



SPOTLIGHT ON KNOWLEDGE: LAND TENURE IN PASTORALIST SOCIETIES

- ▶ **Altrichter, M., Basurtoc, X., 2008.** [Effects of Land Privatization on the Use of Common-pool Resources of Varying Mobility in the Argentine Chaco.](#) *Conservation and Society* 6(2): 154–165.

The authors hypothesize that the community effects of land privatization policies depend in part on the mobility of common-pool resources. The present the results of their study on the effects of land privatization in a dry region of the Argentine Chaco where low income peasants depend on multiple common-pool resources (CPRs) to survive and where most recently privatization of land tenure has also included large absentee landowners.

- ▶ **Atwood, D. A. 1990.** [Land registration in Africa: The impact on agricultural production.](#) *World Development*. 18 (5): 659-671

This paper disputes the conventional view that informal or traditional systems of land rights impede agricultural development and titling or registration of land is needed to encourage transfer of land to progressive farmers, improve access to credit, and create incentives for investments in improving land, soil conservation and new technology. They argue that titling may be expensive thereby not achieving the desired effects and cheaper alternatives exists that will guarantee individual rights more effectively as the titling/registration programs.

- ▶ **Baland, J.M., Platteau, J.P. 1998.** [Division of the Commons: A partial assessment of the New Institutional Economics of Land Rights.](#) *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 80(3): 644-50.

This paper asks hoe land assets customarily held under corporative ownership get privatized. The authors discuss the principles of the property rights school that asserts that private property is the most efficient arrangement when land assets have become scarce. They point to a number of limitations of this approach, including its neglect of the distributive impact (equity effects) of institutional changes.



- ▶ **Bellemare, M.F. 2013. [The Productivity Impacts of Formal and Informal Land Rights: Evidence from Madagascar](#). *Land Economics* 89, no. 2: 272-290.**

The paper uses the case study of Madagascar to test whether formal or informal land rights have impacts on agricultural productivity. The authors find that there is no statistical significance of land titling on agricultural productivity and conclude that formal land rights such as those establishing through titling programs, will not lead to increased productivity in Madagascar.

- ▶ **Boucher, S., Bradford L. B. 2004. [Land market liberalization and wealth differentiated land access: Panel evidence from Honduras and Peru](#). Selected Paper prepared for presentation at the American Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meeting, Denver, Colorado, August 1-4, 2004**

This paper examines the effects of land market liberalization estimating econometric models of the relationship between operational and owned landholding pre and post land market liberalization policies in Honduras and Peru. Specifically it examines 1) the degree to which land liberalization policies have broken down the dependence of operational area on owned area by promoting more rentals especially to the land-poor households, and 2) the impacts of tenure security on credit supply conditions.

- ▶ **Cotula, L., Toulmin, C., Quan, J. 2006. [Better land access for the rural poor: Lessons from experience and challenges ahead](#). International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). IIED, FAO.**

Authors underline that particular groups tend to be more vulnerable to pressure on land, including those relying on common property resources. "Indigenous lands are typically held in common by relatively large communities. Therefore, titling processes centered on individual private property are wholly inadequate and different tools to improve land tenure security, tailored to community needs, are required including a wide range of joint and communal interests, and of public interests and rights."

- ▶ **De Janvry, A., Sadoulet, E. 2001. *Access to Land and Land Policy Reforms*. Policy Brief No. 3, UNU/WIDER.**

This policy brief is a summary of the UNU/WIDER project volume *Access to Land, Rural Poverty and Public Action* (Oxford University Press, March 2011). It analyses different mechanisms of access to land for the rural poor in an era where redistribution through expropriative land reform is largely inconsistent with



the forces of the political economy. Authors underline that, to be effective, land policies reforms must be embedded in comprehensive policy and institutional reforms, and complemented by effective rural development interventions in support of the competitiveness of beneficiaries.

- ▶ **Deininger, K., Binswanger, H. 1999.** [The Evolution of the World Bank's Land Policy: Principles, Experience, and Future Challenges.](#) *World Bank Research Observatory* 14 (2): 247-276.

This article examines the evolution of policy recommendations concerning rural land issues since the formulation of the World Bank's "Land Reform Policy Paper" in 1975. Authors argue why while in the 25 years since that paper was published, these guiding principles have remained the same, but it is now recognized that communal tenure systems can be more cost-effective than formal title.

