I: INTRODUCTION
Since retiring as Oxfam GB’s Global Land Adviser in February 2007, I have become increasingly interested in, and concerned about, the phenomenon that I insist on calling global land grabbing, though others prefer to describe it in more decorous terms.

I have been collecting, and gradually reading through, some of the literature on land grabbing. Part of the imperative was finding that many of the people I work with were even less informed than I. So, since August 2008 I have been compiling select bibliographies of reports and press cuttings on Biofuels, Land Rights in Africa and Global Land Grabbing, and posting them on http://www.oxfam.org.uk/resources/learning/landrights/general.html Oxfam’s Land Rights in Africa website in an attempt to raise awareness of the issues. The feedback I have received suggests that these are greatly appreciated.

I wrote a first annotated guide in September 2010, updated it in March 2011, and this is a further update in the light of more recent material. What follows is not a full annotation, but an attempt to point out what are, in my personal view, some of the main highlights from these bibliographies, covering reports, press cuttings, journal articles, books, and TV, video and radio clips.

The literature on land grabbing continues to grow apace, with the International Land Coalition and the Oakland Institute being particularly effective in publicizing their research and policy papers, while the global land grabbing conference at IDS, Sussex, in April 2011 generated a great deal of interest and has clearly galvanized academic work (see IV: Journal Articles, below). There are also 4 books on biofuels discussed below (see V).

My bibliography includes a mix of reports by international organizations such as FAO and the World Bank; by agencies such as the International Land Coalition, ActionAid and Oxfam; by the remarkable small pressure group GRAIN; by research and advocacy groups such as IIED, the Oakland Institute, Pambazuka News, IFPRI, and SciDev.Net; by land grabbing corporations, such as Emergent Asset; by biofuel companies, such as Dove Biotech and D1 Oils; by investment firms such as onValues, ODDO Securities and InvestAg Savills; newspaper and magazine articles across the world; and articles in academic journals. I have also included a section of 61 TV, video and radio clips as I think these can be especially revealing of the attitudes of some of those engaged in the land grabbing phenomenon.
II: REPORTS

Discussion of some reports follows the order in which they are presented in my latest Select Bibliography of Reports on Biofuels, Land Rights in Africa & Global Land Grabbing, http://www.oxfam.org.uk/resources/learning/landrights/downloads/select_biblog_reports_biofuels_africanlandrights_global_land_grabbing_at_300911.pdf dated 30 September 2011, where the URLs for each entry can be found.

Included here are a number of conference proceedings (e.g. Brussels Development Briefing 9, CTA /ACP, Development Policy Review Network, Global Donor Platform, SDC, 3D). At such gatherings PowerPoint presentations now seem now to be standard (and sole) fare. In my view, with rare exceptions, these tend to be banal in the extreme.

The FAO has published a plethora of papers on a variety of subjects including:

- food security
- principles for responsible agricultural investment (RAI)
- biofuels and bioenergy

Like other UN agencies, FAO dares not antagonize national governments, so it deploys diplomatic language at all times. Hence the voluntary guidelines are rather anodyne to my taste, while some of the economic forecasts in the World Summit papers appear to be based on sheer guesswork.

The pressure group GRAIN produced the seminal and hugely influential briefing Seized! The 2008 land grab for food and financial security in October 2008, and has published widely on land grabbing across the world, and also on biofuels, which it prefers to call agrofuels. Its daily updated site http://farmlandgrab.org/ is essential reading and quite incomparable.

IIED, notably Lorenzo Cotula, has produced a series of much cited research reports on biofuels in Mozambique and Tanzania, on business models, investment contracts, and biofuels and land grabs (usually in inverted commas!). The work is generally excellent though, as its authors state, still premature and incomplete. There is a tendency to look for win-win scenarios.

Pambazuka News, a weekly newsletter providing space for ‘pan-African voices for freedom and justice’ has a section on land and land rights http://pambazuka.org/en/category/land/ which regularly carries a number of important articles on land grabbing. It also has useful sections on the perspectives of emerging powers (China, India etc) on Africa including http://www.pambazuka.org/en/category/africa_china/

