

Introduction

Territory, land use and natural resources - local responses to globalization

Ole Mertz¹, Reed L. Wadley² and Andreas Egelund Christensen¹

¹*Institute of Geography, University of Copenhagen, Øster Voldgade 10, 1350 Copenhagen K, Denmark.
Emails: om@geogr.ku.dk & aec@geogr.ku.dk*

²*Department of Anthropology, 107 Swallow Hall, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia MO 65211, USA.
Email: wadleyr@missouri.edu*

Spurred by the economic turmoil in the late 1990s during which several developing countries in Asia experienced dramatic downturns with effects at all levels of society and by the contradictory prospering and stagnation of countries in Africa, the International Conference on *Local Land Use Strategies in a Globalizing World: Shaping Sustainable Social and Natural Environments* (held on 21-23 August 2003 at the Institute of Geography, University of Copenhagen, Denmark) set out to explore how local people react when sudden external events strike or when they live under constant external pressure on their resources. Of particular relevance to this debate are local people's access to and control of land and resources, which in many cases may be key determinants of how well crises, whether brief or prolonged, are managed and coped with (Wadley, 2002). Land and other natural resources still play a major role in sustaining rural livelihoods, despite the rapid urbanisation and shift to increasing occupational multiplicity occurring in developing countries (Eder, 1999).

Local people may be constrained by or see opportunities in what they can do economically with their natural and social environments (e.g., Birch-Thomsen et al., 2001), and the globalisation process may further affect their options through increasing commercialization of agriculture, land degradation, expanded and shifting opportunities for labour migration and changing notions of household necessity and luxury (Dahlberg, 1994; Rigg, 2001; Reardon et al., 2000). While rural people are often seen as victims of land policies and globalisation processes, it should also be recognised that, in many cases, they can be quite adept at bringing their notions of territory into negotiations with State agencies. Moreover,

strategic linkages to civil society actors, such as NGOs and academics, can further their cases and bring their problems to the attention of a wider public.

Globalisation processes and change can also be seen directly from patterns of changing land use and land cover (Lambin et al., 2001). Landscapes change as farmers intensify their land use practices and increasingly search for non-farm activities to earn more cash and enhance their position in local and national society (Imbernon, 1999). When income is derived from salaried jobs or remittances from relatives engaged in labour migration, land use systems are likely to be altered, both in terms of the size of land cultivated and the land use practices (Leinbach & Smith, 1994; Reenberg et al., 1998; Mertz et al., 1999), such as new crops or investment in new technology which are often supported by some of the cash earned elsewhere. These changing patterns may also produce new conditions for challenging and negotiating resource access and rights – by local communities against the state, between households within communities and even between men and women within the same households (Thorsen & Reenberg, 2000). As our contributors show in this issue, change in natural resource access operates on multiple levels, affecting and being affected by multiple players, which makes straightforward solutions to resource access problems even more difficult (Leach et al., 1999).

This special issue of the *Geografisk Tidsskrift, Danish Journal of Geography* addresses local responses of rural people to external and internal pressures, with a special emphasis on access and rights to land and resources and the imprints of globalisation processes on landscapes and land use. The issue is composed of nine contributions (which we outline below) that have been selected from amongst more than 70 papers presented at the international conference in 2003. The conference was closely linked to the research activities within the Danish University Consortium on Environment and Development – Sustainable Land Use and Natural Resource Management (DUCED SLUSE), an international collaboration which include the University of Copenhagen (Institutes of Geography and of Anthropology), The Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University (Departments of Agricultural Sci-

ence and of Forestry, Economics and Natural Resources) and Roskilde University (Department of Geography and International Development Studies) as well as partner universities in Malaysia (Universiti Malaysia Sarawak), Thailand (Chiang Mai University, Kasetsart University and Maejo University) and southern Africa (University of KwaZulu Natal, University of Swaziland and University of Botswana).

Overview of contributions

The key concepts addressed in this special issue revolve around territory, land use and natural resource management. The papers are a mix of theoretical and case-oriented analyses of local strategies and their linkages to wider globalisation processes, and we have categorized the papers under three broad headings (although the approach in several of the papers cuts across these categories): (1) Negotiability, territory and property in land use; (2) Local resource management – conflicts and dependency; and (3) Globalisation, local landscapes and land use change.

Negotiability, territory and property in land use

The first three contributions focus on property rights and how these are negotiated within traditional resource use as well as when state intervention brings property rights out of balance.

