doi:10.1093/cdj/bsx027
Advance Access Publication 4 July 2017

Agrarian politics and land struggles in Northern Uganda

Giuliano Martiniello*

Abstract Since 2004, we have observed a significant resurgence of public protests and social mobilizations, both urban and rural, across the African continent. Though the multiplicity of agrarian struggles have gone largely unnoticed by academics and policy makers, rural social struggles have significantly affected the trajectories of rural social change. This article historicizes rural social struggles and explores the diverse range of discourses and forms of resistance that have animated the northern Ugandan countryside, with particular reference to the Amuru district. Initiated as a response to the wave of neoliberal agricultural restructuring through structural adjustment plans, rural social movements, and other community-based political initiatives from below, proliferated in the context of rampant large-scale land enclosures and state authoritarianism. The article suggests that such agrarian struggles be regarded as a process of contestation over the norms, values and practices, which govern the control, access and the use of natural resources such as land, water and food. It situates these struggles within the parameters of everyday peasant politics, which are driven by impulses ranging from the protection of livelihoods and local environments, to claims of autonomy and land sovereignty, and which are grounded in an ontology of the moral economy. Finally, the article engages with the question of the political relevance of localized forms of rural resistance, and how their tactics, strategies and discourses can consolidate or undermine community solidarity, attract or deter other social constituents, and stimulate or diminish equitable and sustainable rural social change.

**Address for correspondence*: Giuliano Martiniello, Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences, American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon; email: gm43@aub.edu.lb

Introduction: conceptualizing agrarian resistance

Over the past decade or so there has been a significant resurgence of public protests and social mobilizations across the African continent, peaking in the years between 2012 and 2014 before declining in 2015. This view is shared by global and African development agencies: a recently published *African Economic Outlook: Sustainable Cities and Structural Transformations* (AfDB, OECD and UNDP, 2016) made explicit what peasant organizations, engaged journalists, critical researchers, affected communities and civil society institutions already knew too well. The report provides significant data with which to reflect upon the inter-relationships between economic and political factors in shaping the emergence of public protest. Yet, strikingly, in this and other mainstream analyses, public protests and social mobilizations are classified along with other 'violent' occurrences such as terrorist attacks and civil wars that threaten the stability of the established political order (Barbet-Gros and Cuesta, 2015; AfDB, OECD and UNDP, 2016). Such analyses seldom engage with the meanings people ascribe to practices of resistance or with the worldviews these practices express. Nor do they engage with the larger social and historical conditions that have shaped the cultural and moral repertoires of struggle. Consequently, it is worth recalling the provocative questions raised by Nigerian political scientist Claude Ake regarding the role played by popular protests in re-imagining and redefining politics, democracy and development in African societies (Ake, 1995).

Implicit in mainstream representations of popular mobilizations is the silencing of the rural character of protest, an omission which results from the artificial construction of rural and urban spaces as separate, and from a long-standing urban bias in development theories and policies, each an expression of dualistic modernization epistemologies (see Lipton, 1977; Leys, 1996). The almost complete erasure of the African countryside from the map of political mobilizations helps to consolidate an existing discursive formation, which frames rural societies as predominantly traditional and archaic, and its social subjects as passive social actors who do not and cannot shape the course of social change.

The resurgence of popular contestations has reinvigorated academic interest in the strategies, tactics, discourses, practices, effects and causes of resistance, and how these affect the nurturing of autonomous political subjectivities. This preoccupation is not new within the social sciences. In African studies, debates on peasant resistance have long captured the attention of radical scholars. Renowned political thinker, Davidson (1974), analysed the contribution of (mostly) peasant resistance to national anti-colonial liberation struggles. For Ranger (1985), the cultural manifestations

of peasant resistance to colonial rule opened the world of social enquiry to processes of consciousness and political-identity formation. In Fanon's (1967), accounts of the *Wretched of the Earth*, peasants represented the quintessential revolutionary subject. Against the backdrop of modernization theories, which postulated the disappearance of peasants under the pressures of capitalist modernity, the economic anthropologist Wolf (1969) maintained instead that the twentieth century had to be read through the prism of peasant rebellions. The unfolding debate in agrarian scholarship further bifurcated along two broad lines. On the one hand were those, such as Isaacman (1990), who argued that resistance should not simply be seen in terms of uprisings, protests and popular mobilizations but also, and more profoundly, in the daily dynamics of social organization around labour and access to land among rural households. On the other hand were those scholars who perceived peasant uprisings as paramount moments in which the subalterns expressed their political subjectivities (Guha, 1983).

