



Ambiguity, Contradiction, and an International Land Acquisition: Lessons Learned from the Establishment of the Kaweri Coffee Plantation in Mubende, Uganda

Kathryn Gardner

Department of Geography, Ohio University
kg873714@ohio.edu

Harold Perkins

Department of Geography, Ohio University
perkinsh@ohio.edu

Abstract

In 2001 Neumann Kaffee Gruppe, a German-based company, established Kaweri Coffee Plantation in Mubende District, Uganda. The multinational leased land for Kaweri from the Ugandan government, which purchased the parcel from a formally-tenured owner the year before. However, 2000 villagers filed suit against Kaweri for violating their customary tenure rights after being forcibly evicted from their farms by the Ugandan military to make way for the plantation. In this study, we ask how smallholders with constitutionally protected, customary rights were dispossessed of their farms. To answer this, we used document analysis to examine relevant Ugandan legal doctrine in addition to dozens of published accounts, documentaries, and social media postings created by conflicting parties to the Kaweri controversy. We subsequently triangulated our data by interviewing a key informant displaced by Kaweri. Our findings indicate Kaweri's establishment at the expense of Mubende farmers is a textbook example of accumulation by dispossession. More specifically, however, they reveal that substantial ambiguity and contradiction exist in Uganda's constitutional and policy frameworks purported to protect small landholders, making it possible for its government to pursue neoliberalizing development goals through international land acquisition. We term this process *accumulation by ambiguity*. Neumann Kaffee Gruppe shields itself from liability by interpreting equivocal Ugandan law in a way that recognizes formalized land tenure over informal, customary tenure. Legal, yet unjust, land acquisitions associated with market liberalization are possible in Uganda as a result.

Keywords

Accumulation by dispossession, international land acquisition, land tenure, neoliberalism, Uganda

Introduction

The Ugandan government established its *Plan for the Modernization of Agriculture* (PMA) in 2000. The PMA, with its “mission to eradicate poverty,” liberalizes agriculture in Uganda by “transforming subsistence agriculture to commercial agriculture” (GRU 2000, 28). The push toward commercialization is meant, according to the document, to improve wages for farm workers and to encourage smallholder farmers to grow income-enhancing specialty crops.¹ Despite the PMA’s ostensible goal of eradicating rural poverty through agro-sector reforms, commercialization of the country’s agricultural economy actually threatens the livelihoods of the smallholder farmers it presumes to support. Coffee production is a prime example. One of Uganda’s export cash crops, it was mostly grown by smallholder farmers prior to 2000. However, the PMA welcomes international coffee investors to Uganda to compete with its extant smaller-scale producers (FIAN 2004; 2012).² Foreign investment in large-scale coffee plantations thus creates a potential contradiction in relation to the PMA’s poverty alleviation goal as it disrupts livelihoods dependent on small-scale coffee production.

During PMA implementation, a German corporation named Neumann Kaffee Gruppe (NKG), searched for land to establish “...a socially and ecologically sustainable plantation for coffee of the Robusta variety” (NKG 2020a, 1). NKG accounts for nine percent of the global market for green coffee³, controlling 7,444 hectares of land among its plantations worldwide (NKG 2020b; 2021a). Although NKG considered sites elsewhere, it chose land in Mubende District, Uganda for its Kaweri Coffee Plantation (herein Kaweri) because the PMA encouraged establishment of a “...sustainable model farm” (NKG 2020a, 1) in a part of Uganda in need of development (NKG 2021b) [see figure one below].⁴ However, siting the 2512 hectare Kaweri plantation on lands occupied by 400 small-scale farm families in four villages (more than 2000 individuals) ignited controversy as violent evictions by the Ugandan military were subsequently reported (Enger 2012; FIAN 2012).

Long before Kaweri, legacies of colonialism, dictatorship, and economic marginalization left Uganda with a poverty rate approaching 60 percent and infrastructure inadequate to transform its subsistence-agricultural economy into a commercial one (IFAD 2009). Thus the Ugandan government seeks foreign direct investment and international trade through development-oriented, reformist policies like the PMA. However, a mix of overlapping customary and formal land tenure systems creates a fraught historical geography on which foreign investment propagates (Rice 2007). Prior to colonialism, all lands in what is now Uganda were held under customary tenure, lacking ‘official’ documentation (Mabikke 2016). Uganda became a British Protectorate in 1894, when colonial administrators created a formal land

¹ Light regulation, enforcement of private property rights, and technical assistance are also promised, among other reforms (PMA 2000).

² The PMA purposefully deregulated Uganda’s domestic, small holder-oriented agricultural market to attract international investments in large-scale, commercial agriculture on the premise that it will modernize agriculture and increase employment in rural Uganda. Little is said in the PMA document, however, about resulting pressures on existing small holder farmers.

³ Green coffee refers to unroasted coffee beans.

⁴ NKG believed the Mubende site in particular allowed it to create a ‘sustainable model farm’ based on its ideal, rolling topography and excellent climate for growing coffee as well as the community’s perceived need for economic development.

tenure system to supersede customary tenure (Wabineno-Oryema 2014).⁵ Despite this, much land remained under customary tenure following Uganda's 1962 independence. Reversing a 1975 decree



Figure 1. Map by Harold Perkins.

vesting all land with the state, the 1995 Ugandan Constitution enshrines both customary and formal tenure systems (GRU 1995). Legal recognition of customary tenure should, in theory, protect smallholder farmers' access to land. However, in Uganda and elsewhere, administration of formal tenure systems leaves peasant farmers on shaky ground (Rice 2007; Batungi and R  ther 2008). It is in this context that we examine how Kaweri's establishment under the PMA was possible despite constitutional protections for Mubende's customary smallholders.

Mubende District is in the Central Region of Uganda. The mostly rural, 2700 square km district is home to approximately 700,000 people, including Baganda, Banyoro, and Banyankole ethnic groups, among others (MDLG 2021). Its moderate elevation and topography, combined with a tropical climate, make it an ideal location for growing a variety of crops in addition to coffee including maize, plantains,

⁵ Customary tenure is still the most common form of Ugandan landholding, encompassing about three-quarters of the country (FAO, 2021). It is "recognized as legitimate by the community, enforced in the customary courts, or even merely by social pressure and generally known though not normally recorded in writing" (Wabineno-Oryema 2014, 9). Customary tenure in Uganda can be transferred into formalized, Freehold tenure granting legally-recognized right of ownership to landholders. Formal land tenure also includes the Mailo allotment system based on an agreement between the British and the Buganda Kingdom of central Uganda in 1900. Freehold or Mailo landholders may enter into lease agreements providing tenants legal rights under Leasehold tenure. For more on Uganda's land tenure system, see Batungi and R  ther (2008).

beans, and cassava. Despite the prevalence of subsistence agriculture in Mubende, food insecurity remains a major concern. While data is difficult to come by for Mubende specifically, the larger Central Region of which it is part had a poverty rate approaching 16 percent in 2013 and 15 percent of its children were considered severely stunted in 2011 (Data Africa 2021). It is therefore unsurprising that the Ugandan state uses the prevalence of poverty in Mubende to promote its PMA and associated commercial developments, including in Kaweri.

