary Committee for Finance and Economic Affairs Workshop on the Bills for the Land Act and Village Land Act, Dodoma, Tanzania, 26-28 January 1999.
- Tamba III, Jean-Matthew. 2004. 'Farmers tell Government: We will not be sacrificed,' *Panos* (London), 10 August, posted on allafrika.com and accessed on 10 September 2004.
- Vail, Leroy, ed. 1989. *The Creation of Tribalism in Southern Africa* (London: James Currey).
- Waldorf, Lars. 2016. "Peace-Building, Group-Based Inequalities, and Legal Empowerment." A paper presented at the 7-8 October 2016 UNU-WIDER workshop on "Addressing Group-Based Inequality through Legal Empowerment."

Williams, Gavan. 1981. 'The World Bank and the Peasant Problem,' in Judith Heyer, Gavan Williams, and Pepe Roberts (eds), *Rural Development in Tropical Africa*. New York: St. Martin's Press, pp. 16-51.

World Bank. 1989. *Sub-Saharan Africa: From Crisis to Sustainable Growth* (Washington, D.C., 1989).

World Bank. 2003. 'Country Assistance Strategy: Senegal,' 23 March.

World Bank. 2005. Land Policy and Administration Homepage, available at <http://Inweb18.worldbank.org/ESSD/ardext.nsf/24ByDocName/LandPolicyandAdministration/> Accessed 23 Oct. 2005.