The intellectual ferment generated by James Scott's seminal work, *The Weapons of the Weak* (1985) shifted the traditional focus on visible uprisings, taking place in the public sphere, to 'hidden struggles' (Beinart and Bundy, 1987) characterized by their subterranean character. Overall, these studies tried to unpack the political aspects of peasant politics and mobilization as a way to understand and capture the meanings and perceptions that shaped peasants' agency and worldview. This interdisciplinary body of thought and scholarship asked questions such as: who are peasants; what is their relationship *vis a vis* capital, state and other social classes; and how has their agency affected the realm of institutional/official colonial and post-colonial politics?

Despite this historically rich, multi-disciplinary, multi-layered and politically engaged epistemic tradition, contemporary research into the forms of resistance in Africa today remains confined to small academic circles. This is the result of the intellectual hegemony exerted by neoliberal economic and political theories since the 1980/90 s. These theories have focused on the centrality of unfettered and deregulated markets as *the* optimal instruments for efficiently redistributing resources among competitive producers, thus providing public opinion with a de-politicized view of development (Ferguson, 1994). Furthermore, interpreting rural social struggles has become increasingly difficult because these struggles are often hidden from public view by violent or repressive state apparatuses, and this makes research fieldwork in rural settings increasingly perilous.

Yet, as the disastrous socio-economic consequences of the neoliberal project started to become manifest, a new wave of struggles and mobilizations

unfolded under the spur of new rural social movements. As argued by Moyo and Yeros:

> In the last quarter of the century, profound socio-economic and political changes have been under way in the countrysides of the periphery. Under the weight of structural adjustment programmes, peasants and workers have seen their conditions of social reproduction deteriorate giving way to a desperate search for economic and political alternatives (2005, p. 1).

More recently within the realm of Agrarian Studies, a significant literature has emerged around what Borras, Edelman and Kay (2008) call 'transnational agrarian movements'. The main concern of these agrarian scholars has been to understand how peasants both shape and respond to agrarian changes that have been stimulated by the corporate-driven industrialization of agriculture, land privatization and enclosures. Whilst such rampant processes of rural transformation already underpinned earlier structural adjustment plans, they became more extensive after the 2008 economic crisis in which financial, food and energy crises converged. Movements were spurred by the need to confront global food empires with transnational forms of communication, networks and struggle: consequently, significant research emerged that sought to capture the new modes of organization, narratives and practices of these agrarian movements (see Desmarais, 2007; Borras, 2008). Scholars have also identified the hierarchies and asymmetries that often framed relations between the different components of transnational social movements (Belletti, Johnstone, Wolford, 2008), while other research has highlighted the class contradictions that animated some of these organizations (Bernstein, 2014).

However, the analytical emphasis on the transnational and global character of these movements has virtually neglected 'the internal dynamics of the agrarian movements themselves' (Borras, Edelman and Kay, 2008, p. 11) and the 'differentiated drivers and catalysts of organized political action and mobilization' (Martiniello, 2013, p. 316). Yet, it is the internal dynamics of these movements – issues of class control and domination, representation and accountability – that determine the positions taken by the movements *vis a vis* the state and capital (Borras, Edelman and Kay, 2008, p. 11). Furthermore, social movements have often failed to acknowledge and dialogue with the multiple sites of localized resistance, which are different from the sites and forms of resistance deployed by mass-based organizations (Martiniello, 2013, p. 319).

Though the multiplicity of agrarian struggles have gone largely unnoticed by most academics and policy makers (but see Hall et al., 2015), rural social struggles have significantly affected the trajectories of agrarian change. With

particular reference to the Amuru district in northern Uganda, the locus of a recent and ongoing case of land dispossession and rural social struggle, this article explores the diverse range of discourses and forms of resistance that animated the Ugandan countryside's responses to escalating and large-scale land enclosures. It disentangles the complex forms of community resistance and interrogates the role of the state and domestic elites in extending what activists dub 'land grabbing' and what international financial institutions construct as 'development opportunities'. It does so by historicizing the character of social struggles with reference to colonial and post-colonial socio-political formations; and by exploring the current discourses articulated by different social and political forces in Uganda. This approach situates current processes of land grabbing in the long-term and ongoing dynamics of capitalist enclosure, thus acknowledging continuities in the character of rural social struggles. I interpret agrarian struggles as a process of contestation over the norms, values and practices, which govern the control of, access to and use of natural resources, e.g. land, water and food. Contestation is driven by impulses that range from protection of livelihoods and local environments to claims of autonomy and land sovereignty that are in turn grounded in and consolidated by an ontology of the moral economy.