Kaweri's opponents include Food First Information and Action Network (FIAN), a nonprofit representing community members claiming wrongful eviction in 2001 as a result of the plantation's establishment (FIAN 2016). Concerns expressed by FIAN and another organization, Action Aid,⁶ on behalf of Mubende's displaced farmers are similar to concerns highlighted in case studies of international land acquisitions (ILAs) conducted elsewhere (Borras et al. 2016, 2011; Wolford et al. 2013). However, emphasis in the literature on ILAs varies, and none examine ILA drivers in the context of Uganda's overlapping land tenure systems, contradictory development initiatives, and related constitutional ambiguities. With this gap in mind, this paper asks the following question: *How was it possible for NKG to establish Kaweri on lands where smallholder farmers already claimed their constitutionally-protected, customary tenure rights?* Before answering this question, literature relevant to ILAs is addressed.

Literature regarding International Land Acquisitions

ILAs are a global phenomenon. Drivers cited are numerous but globalized market dynamics are commonly recognized (Balehegn 2015). For example, international corporations acquire cheap production inputs such as land and forests in the Global South as a profitable solution for faltering global markets and/or falling commodity prices (Peluso and Lund 2011). Uncertainty in stock markets in the late 2010s also drove "speculative investments in land in developing countries by fund managers in developed countries" looking for safer places to park capital (Lisk 2013, 564). Others suggest a link between expanding markets and rising commodity prices and international investment in land to meet demand for commodity production during periods of recovery and rapid economic growth (Borras and Franco 2012; Solberg 2012). States and investors facilitate these processes when describing lands subject to acquisition as unoccupied (World Bank 2009).

African lands in particular have been subject to a large number of ILAs in recent years (Borras et al. 2016; 2011) and are commonly portrayed as un(der)utilized (Balehegn 2015). Assumed emptiness is rooted in colonial representations of Africa as untouched with limitless resource potential (Makki and Geisler 2011). Such narratives make it morally acceptable to acquire land. This practice has not abated as the World Bank encourages African investment and development, for example, by defining the Guinea-Savannah zone – a large swath of Sub-Saharan Africa – as a "vast underused land reserve" despite its importance to pastoralists and other agriculturalists (World Bank 2009; Makki and Geisler 2011, 8).

Other structural factors drive smallholders off their lands, too. States sanction low land rents and create tax incentives and subsidies to attract foreign and domestic firms looking for large parcels in Africa (Zeemeijer 2012; Wolford et al. 2013). In Ethiopia in particular, where all land is formally tenured with the state, Rahmato reminds us that the government's use of such strategies to incentivize ILAs further diminishes the already low proportion of farmers holding customary tenure on their farmland (2008).

⁶ The nonprofit ActionAid is a self-described advocacy organization working around the world to promote equitable and just development (ActionAid, 2022). ActionAid originally brought the Kaweri case to FIAN's attention. FIAN International is a world-wide, not-for-profit working to promote access to food. FIAN exposes injustice in the global food production system that disempowers vulnerable populations. In doing so it promotes a fair distribution of food and equal access to resources (FIAN, 2022).

This, he argues, strengthens state power over remaining smallholder farmers standing in the way of market-driven development priorities that enrich investors and government officials alike. This precarious relationship to the neoliberal state-as-landlord makes peasants increasingly vulnerable to eviction (2011) as smallholder agricultural lands in Ethiopia increasingly consolidate into large, commercial farming operations.

We take the theoretical position that these drivers of ILAs are broadly associated with “accumulation by dispossession” (ABD) (Harvey 2003). ABD describes a process in neoliberal political economy whereby expanded capitalist reproduction is accomplished by bringing land (Hall 2011) and other resources like water (Mehta et al. 2012; Perreault, 2013) previously outside of capital, into its orbit. Much of the dispossession occurs in the Global South (Wolford et al. 2013; Hall, 2013) and indeed much is written about ABD specifically in regards to a substantial increase in land acquisitions in Africa as a quick accumulation strategy for interests in the Global North (see, for example, Hall 2011; Moyo et al. 2012; Fairbairn 2013). In this problematic context, some scholars critically refer to ILAs as ‘land grabs’ (Lavers 2012; McMichael 2012).

Proponents of ILAs, however, emphasize the supposed positive impacts from foreign land investment including enhanced employment, food security (Deininger et al. 2011), and infrastructure/technology investments (Lisk 2013). Critical scholarship, however, illuminates negative ILA impacts and reveals that promises of associated benefits often fail to come to fruition for impacted communities (Li 2011; Hall 2011). Ethiopia is a well-documented example as the state embraces market-based policies promised to bring economic development to rural villages (Ingebretsen 2015). Instead of economic opportunity, smallholders find their livelihoods destroyed as they lose access to both their lands and water. The construction of dams in Ethiopia by international firms, on the one hand, floods peasants’ farms and provides them little or no compensation as previously promised (Fisher 2011). On the other hand, foreign investment in Ethiopian land for commercial agriculture severed the Oromo people’s access to river water needed to irrigate their crops and they, too, received little recompense (Rahmato 2011). Similar experiences are documented in Mozambique (Solberg 2012) and Tanzania (Salcedo-La Viña and Notess 2018). The geography of communities dispossessed of their land, water, and forests stretches beyond East Africa, to the farthest corners of the Global South (see, for example, Mehta et al. 2012).

Given their negative impacts on livelihoods, it should be expected that ILAs decrease food security in host countries by creating spikes in food prices associated with domestic shortages (Balehegn 2015). Rahmato suggests in this regard, “the rush for commercial land in Africa and elsewhere by private and sovereign investors is for the production and export of food crops” (2011, 2). Makki and Geisler (2011) likewise note that many countries with high rates of foreign agricultural investments score poorly on the global hunger index. ILA associated employment is often poorly paid, further contributing to food insecurity in communities severed from their livelihoods (Solberg 2012). Much like the situation regarding broken promises of ILA associated employment, agreements regarding investor spending on infrastructure and programs that would combat food insecurity are largely unenforced and often unfulfilled (Cotula et al. 2009). These impacts are gendered, too, as ILAs disproportionately impact women in particular (Glassman 2006; Verma 2014). In many societies, they are responsible for social reproductive functions associated with food security, including farming and foraging on lands subject to acquisition/ABD (Fonjong 2017). Ultimately, then, ILAs intensify economic and gender inequality in communities and foster uneven development on a larger scale (Balehegn 2015).