Nancy Peluso's paper provides a theoretical discussion of local territorialization processes, and looks at different ways of seeing property rights and making claims to land and territories over time. She argues that territorialization is not only an imposed process originating from centres of power: local territorialization has also contributed to changing constructions of ethnic identity, physical landscapes and land tenure. Peluso argues that territorialized spaces must be seen as products of local practises and trends over time, and we need to examine the moving socio-spatial trajectories in order to understand the production of the territorialized landscape. With two cases in West Kalimantan, Indonesia, she illustrates that territorialization is a dynamic and contingent process, an expression of relationships that emerge, operate and converge across and within localities, national spaces and global networks. She discusses the utility of counter-mapping to establish property rights and for making claims – or at least to create documents for negotiation and acknowledgement by national governments – but

emphasises that once rights to resources are territorialized and mapped, state involvement related to access and rights increases.

The article by Carol Warren also focuses on community mapping as a tool, primarily promoted by NGOs, to increase public participation in decision-making and local control over resources. With case studies in Bali, Indonesia, she analyses the role of participatory community mapping in the process of reasserting local control over land use, and shows how local customary rights are exercised differently under different circumstances. For example, simple one-directional movement of property relations and production regimes is not something that the Balinese accept unequivocally.

Banerjee and Bojsen's case study from Malaysia discusses local people's ability to negotiate land use and the processes evolving around negotiations in a resettlement scheme. They argue that negotiations are composed of a multiplicity of practices at different levels that directly or indirectly influence the choice of land use strategies, and that local people are able to form and transform land use even under strong influences of state power and commercialisation. Banerjee and Bojsen show how local, everyday practices can have just as strong implications for land use strategies as centre-powered decisions on land use policies, and that local people are able to negotiate land use even under unstable circumstances accompanying the resettlement scheme and the government-led plantation program. However, they point out that some negotiations seem to favour actors already in better positions, leading to increasing inequalities among the locals.

Local resource management – conflicts and dependency

Dahlberg's paper also contributes to the discussion on negotiation and cooperation over local resources, but (compared to Peluso, Warren and Banerjee and Bojsen) her analysis is focused on conflicts and dependency of resource use in a protected area in South Africa. The dilemma in this case study is the harvest of fibrous wetland plants by local women for local craft production aimed at the increasing tourism sector; the tourism industry encourages this harvest but, at the same time, promotes the wetlands as 'a wilderness untouched by man'. Although this dilemma is neither new nor specific to this area, Dahlberg reveals a complex weave of dependencies and conflicts related to nature conservation and local resource use. Dahlberg shows how differently three interest groups perceive the wetland and its resources, as well as the social and ecological processes that have shaped

the present environment. She discusses how these different perceptions cause confusion, in particular when issues of rights and morals, access and extraction are contested. Dahlberg argues that the high degree of variability in resource use calls for multiple interpretations of the environment to promote sound decisions on natural resource management.

Siedenburg and Gausset et al. also analyse local people's use and perception of natural vegetation and resources. Siedenburg argues that different households within the same communities perceive and view natural resources differently, and that these differing perspectives appear to correspond to differing management strategies. He also, in line with Dahlberg, calls for a more nuanced approach in order to understand natural resource management in a contemporary context often characterized by increasing pressure on local natural resources. Siedenburg discusses the possibility that households adapt to changes differently: some may adopt advantageous and accessible technologies, while others neglect them. Based on a case study from Tanzania, he argues that major knowledge differences exist among households in relation to tree management strategies, and this local knowledge should be seen as a determinant of management strategies.

Gausset et al. also look at tree management strategies, but with focus on gender aspects in relation to utilisation of trees in south-western Burkina Faso. They conclude that male-dominated ownership of land and natural resources often restricts the ability of women to use trees for purposes which may benefit the household. Men are primarily interested in the commercial use of trees while women are mostly interested in trees for subsistence purposes, and consequently women tend to rely more on the existence of communally owned resources while men prefer privatised resources. Gausset et al. show that women have developed successful strategies to cope with the existing social and tenure constraints, but argue that increasing integration in the world economy, reliance on market economy and cash and increased commercialisation of trees and tree products have caused women's access to and control over tree resources to become even more fragile and uncertain. Thus linked to the papers by Peluso, Warren, and Banerjee and Bojsen, they also argue that the increasing privatisation leads to renegotiation of the customary rights that previously secured access to land for women.

Zurcher also focuses on access to and control over natural resources, although her study is reversed in the sense that it analyses how networks of actors influence govern-

ment policies on land use and natural resource management. Her case is the Community Forest Bill in Thailand, and she discusses the appearance of actor networks that question the effectiveness of state control and lobby for formal frameworks to establish rights over forest resources for local people. The paper pays special attention to academics and 'public intellectuals' who have played important roles in this process. She argues that, were it not for these groups in society, conflicts over access rights to forest resources at the local level would not have had widespread national attention. Zurcher argues that the process of drafting a Community Forest Bill has been an especially important step towards increased focus on community forestry.