The International Land Coalition (ILC) has produced a wide range of excellent country research reports (on Ethiopia, Zambia, Rwanda, Kenya and Madagascar) and policy briefs as part of its ‘commercial pressures on land’ programme. It has expanding its membership and in May 2011 in Tirana it publicly denounced ‘all forms of land grabbing, whether international or national. It circulates useful bi-weekly updates and commissioned an outstanding report by Liz Daley on the almost totally neglected gendered aspects of land grabbing, one on public lands by Liz Alden Wily, as well as an excellent historical perspective by Chris Huggins. With others, it has been compiling a Land Matrix, ‘a systematic stocktaking of large-scale land-based investments.’
The **Oakland Institute** is emerging as a key player, undertaking serious research and finding imaginative ways of publicising a variety of issues, e.g. American universities investing their pension funds in ways that contribute to land grabbing. Its success in halting a land deal in South Sudan owed much to its use of good, old-fashioned radio! It has produced country reports on Ethiopia, Mali and Sierra Leone, with more to come. It has also produced two powerful critiques of the dominant consensus. *Mis(Investment in Agriculture* exposes the role of the World Bank’s private sector arm, the International Finance Corporation, in fuelling land grabs, especially in Africa. It has ‘not only encouraged and facilitated land grabs’ but has also ‘deeply influenced the legislation and policy agendas of developing countries, directly shaping social and economic outcomes that affect local livelihoods and food security’, e.g. in Ethiopia. *The Great Land Grab* ‘dismantles the myth of the “win-win” argument’, questions the assumption that increased private sector investment in agriculture is beneficial to all, and argues that small farmers are being pushed aside.

**Sci-Dev.Net**, the Science and Development Network, is a not-for-profit organisation dedicated to providing reliable and authoritative information about science and technology for the developing world. It has reproduced a lot of interesting papers on biofuels.

**OHCHR**, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, includes the critically important work and views of Olivier De Schutter, the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, on a wide range of issues. His website states that he is ‘not a staff of the UN nor paid for his work’, which presumably helps explain why his views are significantly more radical than those who are.

**IFPRI**, a Washington-based think tank, has produced a series of reports on biofuels, but is best known for its April 2009 Policy Brief, *“Land Grabbing” by Foreign Investors in Developing Countries: Risks and Opportunities*. This has probably been cited more often than any other document on land grabbing; perhaps the timing was right. The widely reproduced figure of 15-20m ha affected by land deals was actually not in the Brief but, according to one of its authors, ‘was given out in a press conference when we released the brief. It wasn’t entirely invented: it was the number based on media reports of land deals that were either reported to be under negotiation or signed deals, since 2006. Unfortunately, many of the caveats got dropped when this got reported over and over.’ The Brief, which looks ‘toward win-win policies’ was publicized in *The Economist* on 21 May 2009 in ‘Buying farmland abroad. Outsourcing’ third wave’, and others took it up from there. More recently it published a policy brief and a discussion paper of the gender implications of land grabbing.

The **World Bank** is a key player in the land grabbing field, with its *Investing Across Borders Project*, its private sector lending arm the IFC (International Finance Corporation), critiqued by the Oakland Institute, and in the search for codes of conduct and principles for responsible agricultural investment (RAI). Its much delayed report, *Rising Global Interest in Farmland: Can It Yield Sustainable and Equitable Benefits?* (originally called *The Global Land Rush*) was finally published in September 2010 and provoked widespread comment.

**ActionAid** has produced an outstanding report on biofuels, *Meals per gallon*, which was immediately picked up in *The Guardian* and *The Independent* on 15 February 2010. It has been the most consistently vocal and outspoken international NGO on land grabbing.

The **African Biodiversity Network** has produced a number of critical reports on land grabbing, agrofuels and ‘the myth of marginal lands’, and has severely criticised the UK for setting targets for biofuels that will sacrifice Africa’s land, forests and food to satisfy the UK’s vast energy requirements.
The **African Development Bank** has issued a code of conduct for land acquisition which includes ‘respect existing land rights and land tenure arrangements, both formal and customary.’

**Brussels Development Briefing 9** comprises a set of presentations by NRI, French Development Cooperation, UNECA, IIED, FAO and EAFF at a conference on land access and rural development in February 2009. There is also a useful 40-page resources reader compiled by CTA.

The **Centre for Human Rights & Global Justice** New York University has produced a good study of land deals and biofuel investment in Tanzania, Southern Sudan, Mali and Pakistan.

The reconstituted **Committee on World Food Security** looks set to play an important role in the ‘policy convergence process’ on voluntary guidelines etc.

**CRBM** discloses some European financial company ‘vultures of land grabbing’.

**CREPE** has produced an extremely informative report on agrofuel crops which contradicts the assumptions of the EU biofuels policy.


**FIAN** has a very detailed and thorough study of the impact of EU policies on land grabbing in Africa, a human rights analysis of land grabbing in Kenya and Mozambique, and an explanation of why it opposes RAI.