It is therefore not surprising that ILAs spark considerable resistance among smallholders, given all of these difficulties. Resistance means that coercive tactics are often necessary to carry out ILAs. Indeed a common emphasis in writings on ILAs/ABD in Africa and elsewhere is that collective and smallholder resources are brought into capital’s purview primarily through *extra-economic* means as

opposed to normalized circuits of capital investment associated with free market transactions (Glassman 2006; Hall 2013). Extra-economic means include state corruption, (il)legal policies, extra-judicial maneuvers, and threats/acts of physical violence against tenants by militaries, corporate mercenaries, and police (Akram-Lodhi, 2012). If ILAs are to be successful from capital's standpoint, they require support from a variety of state/parastatal institutions eagerly awaiting their share of the spoils (Fairbairn 2013). We see this as an area worthy of further investigation. Despite decades of scholarship on ABD and land acquisitions in Africa and elsewhere, much is left to learn about the ways that extra-economic forms of dispossession are carried forth and subsequently experienced by smallholders. Before addressing this specifically in the context of Mubende, Uganda, our methods require elaboration.

Methods and Data

We used a qualitative research methodology to interrogate data regarding the Kaweri controversy. Qualitative research methods are useful for “the examination of structures and processes on the one hand and of individuals and their experiences on the other” (Winchester and Rofe 2010, 6). Thus, qualitative researchers in human geography emphasize the importance of understanding how people variously construct, and are affected by, the world around them (Limb and Dwyer 2001; Hay 2016). In order to accomplish this in regards to Kaweri, we employed a qualitative approach to document analysis on relevant published data. Document analysis was chosen due to its potential for revealing empirical knowledge and conceptual insights from rich sources of readily available published data (Hsieh and Shannon 2005; Corbin and Strauss, 2008). Following Bowen, we consider document analysis a viable way to generate substantial data for a case study where logistical constraints in conducting fieldwork and locating interview respondents created obstacles to collecting other forms of data (2009). Also, documents are an especially useful way to track changes in the spatio-temporal aspects of case studies like Kaweri, where the original event happened decades ago.

Most of the documents from which we derived data were published between 2002 and 2021 by Neumann Kaffee Gruppe (NKG) and Food First Information and Action Network (FIAN) in public social media forums which we assume are intended to sway public opinion. The data from NKG includes their detailed timeline of events regarding the development of Kaweri, the benefits of its investment in Mubende, and its commitment to sustainable development. The data representing FIAN is also comprehensive. The organization publishes wide-ranging articles on their website, documentaries for social media, and written reports on its legal case against NKG outlining the specific ways it believes the firm is violating Mubende resident's rights. Some additional third-party published texts, such as reports on Kaweri's impact on food security published by ActionAid, are also included in our analysis.

We used a system of coding to generate common themes from our documents that could guide us to our research question and ultimately our theory regarding ambiguity and international land acquisition in Uganda. See Table 1, below. Our codes initially produced overarching themes concerning Kaweri's supposed benefits for Mubende villagers on the one hand, and the harms it caused, on the other. Common codes from accounts supportive of Kaweri's establishment include beneficial developments like schools, water boreholes, jobs, healthcare, and better coffee prices for local producers. Common codes from accounts critical of the establishment of Kaweri included concerns about violence, human displacement, killing of livestock and crops, destruction of livelihoods, and food insecurity. Resulting major themes for and against Kaweri in the data revealed the discursive framing of the Kaweri controversy aligns with the wider land acquisition literature cited in this study. Cross-referencing our new codes against the data, however, revealed hidden themes important to further theorizing the political economy of ILAs in Uganda.

Amidst our codes framing arguments for or against Kaweri, we discovered that opponents and proponents often relied on differing interpretations of the *same* legal institutions, documents, and constructs to defend their positions. Defenders of each position differentially referred to constitutionality,

SAMPLE DOCUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF KAWERI	SAMPLE CODE(S)	THEME(S)
NKG. 2021a. NKG Tropical Farm Management: Responsible farming means protection of natural assets.	-Sustainable economic development -Collaboration w/small producers -Social responsibility to Mubende	-Kaweri provides legal, sustainable development that benefits Mubende. NKG not responsible for violence or evictions.
NKG. 2021b. NKG Sustainable commitment- for the people, for the region.	-Sustainable coffee cultivation/ecofriendly -Positive local economic impact -Involvement of locals as plantation labourers	
NKG. 2020a. Chronology of events, Kaweri Coffee Plantation -2000 to 2020.	-Legal, formal tenure for plantation parcel -Conflict despite proper compensation for farmers -NKG not responsible for violence	
NKG. 2013. The project: Kaweri and the leasing of clean title land in Uganda.	-Kaweri as legal collaboration with Ugandan state -History of land title not in dispute (formal tenure) -NKG as responsible corporate citizen	
SAMPLE DOCUMENTS AGAINST KAWERI	SAMPLE CODE(S)	THEME(S)
FIAN International. 2019. Human Rights Violations in context of Kaweri Coffee Plantation in Mubende/Uganda.	-Kaweri land deal as violation of constitutional rights (land/livelihood/food) -International investors circumvent land policy -Inadequate compensation	-Kaweri is illegal land acquisition. NKG, Germany, Uganda all violate domestic and international human rights. Loss of livelihoods, food, water.
FIAN Germany. 2016. Extra-Territorial Human Rights Violations in the Context of Supporting Large Scale Agrarian Investments: The Case of Kaweri Coffee Plantation Ltd. in Mubende/Uganda.	-Culpability of German state in Kaweri case -German state violation of UN CEDAW right to food, land, and water -German state violation of women’s rights under UN CEDAW (discrimination against women)	
FIAN International. 2009. Complaint against Neumann Kaffee Gruppe under the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises.	-Kaweri failure to consider other stakeholders -Kaweri fails to safeguard other sustainable dev -Kaweri fails to protect human rights/rule of law -Kaweri eviction unconstitutional/illegal in Uganda	
FIAN International. 2004. The Case Mubende.	-Farms, livestock, livelihoods destroyed -Evictees physically injured by army -Unconstitutionality of land acquisition	
LEGAL/INSTITUTIONAL DOCUMENTS	SAMPLE CODE(S)	THEME(S)
Government of the Republic of Uganda Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development. 2013. The Uganda National Land Policy.	-Definitions of Ugandan land tenures -Legal definitions of land ownership eligibility -Policies protecting informal land tenure -Requirements for state acquisition of land	- Customary tenure legal, BUT subsistence agriculture undesirable. State prioritizes commercial agriculture. International investment particularly welcome. State and investors use legal ambiguity to take land.
Government of the Republic of Uganda. 2000. Plan for Modernization of Agriculture: Eradicating Poverty in Uganda.	-Subsistence agriculture economically undesirable -Poverty alleviation through commercial and specialized agriculture -State encouragement of private sector investment -Technical assistance and regulatory relief	
Government of the Republic of Uganda. 1998. Land Act, 1998.	-Definitions of various Ugandan land tenures -Certification of customary land ownership <u>-Rules governing state acquisition of private land</u>	
Government of the Republic of Uganda. 1995. Constitution of the Republic of Uganda, 1995.	-Ownership of land by Ugandan citizens only -Provision for leasing to non-citizens -Enshrinement of customary land tenure -Requirement of adequate compensation for seizure	