Globalisation, local landscapes and land use change

The last two contributions look, in different ways, at how globalisation processes have shaped local landscapes. McKay's paper is about 'reading remittances into landscapes' by linking female labour migration and land use patterns. McKay argues through case studies in the Philippines that changes in land, labour, crops and cropping patterns may not reflect local ecological or economic opportunities or constraints as much as they reflect gendered versions of local modernity. For example, she shows how conversion of rice fields to bean gardens is a result of remittances from women working overseas and, by examining the effect of those remittances on local landscapes, identifies specific gendered dimensions of land use change.

Finally, Mortimore et al. provide an overview of their long-term research on spatial and temporal changes in land use and land cover in four regions of dryland Africa. They explore linkages between global and policy drivers of land use change and land cover data, and argue that three transitions – from natural to capitalised landscapes, deepening intensification and adjustment of production – may be discernible from land use change data, but not necessarily from land cover change data. The importance of changed livelihood strategies must thus be understood when analyzing land use adaptations and before land cover scenarios are extrapolated to larger areas. They conclude that degradational narratives will continue to drive the understanding of land use change unless land cover change data are linked with both temporal dynamics (transitions) and local level processes.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the authors for their contributions to this special issue as well as the anonymous referees for their thorough and constructive reviews of the papers. We are also grateful for the numerous sponsors of the International Conference in 2003: the Danish University Consortium on Environment and Development – Sustainable Land Use and Natural Resource Management (DUCED SLUSE), funded by the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Danida; the Institute of Geography, University of Copenhagen, Denmark; the Danish Social Science Research Council; the North/South Priority Research Area, University of Copenhagen, Denmark; the Danish Agricultural and Veterinary Research Council; Knud Højgaards Fund, Denmark; the Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University, Denmark; and the International Institute for Asian Studies, Netherlands.

References

- Birch-Thomsen, T., Frederiksen P. & Sano H.-O. (2001): A Livelihood Perspective on Natural Resource Management and Environmental Change in Semiarid Tanzania. *Economic Geography* 77: 41-66.
- Dahlberg, A. (1994): Contesting Views and Changing Paradigms: The Land Degradation Debate in Southern Africa. Nordiska Afrikainstitutet, Uppsala, Sweden. Discussion Paper 6.
- Eder, J. (1999): A Generation Later: Household Strategies and Economic Change in the Rural Philippines. Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press.
- Imbernon, J. (1999): Changes in agricultural practice and landscape over a 60-year period in North Lampung, Sumatra. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* 76: 61-66.
- Lambin, E.F., Turner, B.L., Geist, H.J., Agbola, S.B., Angelsen, A., Bruce, J.W., Coomes, O.T., Dirzo, R., Fischer, G., Folke, C., George, P.S., Homewood, K., Imbernon, J., Leemans, R., Li, X.B., Moran, E.F., Mortimore, M., Ramakrishnan, P.S., Richards, J.F., Skanes, H., Steffen, W., Stone, G.D., Svedin, U., Veldkamp, T.A., Vogel, C. & Xu, J.C. (2001): The causes of land-use and land-cover change: moving beyond the myths. *Global Environmental Change-Human and Policy Dimensions* 11: 261-269.
- Leach, M., Mearns, R. & Scoones, I. (1999): Environmental entitlements: Dynamics and Institutions in Community-Based Natural Resource Management. *World Development* 27 (2): 225-247.
- Leinbach, T.R. & Smith, A. (1994): Off-farm employment, land and life cycle: transmigrant households in South Sumatra, Indonesia. *Economic Geography* 70: 273-296.
- Mertz, O., Christensen, A.E., Højskov, P., Birch-Thomsen, T. (1999): Subsistence or cash: strategies for change in shifting cultivation. *Geografisk Tidsskrift, Danish Journal of Geography, Special Issue 1*: 133-142.
- Reardon, T., Taylor, J.E., Stamoulis, K., Lanjouw, P. & Balisacan, A. (2000): Effects of non-farm employment on rural income inequality in developing countries: An investment perspective. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 51: 266-288
- Reenberg, A., Nielsen, T.L. & Rasmussen, K. (1998): Field expansion and reallocation in the Sahel - land use pattern dynamics in a fluctuating biophysical and socio-economic environment. *Global Environmental Change* 8: 309-327.
- Rigg, J. (2001): *More than the Soil: Rural Change in Southeast Asia*. Harlow, UK, Prentice Hall.
- Thorsen, D. & Reenberg, A. (2000): Marginal producers or breadwinners: Women's cropping strategies and access to agricultural key resources in Boulgou Province, Burkina Faso. *Geografisk Tidsskrift, Danish Journal of Geography* 100: 47-59.
- Wadley, R. (2002): Coping with crisis – smoke, drought, flood and currency: Iban households in West Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Culture and Agriculture* 24: 26-33.