- ▶ **DFID 2002.** [Better livelihoods for poor people: The role of Land Policy.](#) London: Department for International Development (DFID), London.

Since the 1960s, programs of land titling have sought to strengthen tenure by converting customary or other informal rights to land to statutory rights. Private household plots have provided an important safety net in supporting livelihoods and food security during the transition process. But few titling programs in developing countries have succeeded. This paper advocates a rights-based approach to land meaning advocacy and representation of the poor in land management. What interests us from this paper is mostly when it addresses the issue of strengthening tenure security.

- ▶ **Diez, A. (2006).** *Las organizaciones colectivas, los recursos y los pueblos indígenas en el Perú (Collective organisations, resources and indigenous people in Peru)*. In: Eguren, Fernando (ed.), *Reforma agraria y desarrollo rural en la región andina (Agrarian reform and rural development in the Andean Region)* (pp. 111-130). Centro Peruano de Estudios Sociales (CEPES), Lima.

Diez presents an overview of how peasant and indigenous communities of Peru function. He begins by describing the historic relation communities have established with the state. Then, he moves to examine the logic of resources use within the communities, moving from the logic of property to the logic of territory. Finally, he discusses the implications of this resource use model on issues of autonomy and self-determination.



- ▶ **Feder, G., Nishio, A. 1998. [The benefits of land registration and titling: Economic and social perspectives.](#) *Land Use Policy* 15 (1): 25-43**

This paper evaluates the effects of land registration and titling around the world (using cases of rural Thailand, urban Philippines, urban Indonesia, rural India, experiences from Latin America and the Caribbean, and rural Africa). Authors argue that there is convincing evidence from around the world that land registration has led to better access to formal credit, higher land values, higher investments in land, and higher output/income. But there are prerequisites for land registration to be economically viable and social aspects which need to be considered when designing a land registration system.

- ▶ **Foltz, J., Bruce A. L., Rigoberto L. 2000. [Land Tenure, Investment, and Agricultural Production in Nicaragua.](#) Development Discussion Paper No. 738, Harvard Institute for International Development.**

Based on different cases in Central America, authors argue that the effects of land tenure and tenure security on credit, investment, and agricultural production seems to have received less attention in Latin America, and Central America in particular, than in Africa or Asia. The existing literature from Central America finds almost no significant links between the presence of titles and credit, investment, and productivity.

- ▶ **Fort, R. 2007. [Property Rights after Market Liberalization Reforms: Land Titling and Investments in Rural Peru.](#) PhD Thesis. Wageningen Academic Publisher, Wageningen.**

This study discusses the links between land access, property rights, and economic development, analyzing the results and limitations of a public intervention- Land Titling and Registration- that constitutes one of the main instruments for contemporary land policy in Peru.

- ▶ **Ghimire, K. (Ed.) 2001. [Land Reform and Peasant Livelihoods: the social dynamics of rural poverty and agrarian reform in developing countries.](#) ITDG Publishing, London.**

This critical analysis of the performance of land-reform programs on a world-wide basis is written by several prominent scholars who have extensive experience in field research, advisory work and the implementation of reform programs. They provide empirical evidence from many countries how improved access to land is positively linked to production, investment, employment, food security and poverty reduction. They examine the reasons for success and failure as well as shortcomings of past reform efforts and review the role of the different actors in this process.



- ▶ **González de Olarte, E. (1984).** *Economía de la Comunidad Campesina. Aproximación Regional (Economy of the Peasant Community: Regional approach).* Instituto de Estudios Peruanos (IEP), Lima.

This book is an essential resource when studying the economies of peasant communities in Andean peasant societies from Peru. The author wants to understand why this model of collective governance of the land have remained despite rapid changes of major society, and thus explains what is the economic rationality behind this form of collective organisation.

- ▶ **Griffiths, T. (2006).** [*Indigenous peoples, land tenure and land policy in Latin America.*](#) Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Rome.

The author assesses the effects of land tenure and land policy on territories under collective ownership of indigenous peoples. He underlines that unlike the civil codes of many Latin American countries, which dictate that land ownership rights derive exclusively from the social function of rural property when put to agricultural use, indigenous customary laws see exclusive rights of possession flowing from use, occupancy, practical and spiritual knowledge, and religious and spiritual ties to the land. In many indigenous societies, traditional territorial possession and rights to share in and benefit from a homeland are derived from intimate collective and individual knowledge of the totality of a particular territory or a specific part of that territory.