Table 1. Sample of documents analyzed, codes developed, and resulting themes.

land tenure, legality, development and modernization policy, matters of the state, and corporate responsibility, among others. Thus a major theme emerging from our codes indicated a substantial amount of ambiguity, equivocality, and conflict in the interpretations of legal institutions and documents used to bolster narratives on both sides of the Kaweri conflict. For this reason, relevant portions of the Ugandan Constitution (GRU 1995), the *Ugandan Land Act of 1998* (GRU 1998), the *Ugandan Plan for the Modernization of Agriculture* (PMA) (GRU 2000), and the *Uganda National Land Policy* (GRU 2013) were also reviewed and coded for our analysis.

We realize that relying solely on documentation poses potential problems for the rigour of qualitative research projects (Bowen, 2009). Thus we triangulated our findings by supplementing them with a semi-structured interview with a key informant displaced by Kaweri from Block 99 in Mubende District (for more on triangulation, see Denzin, 1970). A professional contact helped secure an interview with the individual who is actively involved in coordinating a longstanding lawsuit against the Ugandan government and NKG in Ugandan court.⁷ Our interviewee was a life-long resident of Mubende, who before eviction, taught in a school that subsequently shut down during Kaweri's establishment. Additional data gathered from this interview proved helpful in verifying our interpretations of our original data as well as answering contextual and conceptual questions raised during the review process that we could not otherwise answer. The interview occurred via video conferencing technology and lasted about an hour. The data garnered was also transcribed, coded, and cross-referenced to our original data and codes.

How was it possible for NKG to establish Kaweri on lands where smallholder farmers already claimed their constitutionally-protected, customary tenure rights?

According to our interviewee, sometime around 2000, the CEO of NKG- through happenstance- was on a flight with Ugandan President Museveni. When Museveni learned that NKG was looking to expand its operations into East Africa, he personally invited NKG's CEO to look for land within Uganda. Weeks later, NKG representatives were on helicopters with Ugandan government officials surveying the landscape for suitable locations to establish a coffee plantation. Shortly thereafter, the NKG representatives in consultation with representatives from the Ugandan Investment Authority (UIA), focused on lands within Mubende District. Our interviewee said Block 99 was chosen there given the site's suitable rolling topography, its titled ownership (tenure) status, and its location outside President Museveni's home region in the west of Uganda where much of his political support traditionally comes from. Once the site was chosen, Mubende's district commissioner worked closely with field managers from NKG to begin site preparation, including meeting with impacted residents.

In a meeting on June 18th, 2001, villagers were given an ultimatum to leave the land designated for Kaweri by August 31st, 2001. Our respondent, among other affected residents, hired an attorney and petitioned the government to stop the evictions. But they received no response. Most villagers did not leave and *before* the deadline passed, the military beat residents, burned their homes and crops, and killed their livestock. Nearly 400 families subsequently filed suit in Ugandan court against the government of Uganda and NKG in 2002, claiming they were violently evicted from their lands they had a legal right to farm. By this point Action Aid and FIAN stepped in to assist the evictees.

FIAN detailed in a complaint to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development what it says took place leading up to the establishment of the 2512 hectare Kaweri Coffee Plantation in 2001. In the document, FIAN maintained that 2000 people lived on the land on which NKG established

⁷ Our interviewee graciously granted us permission to reveal their name. However, we opted to conceal their identity given they were previously arrested for their activism and charged by the state as a saboteur. Also litigation concerning Kaweri is ongoing. We are thankful for their willingness to speak to us about their experience.

Kaweri (2009). The nonprofit argued that, *despite protections of customary tenure*, the residents were wrongfully and violently evicted by the Ugandan army during August 17-21, 2001 (FIAN 2009). FIAN reiterated the accounts by affected farmers:

The Uganda People's Defense Force (UPDF, army of the State of Uganda) forced them to leave their premises because the semi-statal Ugandan Investment Authority (UIA) wanted to lease it to the Kaweri Coffee Plantation Ltd... The inhabitants were threatened and forced to leave at gunpoint and several of those being evicted were beaten in the process. The soldiers set houses on fire and demolished them, including the fully equipped private clinic of the community and six churches. (2019, 6).

Another NGO, ActionAid, also documented interviews with villagers displaced by Kaweri. A chairman of one of the impacted villages said in his interview, the "Government supported the investor to take our land. They brought soldiers to evict us and kill us..." (2008, 40).

Using villager accounts of the eviction, FIAN and ActionAid publicly charged NKG with violating Ugandan constitutional law. FIAN, for instance, says: "The affected communities had deemed themselves safe from such displacement since the Ugandan constitution and Uganda law allow for dispossession only under very strict regulations" (2009, 4). FIAN pointed out that with few exceptions, Article 237(1) of the Ugandan Constitution permits only citizens to own land:

This means that no foreign investor shall carry on the business of crop production, animal production or acquire or be granted or lease land for the purpose of crop production or animal production in Uganda...unless the Minister provides an exemption to the business...which was not done in the Kaweri case... NKG is a German company which acquired the land illegally (2019, 17).

FIAN continued their argument by claiming another violation of constitutional law by Kaweri and UIA. In this case, the NGO claimed NKG violated Articles 26, 29(2-a) and 237(1, 3-a, 8) of the Ugandan Constitution regarding the state's burden to prove the necessity for eviction and its obligation for just compensation:

...no person shall be compulsorily deprived of property unless it is necessary for public use or in the interest of defense, public safety, public order, public morality or public health and prior to the taking of possession or acquisition of the property prompt payment of fair and adequate compensation has to be made (2019, 16).