The well publicised **Foresight** report on failings in the world food system and how best to respond is remarkably silent on land grabbing.

**Forum for Social Studies, Addis Ababa** has a fine policy debate paper by Dessalegn Rahmato.

**Friends of the Earth** has produced a damning general report on the scale and impact of land grabbing for agrofuels and two very critical studies of the ‘miracle crop’ of jatropha in Mozambique (May 2010) and in Swaziland (May 2009).

The **German Government** has an excellent ‘development policy stance’ on land grabbing.

**Future Agricultures Consortium** has an outstanding policy brief by Ruth Hall.

**Global Donor Platform** is another collection of conference presentations, in Rome in January 2010, with contributions from, among others, FAO, the World Bank, IFAD, IIED, EBG Capital, Sustainable Business Development, and AccountAbility. It also includes the FAO / IFAD / UNCTAD / World Bank Group discussion note, *Principles for Responsible Agricultural Investment that Respects Rights, Livelihoods and Resources*.

**Global Land Project** has a good report which has tried to add up all the figures, using the ILC’s blog (which relies on media reports) and other sources. It details these in a table and estimates that 51-63m ha are assigned or under negotiation in 27 countries. There was a
significant rise in media reports in November 2009 because of the World Summit on Food Security. Ethiopia, Madagascar and Sudan have the highest number of land deals.

**GTZ** has an excellent, detailed report on FDI (foreign direct investment) in land in developing countries, with particular attention to Madagascar, Mali, Laos and Cambodia.

The **Gulf Research Center** offers an interesting insight into the potential for Gulf agro investments in Africa and Central Asia.

The executive summary of the synthesis report of **IAASTD**'s *Agriculture at a Crossroads* is well worth a look, with its focus on 'some of the unintended social and environmental consequences of our scientific and technological achievements.' It argues that 'business as usual is not an option' and that policies should now be directed at resource poor farmers who were served least by previous approaches.

**IBON** has an excellent policy brief on the drivers of the global rush for farmland acquisitions.

**IFAD**, which has conducted research with IIED, FAO and others, also has its own take on responding to land grabbing, promoting responsible investment, and risks and opportunities for smallholder farmers.

**IISD** (the International Institute for Sustainable Development), in a study of foreign investment in land and water, usefully reminds us that 'what are often described now as land grabs are really water grabs.'

**ISIS** (the Institute of Science in Society) has two excellent short reports by Mae-Wan Ho on biofuels and world hunger, and ‘land rush’ and food security.

A policy brief by **IWMI** (the International Water Management Institute) examines the water implications of biofuel crops, arguing that they are likely to escalate competition for water, especially in areas where it is already scarce.

The **Japanese Government** hosted a roundtable at the UN in September 2009 on promoting responsible international investment in agriculture. This featured PowerPoint presentations by some of the usual suspects; the World Bank, FAO and UNCTAD, looking for a ‘win-win-win’ situation.

**Justiça Ambiental** (JA) has recently produced a preliminary analysis of land grabbing in Mozambique. It earlier offered a detailed and highly critical analysis of jatropha farming there, arguing that the current rush to develop large-scale production is ill-conceived. It is not the miracle crop it has been marketed to be, and JA calls for it to be halted. 'Europe and the United States should look inward for their energy sustainability solutions rather than towards Africa.'

**LDPI (Land Deals Policy Initiative)**, which organized the land grabbing conference at IDS, Sussex, has also produced 4 useful working papers.

**Mokoro** includes this author's 4-page rant, later transformed into a vaguely respectable 'academic' paper asking 'Would Cecil Rhodes have signed a code of conduct?', and a summary of Liz Daley’s ILC paper on gender and land grabbing.

**Norwegian People's Aid** has an important new report on ‘large-scale land-based investment in Southern Sudan’ which recommends: adopting a presumption in favor of
disclosure for all documents; developing clear jurisdictional roles for public institutions at all levels; consider establishing a graduated land ceiling and a temporary moratorium on all land acquisitions above a certain size; establishing a technical committee to review all existing contracts; promoting alternative business models that better account for the needs of local populations; exploring opportunities for constructive engagement with companies that demonstrate a willingness to adhere to regulatory standards.

The Nuffield Council on Bioethics has a major report on ethical issues of biofuels.

onValues has produced the report of a Geneva conference on The investment case for responsible investments in Africa.