Understanding land enclosures in Africa

The current wave of large-scale land and agricultural investments and acquisitions, which has been sponsored and supported by international development agencies, and criticized by transnational agrarian movements, has re-animated the debate about issues of control, access and use of land, and about land's significance for the rural livelihoods of small-scale agricultural producers (Borras and Franco, 2012). The resurfacing of land as a key element in the management of natural resources is nothing new, especially in neoliberal circles (Amanor, 2008, p. 11). Since the 1980/90 s a paradigm of market-based land reforms has emerged as the dominant discursive formation and policy orientation shaping land matters in Africa (Borras, 2003; Lahiff, Borras and Kay, 2007). Influenced by the theories of the Peruvian development economist Hernando de Soto (2000), international development institutions further advanced policies of land privatization, titling and formalization, which targeted existing customary land tenure regimes; policies already initiated through the structural adjustment programmes associated with (re)negotiations of national debt. Within this paradigm, efficient and properly formalized property rights have the virtue of 'bringing life into a death asset', an 'innovation' which is seen as the *sine qua non* for rural development. This approach, which cedes to the allegedly

virtuous market the task of redistributing the most precious resource in predominantly agrarian social formations, has become hegemonic and it represents pro-market land reforms as the natural horizon of land policies in the African continent.

Large-scale land acquisitions are a global phenomenon, but are particularly prevalent in the African continent. According to White *et al.* (2012), almost 60 percent of land deals have taken place in the African continent between 2007/2008 and 2010/2011: it has become the epicentre of global land grabbing. The resulting 'land-rush' has proliferated in a context where limits to the power of private capital and barriers to its expansion have been removed along with a 're-regulation' of the role of the state. This has facilitated the creation of a 'conductive' legislative environment for foreign and national investment in land resources. Spurred on by the convergence of multiple and overlapping financial, food and energy crises, financial capital and agribusiness has exhibited a renewed interest in the potential opportunities provided by cheap and fertile farmland (Fairbairn, 2014; Clapp, 2014).

According to the World Bank's report, *Awakening Africa's Sleeping Giant: Prospects for Commercial Agriculture in the Guinea Savannah Zone and Beyond*:

> Particularly in Africa, agriculture continues to lag… While the poor performance of African agriculture can be attributed partly to adverse agroecological conditions, experience from elsewhere in the developing world suggests that significant progress is possible. Africa's Guinea Savannah zone is a case in point. The Guinea Savannah covers some 600 million hectares in Africa, of which about 400 million can be used for agriculture. Less than 10 percent of this area is currently cropped, making it *one of the largest underused agricultural land reserves in the world* (World Bank, 2009, p. 1, emphasis added).

In this study, the World Bank identified the agricultural potential of six commodities 'well-suited' to the Guinea Savannah: cassava, cotton, maize, rice, soybeans and sugar in order to affirm the potential competitiveness and economic benefits of African agriculture. In another study, the World Bank Development Report estimated that 45 million hectares of land were included in commercial deals in Africa between 2008–2010 (World Bank, 2011, p. vi).

Attracted by the global character of the phenomenon, its geographical scope and its inter-connections with other complex economic and social crises, social scientists from diverse disciplines, using a multiplicity of interpretive approaches, have tried to assess the factors driving land grabbing and its implications. In doing so, a veritable literature-rush can be juxtaposed with the land-rush (Oya, 2013). Yet the initial assessments and evaluations of the land acreage involved in large-scale land acquisitions has

been somewhat inflated. According to the US anthropologist Marc Edelman (2013), this has been the result of the lack of rigour in the methodologies and modes of enquiry employed. Moreover, researchers have often based their analyses on prior work done by activist or advocacy organizations, which tended to privilege political rather than academic imperatives in their representation of issues. Yet, it can still be said that while a portion of the announced deals has not been implemented due to politico-bureaucratic impediments, land enclosures seem to continue unabated (GRAIN, 2016, p. 9).

The first wave of 'pioneering' efforts at interpretation and study of land grabbing tended to focus on the foreign character of land acquisitions (Zoomers, 2010), capturing the global significance and nature of grabs and their connections to wider processes of capital accumulation. However, such studies have often been epiphenomenal in character (Martiniello, 2016) inadvertently silencing meso- and micro-levels of analysis, and obscuring the significant roles played by the state and its local elites in facilitating land grabbing (Peters, 2013). By failing to systematically understand the distinctive histories and patterns of land dispossession (Moyo, Yeros and Jha, 2012), the literature-rush, albeit with some exceptions (Borras and Franco, 2013; Hall *et al.*, 2015), has failed to explore rural subjects' own interpretations of, and responses to, land dispossession. It has simultaneously minimized the socially differentiated character of those rural communities affected by grabs (Borras and Franco, 2013).