However, according to FIAN's 2009 complaint letter, only two percent of those evicted for Kaweri received proper compensation. This, the NGO claimed, is because the two percent were considered 'legal occupants,' meaning they were recognized as having *formal* land tenure. Authorities, according to FIAN, considered the remaining evictees as unlawful squatters and therefore undeserving of compensation. FIAN and ActionAid argued that, in addition to being unconstitutional, the eviction and selective compensation ran counter to the *Ugandan Land Act of 1998*. The *Land Act* recognizes as customary, legal occupants those living on land without formal title, whose presence remains unchallenged for more than 12 years (GRU 1998). The NGOs, in alleging constitutional and policy violations by NKG, argued that evicting farmers ultimately destroys their livelihoods (Banga and Nuwagaba 2002; ActionAid 2008; FIAN 2009)

In its own defense, NKG published a chronology of events outlining the reasons they established Kaweri in Uganda in the first place (2020a). NKG stated they chose Uganda for investment because the firm had "...support from the Ugandan Investment Authority (UIA) and the entire government" (2020a, 1). Another reason for choosing Uganda was the "availability of land in form of registered private ownership... free from third party claims" (2020a, 1-2). Land identified as Block 99 in Buwekula

County, Mubende District, which became Kaweri, apparently met these criteria for NKG. Indeed the firm emphasizes the site's history of private ownership going back to 1964 (2020a). Though NKG made no mention of what specific form of land tenure was in place at Block 99 at the time of its acquisition by UIA, NKG's emphasis on private ownership through clear title suggests it had concern for properly navigating Uganda's formal land tenure system. After NKG decided the Mubende site was suitable for its plantation in 2000, UIA subsequently purchased it from the private owner in 2001 and leased it to NKG for 99 years.⁸

NKG admitted knowing occupants lived in Block 99 prior to signing a lease agreement with UIA. In so doing, however, the firm counters claims by FIAN and ActionAid that 2000 people were impacted, suggesting only "25 small farmers" living in Block 99 refused to accept compensation and move (2013, 3). NKG went on to offer this response: "These persons were subsequently forced to leave the land; government authorities assisted the former owner in this process". However, NKG distanced themselves from the military action (2013, 3):

NKG very much regrets that these forced relocations of the 25 small farmers took place and condemns the actions of the army. At no time could NKG have foreseen this tragic development, and even less have influenced it. Although NKG genuinely regrets that these events unfolded it should be noted that the people in the region were very much aware that Block 99 was privately owned.

The last part of this statement indicates NKG emphasizes the legality of its lease based on formal land tenure rights under Ugandan constitutional property law. NKG further denied any legal responsibility for compensating displaced farmers, claiming enforcement of the seller's contractual obligations is the state's purview. NKG insisted, "The Ugandan government, just like any other state, does not tolerate the interference of foreign companies into national affairs"⁹ (2013, 1). NKG simultaneously argued that Kaweri's establishment in Mubende created community-wide development benefits that outweigh harms committed to the 25 smallholder farmers it officially recognizes as displaced (2013; 2021b).

The Kaweri case provides insights into how ILAs proceed amidst considerable controversy. Firstly, despite NGO reliance on charging NKG with violations of constitutional law and policy in Mubende, ambiguities and contradictions persist in the legal governance and development of land in Uganda. For example, it seems the Ugandan Constitution protects land ownership as a right reserved for Ugandan citizens (UC Art. 237.1) to prevent them losing their lands to foreign entities like NKG during liberalization of the country's agricultural sector (GRU 2000). Yet there is an important constitutional caveat empowering the Ugandan government to acquire land: "The Government or a local government may, subject to article 26 of this Constitution, acquire land in the public interest; and the conditions governing such acquisition shall be as prescribed by Parliament" (Art. 237.2-a). Although Article 237.2-a clearly establishes the Ugandan government's legal basis for acquiring land, the definition of public interest remains unclear.

This is important because constitutional law guarantees formal landowners in Uganda, including the government, the right to rent land to foreign entities in leasehold tenure arrangements (UC 237.3-d). This creates a legal opening for foreign firms to take de facto control of Ugandan lands for up to 99 years. By this contradictory method the Ugandan government, through the UIA, legally acquired Block 99 from

⁸ UIA purchased the land as NKG, a German firm, was ineligible to own land under the Ugandan Constitution. NKG thus entered into a formal, leasehold tenure arrangement under Ugandan law.

⁹ NKG indicated it required UIA to provide receipts confirming displaced persons were compensated, before it signed a lease for Block 99 with the UIA (NKG, 2013).

a person holding formal tenure and leased it to NKG at the expense of persons otherwise constitutionally protected from eviction through customary right. UIA and NKG argued economic growth is the public good justifying the evictions (NKG 2021b). Therein lies another contradiction according to FIAN and evictees. Uganda's PMA policy document emphasizes the importance of eliminating poverty among subsistence farmers, yet it supports the liberalization of land markets that steer parcels away from smallholders toward large-scale commercial investors.

However, the *Land Act of 1998* (and Amendments), based on Uganda's Constitution, was enacted in part to protect smallholders, many of whom hold customary tenure (GRU 1998). The Act attempts clarification of customary tenure, delineates its relation to formal tenures, and makes explicit its recognition by the state. This too, then, should protect smallholders from wealthier investors like NKG. But a closer reading of the Act reveals that part of its purpose is formalizing customary tenure because it is problematic for administration of formal tenure systems under Uganda's economic modernization. The subsequent *2013 Uganda National Land Policy* document states in this regard: "This duality of property rights systems resulted in land tenures, whose maintenance has turned cumbersome and confusing in the current social, economic, and political circumstances... The dual systems of land administration, (the formal/statutory and informal/customary), breeds conflict, confusion and overlaps in institutional mandates" (GRU 2013, 4). Unsurprisingly, customary tenure is "viewed as an obstacle to economic development" (UHRC 2017, 28).

Under the *Land Act of 1998*, then, anyone holding customary tenure may petition councils for a "certificate of customary tenure" providing them rights similar to those held by formally-titled landowners. Customary certificate holders may then re-petition for formal, freehold land tenure status if they choose. The challenge here for smallholders is it is unclear how they navigate the complicated formalization process required for recognition of their rights. There is also no guarantee their petition for a certificate will be granted, especially if challenged by a third party with another tenure claim for the same land. Thus it remains uncertain if smallholders, lacking a certificate, enjoy practical recourse in instances of displacement. It is possible that formalization of informal tenure arrangements creates a contradiction whereby uncertified customary tenure holders become *more* vulnerable to eviction if they cannot prove they have a documented right to remain on the land.

As the PMA makes evident, most *Land Act of 1998* provisions were not fully enforced across Uganda at the time NKG was searching for land. There is also little evidence in any of the documentation concerning Kaweri that the certified version of customary tenure was widely available to local smallholders in Block 99 at the time of evictions in 2001. It is not even clear what proportion of the evictees would qualify under the Act's criteria if enforced at the time. However, the *Land Act of 1998* includes another element which provides clarification and offers protection for some subsistence farmers by defining who is legally allowed to remain on land formally titled to a third party. More specifically, farmers occupying land they do not formally own for at least twelve years without a challenge by the legal owner are considered "bona-fide" and have the right to stay on the land or are deserving of compensation if evicted (GRU 1998, 29.2a-b).