- ▶ **Hvalkof, S., 2008.** [*Privatization of Land and Indigenous Communities in Latin America: Tenure Security or Social Security?*](#) DIIS Working Paper no 2008/21. Danish Institute for International Studies, DIIS, Copenhagen.

This study analyzes the impacts of contemporary land privatization processes and individual titling programs affecting indigenous communities in Latin America. It is informed by case studies from Peru, Bolivia, Honduras and Mexico. It argues that there are significant contradictions between indigenous communal land arrangements and tenure systems, and the market-based land and agricultural policy reforms being promoted by multilateral donor agencies. Individual titling is seen as a complement to already existing communal and customary tenure arrangements, and not necessarily an alternative.

- ▶ **Jansen, K., Roquas, E., 1998.** *Modernising Insecurity: The Land Titling Projects in Honduras.* *Development and Change* 29(1):81-106.

Conventional theory says that land titling programmes are sine qua non to induce investment in agriculture



because they offer the security of continued access to land and collateral to qualify for formal credit. However, in some situation formal titling may worsen the security of access to land and constrain land market transactions: titling may increase transaction costs in the circulation of land, create new sources of conflict, and not add anything to anything to efficiency in resource use.

- ▶ **Kervyn, B., CEDEP AYLLU Team (1989). *Campeños y acción colectiva: la organización del espacio en comunidades de la Sierra Sur del Perú (Peasants and collective action: the organization of space in communities of the southern highlands of Peru)*. *Revista Andina* 7(1).**

The authors analyse the effects of the collective provision of infrastructure on the reduction of negative externalities and risks. They show that collective organisation emerges there where the expected benefits that the family can obtain through community are greater than the costs involved on the institution maintenance.

- ▶ **Löhr, D., 2012. [The Failure of Land Privatization: On the Need for New Development Policies](#). In Bollier, D. Silke H. (eds.), *The Wealth of the Commons. A World beyond Market and State*. **The Commons Strategy Group, online publication.****

Author discusses that the dogma of land privatization states that individual ownership stimulates investment while avoiding the overuse of resources assuming that this would allow the person who bears the investment costs to reap the yields. He argues that it conceals the fact that the right to take the yields from land and the right to sell the asset is not limited to the "improvements", but includes the most important sources of land value –location, intensity of use, quality- that are beyond the control of individual owners. In most cases, the basis of land value is created by the community (e.g. infrastructure) and a high share of these costs is borne by the community.

- ▶ **Montaner Larson, J. 2002. *Land Ownership and Property Rights*. In Azzam, Azzeddine (ed.), *Public Regulation in Food and Agriculture: Goals, Constraints, Policies, Instruments, and Disputes*. **University of Nebraska, EOLSS, Lincoln, USA.****

Starting the late 1970s and through the 1990s, governments and international agencies turned to modifying market forces to provide land access for the poor in the developing world. Primary among these policies is land titling. But research has found that land titling programs generally have mixed result. Farmers with greater access or larger farms are more likely to benefit, hence these programs are not likely



to benefit the poorest farmers or to lead to a broader, more equitable distribution of land.

- ▶ **Nugent, J., Sánchez, N. 1998. Common property rights as an endogenous response to risk. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 80(3): 651-7.**

The authors show that common property systems may serve as a risk-minimizing form of property ownership. The case they consider is property management of rangelands in Sudan as a response to spatially variable rainfall.

- ▶ **Obeng-Odoom, F. 2012. [Land reforms in Africa: Theory, practice, and outcome](#). *Habitat International* 36(1): 161-170.**

Focused on African countries, the author evaluate the theory and practices of different land regimes and their outcomes. He finds that the benefits of individual land ownership are overstated. Most of the land reform programs in these countries have benefited the local elite. Each land regime, whether individual or communal has its advantages over the other. While private land clearly establishes clear boundaries and right, communal systems works where rules are not biased and leaders are accountable. However, having both systems is not desirable as one overrides the other.