Oxfam, my former employer, has finally discovered land grabbing! An excellent briefing paper of September 2011, Land and Power. The growing scandal surrounding the new wave of investment in land cited the Land Matrix Partnership (of the ILC and others) figure of ‘227 million hectares – an area the size of Western Europe – has been sold or leased since 2001, mostly to international investors. The bulk of these acquisitions has taken place over the past two years.’ Oxfam has also produced some useful briefings on biofuels; some serious engaged, critical work in Tanzania, in collaboration with LARRI; an eastern Africa workshop on land grabbing which said that governments were the major land grabbers in the region; and an October 2010 study of land grabbing and possible policy responses.

PLAAS has interesting papers on South African farmers moving north and whether Africa can develop a regional response to ‘resource grabbing’.

The journal Rural 21, in its No.1/2010 edition, has a good section on ‘land acquisitions – land grabbed?’

SDC (Swiss Development Cooperation) organized a symposium in Bern in October 2009 on ‘large-scale investment in agriculture and land’. PowerPoint presentations were made by IISD, ILC and EBG Capital, and a mass of background material was made available online. SDC also wrote a good issues paper on biofuels.

Spire has a useful study of land investments or land grabbing in Tanzania and Mozambique.


Welthungerhilfe produced a hard hitting brief on land grabbing, with the sub-title ‘people are losing the ground beneath their feet’. It was not afraid to argue that ‘land grabbing is encouraged by irresponsible and corrupt decision-makers in developing countries.’

The Woodrow Wilson Center put together a much-cited collection, Land Grab? The Race for the World’s Farmland, resulting from a conference in May 2009, including thematic contributions from writers at the FAO, IATP (the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy), World Perspectives Inc, IFPRI (on codes of conduct), and short regional case studies on Africa, Asia, and Central and Eastern Europe.

The World Development Movement published a report The great hunger lottery: How banking speculation causes food crises, which was publicised in The Guardian of 24 July 2010. It ‘compiled extensive evidence establishing the role of food commodity derivatives in destabilising and driving up food prices around the world.’
III: PRESS CUTTINGS

My latest Select bibliography of Press Cuttings on Biofuels, Land Rights in Africa & Global Land Grabbing runs to over 100 pages!

http://www.oxfam.org.uk/resources/learning/landrights/downloads/select_bibliog_presscutts_biofuels_africanlandrights_global_land_grabbing_at_300911.pdf dated 30 September 2011, where the URLs for each entry can be found.

It is divided into: global, Africa general, over 30 individual African countries (Algeria – Zimbabwe), Middle East general, Asia general, 9 individual Asian countries, Latin America general, 4 individual Latin American countries.

I have divided it this way for ease of use, with the focus always on Africa. It is not surprising to see that, among African countries, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mozambique, South Africa, Sudan and Tanzania are the top scorers, with Ethiopia comfortably taking the gold medal!

There are particular reasons in each case. Sudan, with a long history of conflict, not least over land, is now a prime target of nearby Gulf states looking to feed their growing populations by outsourcing agriculture. They stress a common faith (Islam). Mozambique sees itself as a future African leader in biofuel production. Kenya and Tanzania, with good ports and infrastructure, are particularly attractive to investors. South Africa features because its commercial farmers are grabbing land across the continent, fearful of land reform at home and boasting about what they have to offer to ‘Africa’.

In Ethiopia, there are particular dynamics at play. At a meeting in London in July 2010 on land grabbing in Oromia, speakers said that Ethiopians often boast that they were never colonised, but the Oromo people say that they were colonised by the Ethiopians, starting from the late 19th century and continuing up to today. Now there is bitter resentment that the government in Addis is giving out huge chunks of land in Oromia (and neighbouring Gambela) to foreigners, principally from India. See ‘The scramble for land and environmental degradation in Oromia’, Pambazuka News, 14 July 2010.

The pace of publication has certainly speeded up over the past six months. I shall not attempt detailed annotation of the huge amount of press cuttings collected. Rather I shall highlight a few which have been influential or of particular interest. I shall use the order stated above, starting with global, and do so beginning with the most recent.

Global

‘Oxfam [in a new report] warns of land grab dangers’; several such on 22 September 2011.

‘“Landgrab” overseas’, 10 September, is a very useful analysis of ‘the aggressive entry of Indian corporations into the markets for agricultural land in Africa.’

On 6 September, ‘a group of institutional investors currently representing US$1.3 trillion in assets launched the Principles for Responsible Investment in Farmland with the goal of improving the sustainability, transparency and accountability of investments in farmland.’ The Financial Times covered the story on 18 September.

‘New frontier palm oil players look to RSPO’, 5 September, looks at the growing expansion of palm oil in Africa because ‘the land constraints, coupled with growing demand, mean major plantations firms are increasingly looking outside of Southeast Asia.’