This clarification of bona-fide occupancy should provide additional legal protection and recourse for Kaweri evictees and indeed FIAN used bona-fide status to build its argument against NKG. According to FIAN, "many" of the people evicted from Block 99 hold legal, customary tenure as "bona fide occupants" and therefore have rights to compensation (2009; 2012, 3). Based on the convoluted and poorly documented ownership and occupancy histories of Block 99, though, it is unclear what the legal status is for many of the evictees lacking certificates of customary tenure. To add even more ambiguity to the constitutional questions surrounding Kaweri, the number of people actually displaced by Kaweri is contested. Is it the 2000 people suing NKG in Ugandan court or 25 farmers as NKG (2020a) insists? No matter the actual number, disagreement over who was present on the land before Kaweri's

establishment is a significant impediment to carrying out the legal requirement under the *Land Act of 1998* to determine who is entitled to compensation based on their bona-fide tenure status.

It is important to note here that despite controversy regarding how many people were displaced for Kaweri, contradictions and ambiguity in the Ugandan Constitution and the *Land Act of 1998* provide NKG with legal and ethical *cover* regarding its development of Block 99. Indeed, Ugandan law and its overlapping land tenure systems are vulnerable to exploitation by multinational corporations for this reason (FIAN 2019). NKG insists, for example, that they followed due diligence in picking a site that met their search criteria: "...the sale of Block 99 including the corresponding and full compensation for resettlements in accordance with Ugandan law (after all, the land had been privately owned since 1964) is a transaction perfectly conformant with the law" (NKG 2020a, 3). While this might be technically true, NKG and UIA interpreted Ugandan constitutional law in a way that denied the right of customary tenure holders in Block 99 (including those who claim bona-fide status) to remain on the land. In other words, NKG selectively identified formalizing elements of Ugandan constitutional law advantageous to its position and followed them diligently. Thus the power of documented, formal tenure edged out farmers who could only claim their customary rights were violated after the fact. This situation reveals how Ugandan constitutional law, while designed to recognize/protect both formal and informal land tenures, actually shields NKG and UIA from accusations they acted illegally in establishing Kaweri.

NKG also argues it acted ethically by saying: "Before the Ugandan government bought the land from Mr. Kayiwa, Kaweri, in a preliminary agreement, demanded for all people living in Block 99 to receive full compensation" (NKG 2020a, 2). NKG expresses regret over the removal of the farmers, but dodges ethics complaints by maintaining the firm did not cause the expulsion because evictions are the responsibility of the Ugandan army. In this regard, NKG expressed an apology without acknowledging responsibility: "Those legal proceedings happened without NKG or Kaweri having known about it and before the lease contract was signed [emphasis original]. NKG very much then and now regrets how these 25 families were treated. Following these events, NKG and Kaweri immediately got in contact with the Catholic diocese of Mityana and initiated a relief programme for the people involved" (NKG 2013, 1).

Interestingly, NKG in defending its actions, stops short of criticizing the Ugandan state for its role in the evictions. This is not surprising in the commission of an act of dispossession; what NKG will not publicly acknowledge is that parking their sizable investment in a contested location requires the Ugandan state to open up the investment space and protect it- with violence if necessary. NKG disavowal of legal/ethical obligations in regard to social and economic disruption by hiding behind the Ugandan Constitution and the separation of corporation and state is therefore a specious argument at best, and at worst, an act of violence in its own right.

Discussion: Kaweri and Accumulation by Ambiguity

The study of Kaweri reveals its establishment is another example of ABD. Our interviewee confirmed this when they said Uganda's government uses its PMA in the Kaweri case and others to "liberate land from the peasants for large commercial farmers and use the evictees as readily available 'slave' labour. Peasants become dependent on investors." Farmers losing their land through violent eviction by the state on behalf of international capital and then becoming proletarians is ABD in its strictest sense (Harvey 2003; Hall 2013; Wolford et al. 2013). What we find more revealing from this analysis, however, is the extra-economic means that made this dispossession legal in Uganda where smallholder land access is supposed to be protected. We term this subtle process, *accumulation by ambiguity*.

The Ugandan state, as evidenced in its Constitution, PMA, and *Land Act of 1998*, created protections for smallholder farmers through legal recognition of customary tenure, citizen-based land

ownership restrictions, and pro-poor agricultural reform policies. But as the PMA and *2013 Uganda National Land Policy* documents also make clear, the state simultaneously supports a neoliberalized development agenda by seeking “a transformed Ugandan society through optimal use and management of land resources for a prosperous and industrialized economy with a developed services sector” (GRU 2013, 8). As the Uganda Human Rights Commission, suggests: “This usually results in forced evictions... to make way for development projects” (2017, 19). Evictions become possible because the constitutional/legal/policy landscape in Uganda is ripe with ambiguity and equivocality that provides the state and its investors much legal room to pursue commercial agricultural development and associated land acquisitions in the name of poverty amelioration. However, protecting smallholders’ land access *and* promoting neoliberal forms of development are fundamentally incompatible priorities, the latter of which is usually prioritized over the former (see; Fisher 2011; Solberg 2012; Balehegn 2015; Salcedo-La Viña and Notess 2017, among others).

Another aspect of accumulation by ambiguity in the Kaweri case relates to the literature suggesting vacant lands rhetoric as a common justification for ILAs in Africa (see Makki and Geisler 2011). NKG knew (at least 25) people farmed on Block 99 before it signed the lease with UIA. At first glance, then, it seems the firm acknowledged the presence of people on the land- which therefore contradicts the vacant lands thesis in this instance. Refusal by NKG to recognize customary rights, however, meant that the firm could deny the existence of 2000 additional people on the land, creating legal ambiguity to serve its purpose. Ambiguity created around the occupation of agricultural space by Ugandans in Mubende recalls how the vacant lands narrative historically worked as a force for dispossession, while also revealing the mechanisms by which it continues to erase Africans from their lands in the neocolonial era. Accumulation by ambiguity in the Kaweri case is therefore likely not a unique situation; additional research is needed to better understand its wider applications.

Indeed our interviewee emphasized that Kaweri’s establishment is now a template for an accelerating number of ILAs across Uganda. The interviewee is, for example, currently helping other farmers resist eviction from a parcel of land near Kaweri acquired by the UIA in much the same manner as NKG (this time on behalf of Chinese investors). It seems, therefore, that accumulation by ambiguity continues as an effective way to dispossess smallholders in a context where the state purports to protect peasant access to farmland through constitutional and policy-related commitments to customary tenure. We argue the potential power of accumulation by ambiguity warrants increased scrutiny in a variety of developing world contexts where states use equivocal and often contradictory legal and policy-related positions to subordinate customary tenure to the power of formal tenure for the purposes of capital accumulation by private interests. It is also reasonable to believe that the pace of ILAs will continue to accelerate in Uganda and throughout Africa as long as investors find ambiguous, yet inviting, institutional circumstances shielding them from accountability. By studying the tools at neoliberalization’s disposal we learn how to better resist it.