According to the *Land Matrix*, an influential database developed by the *International Land Coalitions*, eastern Africa can be considered as one of the epicentres of land grabbing with the highest numbers of deals contracted. In Uganda, large scale land deals cover approximately 1.874.000 ha, or 14.6 percent of total agricultural land –11.5 percent if forestlands are included (Friis and Reenberg, 2010, p. 8). In mainstream analyses, land grabs are interpreted as resulting from a demographic boom (Kiiza, 2012) or from weak legal land systems and obsolete land governance structures (Mabikke, 2011, p. 19–21). Yet, it seems reductive to interpret grabs through these lenses as they have taken different forms and have been driven by diverse discourses and practices: foreign and national agribusiness-led enclosures of fertile lands for export crops; commercial cattle ranches established by national elites; oil explorations by foreign companies; conservation and game reserves for touristic purposes; afforestation schemes spurred by Reduction of Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (Martiniello, 2015, p. 311).

Narratives of African farmland as 'empty', 'unutilized' or 'under-utilized', and thus available to foreign investors to be cheaply purchased, mirror racially constructed colonial discourses of *terra nullius.* Against that,

however, a review of Ugandan daily newspapers from 2009 to 2012 reveals a growing interest in land issues among civil society organizations, NGOs, academics, activists and community associations. They have denounced the social and ecological implications of large-scale land enclosures, which have often targeted forested areas and small-holders' farmland held under customary tenure predominantly situated in peripheral northern regions.

Land struggles in Amuru district

On 18 April 2011, a 100 women in the Amuru District in northern Uganda gathered in protest against the Ugandan government's concession of 10,000 ha to the Madhvani Group for a large-scale sugar plantation. Their targets were local council officials and the company's representatives (escorted by soldiers), in order to stop the processes of land surveying and delimitation. The protesters perceived the deal as an 'unlawful' expropriation of land they claim to have inhabited and used for centuries. By resisting land dispossession and challenging state violence, poor rural communities in Kololo and Lakang villages, where the fieldwork for this article was conducted in 2012–2013, have reiterated the social significance and political salience of both land and agrarian struggles. Such mobilizations, in conjunction with other localized forms of resistance, have been able to stop (albeit temporarily) the implementation of the land-grabbing project. Rather than being an isolated instance of resistance, this April 2011 event reflects the mounting social conflict in the Ugandan countryside as a result of escalating land enclosures (Cavanagh and Benjaminsen, 2015; Westoby and Lyons, 2015).

Among the repertoires of struggle mobilized by women, the most significant from a symbolic and cultural point of view is what might be dubbed 'naked protest'. This form of protest, which mobilizes symbolic imaginaries, uses the bodies of women as a powerful weapon to communicate anger and moral authority simultaneously. In Uganda, undressing in this way is both a sign of the anger and desperation of women who have nothing else to lose, but it is also a form of self-humiliation which generates a kind of symbolic power. By exposing their breasts to the police officers, women convey a powerful message: if you bring sugar here we will have nothing else to feed our children. The cultural power of the message derives not only from the fact that women are the true agriculturalists in the fields but also that they are the ones who are in charge of food preparation, seed selection, household management and child-rearing within rural households (Martiniello, 2015a). They are the socially sanctioned

authorities in practices of agricultural production and social reproduction in the context of morally regulated local economies (see Polanyi, 1957).

We could define women undressing in this context as a 'weapon of the poor', although this usage contrasts somewhat with that of Scott (1985) for whom the 'weapons of the weak' are typically deployed in non-confrontational, low-intensity and risk minimizing or hidden struggles. Yet, like Scott, we can refer to these struggles as responses emerging 'from below' to attempts by superordinate and affluent classes to extract value from the countryside in the form of taxes, labour, land and natural resources. Interestingly, naked protest has quickly diffused across the country (especially in the northern districts) as part of the repertoire of resistances deployed against land dispossession and usurpation.

Access to and productive use of land are key social reproduction strategies for rural households as land provides households with a system of 'social security' (Federici, 2004). Indeed, it is not simply land as a productive asset that matters, it is rather the set of social relations in which land is embedded that provides such security. The social security of the African peasant is ensured through the more or less secure access to land that is protected by customary land tenure regimes (Mamdani, 1996), and through the development and maintenance of land-based social relations that ensure the continuity of this access. Investments in social relations, including what Wolf (1966) dubbed ceremonial funds, serve the purpose of consolidating social links, reinforcing mutuality and reciprocity, and (re) affirming the membership of the community.