- ▶ **Ostrom, E. 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.**

This is a highly influential book on environmental resource management and institutional economics studies. It is an in-depth analysis of several long-standing and viable common property regimes, that seeks to understand “how a group of principals who are in an interdependent situation can organize and govern themselves to obtain continuing joint benefits when all face temptations to free-ride, shirk, or otherwise act opportunistically.”

- ▶ **Place, F. 2009. [Land Tenure and Agricultural Productivity in Africa: A Comparative Analysis of the Economics Literature and Recent Policy Strategies and Reforms](#). *World Development* 37(8): 1326-1336.**

This paper contrasts results from economic studies on the relationships between land tenure security and agricultural productivity in Africa and how these results have influenced recent agricultural, poverty alleviation, and land policy policies. The author suggests that given the heterogeneity in the results from



alleviation, and land policy policies. The author suggests that given the heterogeneity in the results from literature, policies should take into account the local context in which the land systems operate while coming up with policy responses to address agricultural productivity, poverty alleviation and land issues.

- ▶ **Place, F., Hazell, P. 1993.** [Productivity Effects of Indigenous Land Tenure Systems in Sub-Saharan Africa.](#) *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **75(1): 10-19.**

This study uses household level data from three countries: Ghana, Kenya, and Rwanda to test if the indigenous land rights systems in sub-Saharan Africa are a constraint on agricultural productivity. The authors find that land rights are a significant factor in determining investments in land improvements, use of inputs, access to credit, or the productivity of land thereby casting doubts on conventional belief that land registration programs will improve productivity, access to credit and spur investments in improving land.

- ▶ **Sjaastad, E., Bromley, D.W. 1997.** [Indigenous land rights in sub-Saharan Africa: Appropriation, security and investment demand.](#) *World Development.*

The authors discuss the links between appropriation of land rights, tenure security and investment demand. They find that indigenous systems may provide equal or higher investment incentives than private rights systems. They do this by demonstrating that tenure security is not a prerequisite of investments but the reverse channel is true. Therefore, low investment in rural Africa is not as a result of indigenous land systems, which conventional view is that it discourages investment, but as a result of lack of opportunities determined by the cost and availability of agriculture technology.

- ▶ **Thuc Vien, H. 2006.** [Land Privatization and Its Impacts on Rural Livelihoods: An Examination from the Southern Uplands of Vietnam.](#) **Berlin: Humboldt University.**

The research unequivocally demonstrates that though the land privatization throughout Vietnam has been guided by the unique legal framework, its implementation in the uplands, particularly in the buffer zone communities of Cat Tien National Park has resulted in the notable divergence across communities, even households. The differences in the result of implementing land privatization in the upland communities were mainly caused by different factors related to both land legislation and local practices.



- ▶ **Toulmin, C. 2005. Securing land and property rights in sub-Saharan Africa: the role of local institutions. *Land Use Policy* 26(1): 10-19.**

This study looks the role of institutions in securing land rights in Africa. The author argues that land titling programs are slow and biased towards the elite and recommends the recognition of collective rights, promotion of land rights for the marginalised and minorities such as women, and the strengthening local institutions that appropriate the collective rights. This approach was likely to benefit both the rich and poor alike.

- ▶ **Zoomers, A. 2001. [Land and Sustainable Livelihood in Latin America](#). Royal Tropical Institute, Amsterdam.**

The author argues that common property regimes are not an obstacle to investment adding that the problem with the neo-liberal model is that it attempts to impose an oversimplified formula on a very complex reality. The author sustains that in some parts of Latin America common property regimes are still extremely vital and are likely to remain so, "a number of the indigenous parts of the region have mightily resisted pressures to privatize and receive individual titles despite the pressure on land privatization". The author explains why many seem to feel that group ownership gives them all the security they need.

- ▶ **Zoomers, A., van der Haar, G. (eds.) 2001. [Current Land Policy in Latin America: Regulating Land Tenure under Neoliberalism](#). Royal Tropical Institute, Amsterdam**

The authors on this edited collection present evidence that suggests that individualization, registration and titling are not a universal panacea for land problems: they make a positive contribution only in certain instances. She explains why in most cases, these measures have not delivered what was expected of it. For example, some of the authors argue that the effects on access to credit markets apply only to larger landholders and where the banking system and formal credit markets are well developed



TEGEMEO INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURAL
POLICY AND DEVELOPMENT



With the support of