Acknowledgements

We thank Dr. Edna Wangui for her insights and support while conducting our research. We also thank the anonymous reviewers and editor for their encouraging and constructive comments on an earlier draft of this manuscript. Any errors, however, remain the authors’ responsibility.

References

- ActionAid. 2022. "A Global Federation Working for a World Free from Poverty and Injustice." <https://actionaid.org/> Last accessed 9-28-2022.
- ActionAid. 2008. "Effects of MNCs on Food Security. The Case of Neumann Kaffee Group in Mubende District, Uganda." Kampala: ActionAid.
- Akram-Lodhi, A. Haroon. 2012. "Contextualizing Land Grabbing: Contemporary Land Deals, the Global Subsistence Crisis and the World Food System." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies* 33 (2): 119-142.
- Balehegn, Mulubrhan. 2015. "Unintended Consequences: The Ecological Repercussions of Land Grabbing in Sub-Saharan Africa." *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development* 57 (2): 4-21.
- Banga Margaret and Augustus Nuwagaba 2002. "The Impact of Foreign Direct Investment on the Local Economy: The Case of Kaweri Coffee and Kalangala Palm Oil Investments." Kampala: ActionAid.
- Batungi, N. and H. Rüther. 2008. "Land Tenure reform in Uganda. Some Reflections on the Formalisation of Customary Tenure." *Survey Review* 40 9 (308): 116-128.
- Borras Jr, Saturnino. and Jennifer Franco. 2012. "Global Land Grabbing and Trajectories of Agrarian Change: A Preliminary Analysis." *Journal of agrarian change* 12 (1): 34-59.
- Borras, Saturnino., Philip Seufert, Stephan Backes, Danile Fyfe, Roman Herre, Laura Michele, and Elyse Mills. 2016. "Land Grabbing and Human Rights: The Involvement of European Corporate and Financial Entities in Land Grabbing Outside the European Union. European Parliament." 1-132. [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document.html?reference=EXPO_STU\(2016\)578007](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document.html?reference=EXPO_STU(2016)578007) Last accessed 7-17-2021.
- Borras, Saturnino, Ruth Hall, Ian Scoons, Ben White, and Wendy Wolford. 2011. "Towards a Better Understanding of Global Land Grabbing: An Editorial Introduction." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 38 (2): 209-216.
- Bowen, Glenn. (2009). "Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method." *Qualitative Research Journal* 9 (2): 27-40.
- Corbin, Juliet and Anselm Strauss. (2008). "Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory" (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cotula, Lorenzo, Sonja Vermeulen, Rebeca Leonard, and James Keeley. 2009. "Land Grab or Development Opportunity? Agricultural Investment and International Land Deals in Africa." IIED/FAO/IFAD: London/Rome.
- Data Africa. 2021. "About Mubende, Uganda." <https://dataafrica.io/profile/mubende-uga#introduction> Last accessed: 8-2-2021.
- Deininger, Klaus, Derek Byerlee, Jonathan Lindsay, Andrew Norton, Harris Selod, and Mercedes Stickler. 2011. "Rising Global Interest in Farmland: Can It Yield Sustainable and Equitable Benefits?" World Bank: Washington D.C.
- Denzin, Norman. K. 1970. "The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods." New York: Aldine.
- Enger, Michael. 2012. "Coffee to Go- With a Taste of Eviction." FIAN-supported documentary film. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=InjgvSAcfc> Last accessed 7-17-2021.

- Fairbairn, Madeleine. 2013. "Indirect Dispossession: Domestic Power Imbalances and Foreign Access to Land in Mozambique." *Development and Change*. 44 (2): 335-356.
- FIAN Germany. 2016. "Extra-Territorial Human Rights Violations in the Context of Supporting Large Scale Agrarian Investments: The Case of Kaweri Coffee Plantation Ltd. in Mubende/Uganda." https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/Treaties/CEDAW/Shared%20Documents/DEU/INT_CEDAW_NGO_DEU_26255_E.pdf Last accessed 7-17-2021.
- FIAN International. 2022. "For the Right to Food and Nutrition." <https://fian.org/en/> Last accessed 9-28-2022.
- FIAN International. 2019. "Human Rights Violations in the Context of Kaweri Coffee Plantation in Mubende/Uganda." Food First Information and Action Network, 1-11. https://www.fian.org/files/files/HR_violations_in_the_context_of_Kaweri_Coffee_Plantation_in_Mubende.pdf Last accessed 7-17-2021.
- FIAN International. 2012. "Land Grabbing in Uganda: Evictions for Foreign Investment in Coffee in Uganda." FIAN Fact Sheet pp. 1-4.
- FIAN International. 2009. "Complaint against Neumann Kaffee Gruppe under the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises." 1-20. https://www.oecdwatch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/8/dlm_uploads/2021/03/FIAN_vs_NKG_20090615_complaint.pdf Last accessed 7-17-2021.
- FIAN International. 2004. "The Case Mubende." FIAN International Document G27e. pp. 1-21 <https://www.fian.org/files/files/The-case-Mubende-2004.pdf> Last accessed 7-17-2021.
- Fisher, Steve. 2011. "Africa for Sale: Land and Water Grabs Spell Disaster for Rural People and Rivers." *World Rivers Review* 26 (3): 1-16.
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. 2021. "Gender and Land Rights Database." http://www.fao.org/gender-landrights-database/country-profiles/countries-list/land-tenure-and-related-institutions/prevaling-systems-of-land-tenure/en/?country_iso3=UGA Last accessed 8-2-2021.
- Fonjong, Lotsmart. 2017. "Left Out but Not Backing Down: Exploring Women's Voices against Large-Scale Agro-Plantations in Cameroon." *Development in Practice* 27 (8): 1114-25.
- Glassman, Jim. 2006. "Primitive Accumulation, Accumulation by Dispossession, Accumulation by 'Extra-economic' Means." *Progress in Human Geography* 30 (5): 608-625.
- Government of the Republic of Uganda. 2013. "The Uganda National Land Policy." 1-61. <https://www.landnet.ug/landwatch/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/FINAL-UGANDA-NATIONAL-LAND-POLICY-OF-2013.pdf> Last accessed 7-18-2021.
- Government of the Republic of Uganda. 2000. "Plan for Modernization of Agriculture: Eradicating Poverty in Uganda." <https://www.inclusivebusiness.net/sites/default/files/wp/PMAMaindocument.pdf> Last accessed 5-9-2022.
- Government of the Republic of Uganda. 1998. "Land Act, 1998." <https://mlhud.go.ug/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Land-Act-1998-as-amended-CAP-227.pdf> Last accessed 7-17-2021.
- Government of the Republic of Uganda. 1995. "Constitution of the Republic of Uganda, 1995." <https://www.parliament.go.ug/documents/1240/constitution> Last accessed 7-17-2021.
- Hall, Derek. 2013. "Primitive Accumulation, Accumulation by Dispossession and the Global Land Grab." *Third World Quarterly* 34 (9): 1582-1604.