Though scholarship on Africa has shown the gendered character of the division of labour in farming practices and the patriarchal character of systems of customary land tenure (Berry, 1993), in the context of political and economic pressures such as those impacting post-conflict northern Uganda, customary land tenure regimes still represent the most viable option for access to land for rural populations. In northern Uganda, the twenty-year civil war between the Lord's Resistance Army and the Ugandan Government has left the region far behind the rest of the country in all development indicators (Branch, 2011) and made access to land more precarious and insecure. The conflict, which saw the mass forced displacement of over a million rural people into internment camps by the government, facilitated land appropriation by military and government elites and the politically connected business class (Atkinson, 2008; Mabikke, 2011; Atkinson and Owor, 2013; Lenhart, 2013).

In the Amuru district, 98.4 percent of the rural population accesses land through customary land tenure regimes while land in freehold property accounts only for 0.5 percent of rural households (Ravnborg *et al.*, 2013). In a context of low-population densities, sparse settlements and low

technological development, Acholi rural communities have historically developed many forms of mutual help and collective labour practices known as *awak* (Girling, 1960) that have sharpened their political and socio-reproductive autonomy. Mixed cropping and crop rotations, combined with control over labour and seed (re)production, have represented the pillars of food security for Acholi populations in colonial and post-colonial epochs, and still do so today, albeit in a context of increased political subordination, economic marginalization and mounting competition over land resources (Martiniello, 2015a, p.518). Acholi farmers in northern Uganda also donate a significant portion of their harvest to funerals, weddings, initiation ceremonies or beer parties: in key crops such as sorghum this can account for up to 30 percent of their harvest (UBS, 2010). Such practices can be regarded as forms of everyday peasant politics (Scott, 1985; Kerkvliet, 2009), understood as a process of acceptance or contestation over norms and values that regulate access and use of natural resources in a given society or community. This concept of everyday peasant politics aptly captures the ways in which struggles for survival take place on a daily basis at household and village levels, involving choices over labour mobilization, farming practices and political actions.

This analytical perspective further allows us to capture the diachronic character of resistance. Local narratives and living memories of struggles against colonial expropriation have played a preparatory role in shaping current discourses and practices of resistance. Youth and elders of Lakang and Kololo village communities, recall, with a certain pride, the Lamogi rebellion of 1910 (see Adimola, 1954). Though the colonial army eventually suppressed this uprising by poisoning local water sources, the leaders of the Lamogi clan had resisted colonial violence and colonialists' attempts at spatial engineering through deportation to urban areas. As interviews collected during fieldwork revealed, contemporary young men and elders feel connected to this historical event as it represents one of the many facets of their relationship with land, territory and ancestry. Memories of the Lamogi rebellion, informing both the praxis and discourses of resistance, have been mobilized to make sense of and respond to current challenging situations. These memories have provided a meaningful socio-cultural framework which articulates perceptions, meanings and worldviews. In particular, their subaltern relationship *vis a vis* the state can be grasped from this quote:

> Government says land does not belong to us after we came back from camps… President Museveni allowed the interest of Madhvani and yet this is our ancestral land. Museveni took our cattle during the war and gave guns to the Karamojong. Now he wants our land (Participant at a Community Meeting, 18 May 2012).

Despite the government's insistence on the benefits of the project in terms of jobs and infrastructure, rural communities have persistently opposed the implementation of the project. This resistance has taken a number of forms: women's symbolic protests have been utilized along with other forms of local mobilization and assembly, keeping watch on the territory, (lost) legal battles and communication with outsiders such as sympathetic journalists, engaged NGOs and researchers. Its success can be seen in the capacity of 'peasant intellectuals' (Feierman, 1990) to articulate a political platform that has united the different social groups within communities, overcoming intra-class conflicts and rivalries. The remoteness of the districts concerned also helped to galvanize and unite the resistance, as remote areas present particularly significant challenges for state rule and surveillance (Scott, 1975; 2009). Social cohesion was also cemented by local populations' shared disaffection with the Museveni government, arising from the latter's involvement in violence, forced displacements and cattle raiding during the war. Dissatisfaction with political authoritarianism and violence fomented a generally negative attitude towards 'development' initiatives promoted by the government. In this sense, these forms of protest could be read as a critique of orthodox development strategies, which are informed by logics of control and/or capital accumulation, rather than a concern for people's needs, exigencies and views of development.

The land grabbing project itself epitomizes the corporate-driven, top-down approaches of development institutions and it signals the complete denial of the basic principles of participatory or sustainable rural development (Chambers, 1983). It also reflects the systematic delegitimisation of the agency and interpretive character of oppressed rural populations. This view is corroborated by local people's own accusations of having been precluded from knowledge about the project. Yet, it would be misleading to assume that internally differentiated communities responded in a uniform way to the project: existing social cleavages of class, gender, age and ethnicity informed the various ways by which people were affected and by which they interpreted the project. Grappling with the role and agency of community-level actors in shaping development outcomes, Ferguson (1999) suggests that responses will inevitably be diverse and will be affected by historical and contemporary experiences and expectations of the future. For example, in the case of Amuru, cash-poor rural elites have incessantly tried to promote the benefits of the project and to negotiate an agreement with the state in order to monetize their land. They have also used legal means to challenge the unlawful nature of land acquisition.

But the majority of peasants in the communities did not see recourse to the law or its instruments as an affordable and reliable form of defence against the appropriation of their land. Nor did they see land as a tradable commodity to be handed over to the highest bidder. The politics of resource control as enacted among diverse social actors in the community cemented two competing views of land: one promoted land commercialization and privatization; the other recognized the significance of customary land tenure regimes. Such bifurcation contributes to increased land conflicts and tensions within rural communities and households.

Concluding remarks

This article, which proposes an understanding of social change, combining the notion of everyday peasant politics with the idea of land-based social relations, has explored the role of social struggles in shaping paths of development in general and trajectories of agrarian change in particular. Such an analytical approach allows for a politicized understanding of the social forces shaping responses to land dispossession and the perceptions, meanings and narratives driving the praxis of contestation, thus enabling us to capture the dynamics of peasants' contentious politics.

In 2015, after the failure of its aggressive strategy of land acquisition, the state and Madhvani initiated a rapprochement with the Amuru leaders to (re)discuss the terms of the project with local communities. The process has been mediated by local MPs who have promoted a path of negotiation between the government, Madhvani Group and local leaders. Spearheaded by the launch in September 2016 of a baseline report by the Foundation for Human Rights Initiative misleadingly titled *Without Land There is no Living* (KwoPeke, 2016), the initiative is concerned with streamlining the management, sale and acquisition of land. Couched in the language of providing local solutions to land problems, the report advises government and investors on the procedures to follow in the process of land acquisition, e.g. negotiating with local leaders and providing adequate compensation of its owners.

The shift towards dialogue and the integration of compensatory measures within the project need to be read as reflecting the success of rural social struggles. On the other hand, there is the risk that this initiative represents another attempt by the government to further fracture the social cohesiveness of the communities through the co-optation or corruption of some of their leaders. This procedural and opportunistic appeal by the state and capital to the language of participatory development merely applies a veneer of local involvement to the purpose of re-legitimizing the

project. In these cases, radical, progressive and democratic language have been co-opted in order to bring people's views and expectations into line with existing plans and to re-affirm the power of the state. Whether agrarian subjects will respond with further protests and mobilizations, whether they will be able to re-politicize participation so as to broaden spaces of political community, or whether they will accept the path of negotiation and the new terms of the agreement, remains to be seen.

Giuliano Martiniello is Assistant Professor of Rural Community Development at the American University of Beirut.

References

Adimola, A. B. (1954) The Lamogi Rebellion, *Uganda Journal*, **18** (2), 166–177.

AfDB, OECD, UNDP (2016) *African economic outlook: sustainable cities and structural transformations*, AfDB, OECD and UNDP, Addis Ababa.

Ake, C. (1995) *Democracy and Development in Africa*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington DC.

Amanor, K. (2008) Introduction: land and sustainable development issues in Africa, in K. Amanor and S. Moyo, eds, *Land and Sustainable Development in Africa*, Zed Books, London and New York, pp. 1–32.

Atkinson, R. (2008) Land issues in Acholi in the transition from war to peace, *The Examiner*, **4**, 3–25.

Atkinson, R. and Owor, A. (2013) 'Land grabbing': the Ugandan government, Madhvani, and others versus the community of Lakang, Amuru District, *Journal of Peace and Security Studies*, **1**, 49–63.

Barbet-Gros, J. and Cuesta, J. (2015) Food riots: from definition to operationalization, in *World Bank Guide for the Food Riot Radar*, World Bank, Washington DC, pp. 1–10. http://www.worldbank.org/content/dam/Worldbank/document/Poverty%20documents/Introduction%20Guide%20for%20the%20Food%20Riot%20Radar.pdf. (13 January 2016).