- Hall, Ruth. 2011. "Land Grabbing in Southern Africa: The Many Faces of the Investor Rush." *Review of African Political Economy* 38 (128): 193–214.
- Harvey, David. 2003. *The New Imperialism*. Oxford University Press.
- Hay, Iain. (2016). *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*. Oxford University Press.
- Hsieh, Hsiu, and Sarah Shannon. 2005. "Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis." *Qualitative Health Research* 15: 1277-1288.
- Ingebretsen, Emily. 2015. "A Thirsty Third World: How Land Grabs Are Leaving Ethiopia in the Dust." *wH20: The Journal of Gender and Water* 4 (11): 94-102.
- International Fund for Agricultural Development. 2009. "Enabling Poor Rural People to Overcome Poverty in Uganda." <http://www.ifad.org/operations/projects/regions/Pf/factsheets/uganda.pdf> Last accessed 8-2-2021.
- Lavers, Tom. 2012. "The 'Land Grab' as a Development Strategy? The Political Economy of Agricultural Investment in Ethiopia." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 39 (1): 105-132.
- Li, Tania Murray. 2011. "Centering Labor in the Land Grab Debate." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 38 (2): 281-99.
- Limb, Melanie, and Claire Dwyer. 2001. *Qualitative Methodologies for Geographers: Issues and Debates*. London: Arnold.
- Lisk, Franklyn. 2013. "'Land Grabbing' or Harnessing of Development Potential in Agriculture? East Asia's land-based investments in Africa." *The Pacific Review* 26 (5): 563-587.
- Mabikke, Samuel. 2016. "Historical Continuum of Land Rights in Uganda: A Review of Land Tenure Systems and Approaches for Improving Tenure Security." *Journal of Land and Rural Studies* 4 (2): 153-171.
- Makki, Fouad and Charles Geisler. 2011. "Development by Dispossession: Land Grabbing as New Enclosures in Contemporary Ethiopia." *Land Deals Politics Initiative*, 1-21.
- Mehta, Lyla, Gert Jan Veldwisch, and Jennifer Franco. 2012. "Introduction to the Special Issue: Water Grabbing? Focus on the (Re)appropriation of Finite Water Resources." *Water Alternatives* 5 (2): 193-207.
- McMichael, Philip. 2012. "The Land Grab and Corporate Food Regime Restructuring." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 39 (3-4): 681-701.
- Moyo, Sam, Paris Yeros, and Praveen Jha. 2012. "Imperialism and Primitive Accumulation: Notes on the New Scramble for Africa." *Agrarian South: Journal of Political Economy* 1 (2): 181-203.
- Mubende District Local Government. 2021. "Overview." <https://mubende.go.ug/lg/overview> Last accessed 8-2-2021.
- NKG. 2021a. "NKG Tropical Farm Management: Responsible Farming Means Protection of Natural Assets." <https://nkgtropical.com/> Last accessed 7-17-2021.
- NKG. 2021b. NKG "Sustainable Commitment- for the People, for the Region." <https://www.nkg.net/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Sustainable-Commitment.pdf> pp. 1-2. Last accessed 7-17-2021.
- NKG. 2020a. "Chronology of Events, Kaweri Coffee Plantation- 2000 to 2020." 1-11. <https://www.nkg.net/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Chronology.pdf> Last accessed 7-17-2021.

- NKG. 2020b. "Short Profile- Facts and Figures." https://www.nkg.net/wpcontent/uploads/2020/09/ng_factsfigures_en_2020.pdf Last accessed 7-17-2021.
- NKG. 2013. "The Project: Kaweri and the Leasing of Clean Title Land in Uganda." <https://www.nkg.net/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/The-project-Kaweri.pdf> Last accessed 7-18-2021.
- Peluso, Nancy Lee and Christian Lund. 2011. "New Frontiers of Land Control: Introduction." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 38 (4): 667-681.
- Perreault, Tom. 2013. "Dispossession by Accumulation? Mining, Water, and the Nature of Enclosure on the Bolivian Altiplano." *Antipode* 45 (5): 1050-1069.
- Rahmato, Dessalegn. 2011. "Land to Investors: Large-Scale Land Transfers in Ethiopia." *Forum for Social Studies*: Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Rahmato, Dessalegn. 2008. "The Peasant and the State: Studies in Agrarian Change in Ethiopia, 1950s-2000s." CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.
- Rice, Xan. 2007. "Background: Ugandan History." *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/katine/2007/oct/20/agriculture.governance> Last accessed 7-17-2021.
- Salcedo-La Viña, Celine, and Laura Notess. 2017. "A Fair Share for Women: Toward More Equitable Land Compensation and Resettlement in Tanzania and Mozambique." Working Paper.
- Washington, DC: *World Resources Institute*. <https://www.wri.org/publication/a-fair-share-for-women> Last accessed 7-17-2021.
- Solberg, Kenneth Lia. 2012. "Green Resources: Win-Win or Land Grabbing? A Case Study from Niassa, Mozambique." Masters Thesis in the Department of International Environment and Development Studies at Norwegian University of Life Sciences. i-85.
- Uganda Human Rights Commission. 2017. "Land Disputes and Human Rights in Selected Regions of Uganda." 1-92.
- Verma, Ritu. 2014. "Land Grabs, Power, and Gender in East and Southern Africa: So, What's New?" *Feminist Economics* 20 (1): 52-75.
- Wabineno-Oryema, Lillian Mono. 2014. "Changing Face of Land Tenure in Uganda: Period before 1900 to Date." *Journal of Land Administration in Eastern Africa* 2: 134-148.
- Winchester, Hillary P.M. and Matthew Rofe. 2010. "Qualitative Research and Its Place in Human Geography." In *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*, edited by I. Hay, 3-25. Oxford University Press.
- Wolford, Wendy, Saturnino Borrás Jr, Ruth Hall, Ian Scoones, Ben White. 2013. "Governing Global Land Deals: The Role of the State in the Rush for Land." *Development and Change* 44 (2): 189-210.
- World Bank. 2009. "Awakening Africa's Sleeping Giant: Prospects for Commercial Agriculture in the Guinea Savannah Zone and Beyond." Washington D.C.
- Zeemeijer, Ilse. 2012. "Who gets What, When and How? New Corporate Land Acquisitions and the Impact on Local Livelihoods in Uganda." Masters thesis, International Development Studies, Department of Human Geography, Faculty of Geosciences, Utrecht University. <https://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/226092> Last accessed 7-18-2021.