Beinart, W. and Bundy, C. (1987) *Hidden Struggles in Rural South Africa: Politics and Popular Movements in Transkei and Eastern Cape 1890–1930*, Currey, London.

Belletti, B., Johnstone, T. M. and Wolford, W. (2008) Late mobilization: transnational peasant networks and grassroots organizing in Brazil and South Africa, in J. S. Borras, M. Edelman and J. Kay, eds, *Transnational Agrarian Movement Confronting Globalization*, Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester, pp. 123–146.

Bernstein, H. (2014) Food sovereignty via the 'peasant way': a sceptical view, *Journal of Peasant Studies*, **41** (6), 1031–1063.

Berry, S. (1993) *No Condition is Permanent: The Social Dynamics of Agrarian Change in SubSaharan Africa*, The University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.

Borras, S. M. (2003) Questioning market-led agrarian reforms: experiences from Brazil, Colombia and South Africa', *Journal of Agrarian Change*, **3** (3), 367–394.
Borras, S. M. (2008) La Vía Campesina and its global campaign for agrarian reform, *Journal of Agrarian Change*, **8** (2–3), 258–289.
Borras, J. S., Edelman, M. and Kay, K. (2008) *Transnational Agrarian Movement Confronting Globalization*, Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester.
Borras, J. S. and Franco, J. (2012) Global land grabbing and trajectories of agrarian change: a preliminary analysis, *Journal of Agrarian Change*, **12** (1), 34–59.
Borras, J. S. and Franco, J. (2013) Global land grabbing and political responses 'From Below', *Third World Quarterly*, **34** (9), 1723–1747.
Branch, A. (2011) *Displacing Human Rights. War and Intervention in Northern Uganda*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Cavanagh, C. and Benjaminsen, T. A. (2015) Guerrilla Agriculture? A biopolitical guide to illicit cultivation within an IUCN Category II protected area, *Journal of Peasant Studies*, **42** (3–4), 725–745.
Chambers, R. (1983) *Rural Development: Putting the Last First*, Prentice Hall, Harlow.
Clapp, J. (2014) Financialization, distance and global food politics, *Journal of Peasant Studies*, **41** (5), 797–814. Special Issue: *Global Agrarian Transformation Vol. 1: New Directions in Political Economy*.
Davidson, B. (1974) African peasantries and revolution, *Journal of Peasant Studies*, **1** (3), 269–290.
Desmarais, A. (2007) La Via Campesina, in *Globalization and the Power of Peasants*, Pluto Press, London.
de Soto, H. (2000) *The Mystery of Capital: Why Capitalism Triumphs in the West and Fails Everywhere Else*, Black Swan, London.
Edelman, M. (2013) Messy hectares: questions about the epistemology of land grabbing data, *Journal of Peasant Studies*, **40** (3), 485–501.
Fairbairn, M. (2014) Like gold with yield: evolving intersections between farmland and finance, *Journal of Peasant Studies*, **41** (5), 777–795.
Fanon, F. (1967) *The Wretched of the Earth*, Penguin Books, London.
Federici, S. (2004) Women land struggles and the reconstruction of the commons, *The Journal of Labour and Society*, **14**, 41–56.
Feierman, S. (1990) *Peasant Intellectuals: Anthropology and History in Tanzania*, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
Ferguson, J. (1994) *) The Anti-Politics Machine: Development, Depoliticization and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
Ferguson, J. (1999) *Expectations of Modernity: Myths and Meanings of Urban Life on the Zambian Copperbelt*, University of California Press, Berkeley and London.
Friis, C. and Reenberg, A. (2010) Land Grab in Africa: Emerging Land System Drivers in a Teleconnected World, GLP Report N. 1. Copenhagen: GLP-IPO.
Girling, F. (1960) *The Acholi of Uganda*, Her Majesty Stationery Office, London.
GRAIN (2016) *The Global Farmland Grab in 2016: How Big, How Bad?* GRAIN, Barcelona.
Guha, R. (1983) *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India*, Oxford University Press, Delhi.

Hall, R., Edelman, M., Borras, J. S., *et al*. (2015) Resistance, acquiescence or incorporation? An introduction to land grabbing and political reactions from below, *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, **42** (3–4), 467–488.

Isaacman, A. (1990) Peasants and rural protest in Africa, *Africa Studies Review*, **33** (2), 1–120.

Kerkvliet, B. J. T. (2009) Everyday politics in peasant societies (and ours), *Journal of Peasant Studies*, **36** (1), 227–243.

Kiiza, J. (2012) 'Land Grabbing in Uganda: proximate vs underlying drivers', paper presented at the seminar organized by Uganda Land Alliance, 28 March 2012, Kampala.

KwoPeke, L. N. (2016) *Without Land There is no Living*, Foundation for Human Rights Initiative, Kampala.

Lahiff, E., Borras, S. M. Jr. and Kay, C. (2007) Marked-led agrarian reform: policies, performance and prospects, *Third World Quarterly*, **28** (8), 1417–1436.

Lenhart, L. (2013) Alleged land grabs and governance: exploring mistrust and trust in Northern Uganda – The case of the Apaa land conflict, *Journal of Peace and Security Studies*, **1**, 64–85.

Leys, C. (1996) *The Rise and Fall of Development Theory*, James Currey, Oxford.

Lipton, M. (1977) *Why Poor Stay Poor: Urban Bias in World Development*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Mabikke, S. B. (2011) Escalating land grabbing in post-conflict regions in Northern Uganda: A need for strengthening good land governance in Acholi Region', paper presented at the International Conference on Global Land Grabbing, University of Sussex, 6–8 April 2011, UK.

Mamdani, M. (1996) *Citizen and Subjects: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Martiniello, G. (2013) Land dispossession and rural social movements: the 2011 conference in Mali, *Review of African Political Economy*, **40** (136), 209–220.

Martiniello, G. (2015) Social struggles in Uganda's Acholiland: understanding responses and resistance to Amuru sugar works, *Journal of Peasant Studies*, **42** (3–4), 653–669.

Martiniello, G. (2015a) Food Sovereignty as a praxis? Rethinking the food question in Uganda, *Third World Quarterly*, **36** (3), 508–525.

Martiniello, G. (2016) 'Don't stop the mill': South African capital and agrarian change in Tanzania, *Third World Thematics: A TWQ Journal*, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/23802014.2016.1243017.

Moyo, S. and Yeros, P. (2005) The resurgence of rural movements under neoliberalism, in Moyo S. and Yeros P., eds, Reclaiming the Land: The Resurgence of Rural Movements in Africa, Asia and Latin America, Zed Books, London and New York, pp. 8–64.

Moyo, S., Yeros, P. and Jha, P. (2012) Imperialism and primitive accumulation: notes on a new scramble for Africa, *The Agrarian South: a Journal of Political Economy*, **1** (2), 181–203.

Oya, C. (2013) Methodological reflections on 'land grab' databases and the 'land grab' literature 'rush', *Journal of Peasant Studies*, **40** (3), 503–520.

Peters, P. E. (2013) Conflicts over land and threats to customary tenure in Africa, *African Affairs*, **112** (449), 543–562.
Polanyi, K. (1957) *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Times*, Beacon Press, Boston.
Ravnborg, H. M., Bashaasha, B., Pedersen, R. H., *et al*. (2013) *Land Tenure under Transition: Tenure Security, Land Institutions and Economic Activity in Uganda*, Danish Institute for International Studies, Copenhagen.
Ranger, T. (1985) *Peasant Consciousness: Culture and Conflict in Zimbabwe*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
Scott, J. C. (1975) *The Moral Economy of the Peasant*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.
Scott, J. C. (1985) *Weapons of the Weak. Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London.
Scott, J. C. (2009) *The Art of Not Being Governed: An Anarchist History of Upland Southeast Asia*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London.
Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBS) (2010) *Uganda Census of Agriculture. Vol. III Agricultural Household and Holding Characteristics Report*, Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries, Kampala.
Westoby, P. and Lyons, K. (2015) We would rather die in jail fighting for land, than die of hunger': a Ugandan case study examining the deployment of corporate-led community development in the green economy, *Community Development Journal*, **51** (1), 60–76.
White, B., Borras, S. M. Jr., Hall, R., *et al*. (2012) The new enclosures: critical perspectives on corporate land deals, *Journal of Peasant Studies*, **39** (3–4), 619–647.
Wolf, E. (1966) *Peasants*, Prentice-Hall, Englewoods Cliffs.
Wolf, E. (1969) *Peasant War of the Twentieth Century*, Harper and Row Publishers, New York, Evanston and London.
World Bank (2009) *Awakening Africa's Sleeping Giant: Prospects for Commercial Agriculture in the Guinea Savannah Zone and Beyond*, World Bank, Washington DC.
World Bank (2011) *Rising Global Interest in Farmland: Can it Yield Sustainable and Equitable Benefits?* World Bank, Washington DC.
Zoomers, A. (2010) Globalization and foreignization of Space: seven processes driving current global land grab, *Journal of Peasant Studies*, **37** (2), 429–447.