‘Speculating with Lives: How Global Investors Make Money Out of Hunger’, 1 September, is a good analysis from Der Spiegel as is ‘Global Land Grab’, 22 August, from In These Times.
‘Have we Seen the End of Jatropha as a Potential Biofuel?’, 9 August, cites a report which argues that ‘the extraordinary collapse of Jatropha as a biofuel appears to be due to an extreme case of a well intentioned top down climate mitigation approach, undertaken without adequate preparation and ignoring conflict of interest, and adopted in good faith by other countries, gone awry bringing misery to millions of poorest people across the world.’


‘Food: G20 not biting off more than they can chew’, 24 June, cites Olivier De Schutter, saying ‘The action plan dealt with the symptoms and not the causes of the current crisis. There is much more that could be done. What is needed is an ambitious jump forward.’


‘University trusts are the new colonialism of the 21st century’, 10 June, and ‘Western Investors Buying Up African Farming Properties In “Land Grab”’, 8 June, cite the new Oakland Institute report.

‘The Perils of International Farmland Investing’, 1 June, offers some interesting insights. ‘Investors in Africa’s agriculture sector need to understand that land ownership there is complex, fraught with political, emotive, and survival issues. Over time, there is a poor history of successful attempts to farm across borders. In more stressful times, expect these land deals to lead to unrest and lay the groundwork for wars and national boundary or ownership changes. Eventually, expect trade agreements of oil for food, too.’

‘Europe Worsening Hunger Worldwide’, 31 May, has Oxfam arguing that European countries must abandon subsidies and higher production targets for biofuels.

‘Hedge Farm! The Doomsday Food Price Scenario Turning Hedgies into Survivalists’, 17 May, is a great headline, as is ‘Land Investors Crowd the Waiting Room’, 11 May.

‘Glencore: Profitteering from hunger and chaos’, 9 May, offers a good analysis of the world’s largest commodity trader from Al Jazeera, citing Devlin Kuyek of GRAIN: ‘Glencore owns almost 300,000 hectares of farm land and it is one of the largest farm operators in the world. They are engaging in speculation on the grain trade and have immense market power.’

‘The surge in land deals: When others are grabbing their land’, The Economist, 5 May, from The Economist, which cites papers from the IDS, Sussex land grabbing conference, is excellent, as is Lester Brown’s ‘The new geopolitics of food’, May/June.

‘Landmark conference on land grabbing: large-scale agricultural investments do undermine food security’, 12 April, covers the IDS conference, where in the papers ‘Not a single case of positive outcomes for local communities, food security, employment and environmental sustainability was found.’

‘No easy fix. Simply using more of everything to produce more food will not work’, 24 February, is another excellent analysis from The Economist.

The ‘Dakar Appeal against the land grab’ of 23 February emerged from the World Social Forum.
‘Farmland comes of age for pension funds’, 2 February, interviews Charmion McBride of Insight Investment, who believes that ‘The beauty of investing in farmland, apart from the obvious connection with the world’s demand for food, is that it represents “real” assets, rather than financial ones, and its correlations with other parts of a portfolio are low. Clearly, it is a long-term investment, with a 10-year horizon not uncommon. It is a hedge against inflation. And it is lowly correlated with equities and bond markets... land values tend to hold up, and go up, despite the fluctuations in commodity prices. The big underlying driver of farmland returns is, of course, the rising demand for food. The production of biofuels will also kick in over the next few years, but the expected growth in the world’s population, coupled with rising living standards in emerging countries, will place steadily increasing pressure on demand... as they say about land: they are not making any more of it.’

‘In Corrupt Global Food System, Farmland is the New Gold’, 13 January, is a useful summary, citing the views of Lester Brown (Earth Policy Institute), Anuradha Mittal (Oakland Institute) and Devlin Kuyek (GRAIN).

‘Forced use of biofuels could hit food production, EU warned’, 9 November 2010 discusses a report from IEEP.

‘UN expert urges action over rising food prices’, 1 November, carries a good interview with Olivier De Schutter. He is also cited in ““Stop robbing land from the poorest” urges UN food expert’, 26 October, as saying ‘You won’t solve world hunger by robbing the poorest from the land on which they depend: you will solve it by strengthening security of tenure and by ensuring a more equitable access to land and natural resources.’


The publication on 7 September of the World Bank’s long-awaited report on land grabbing attracted some media attention; the Financial Times noting accurately that ‘the bank walks a fine line between supporting the farmland deals in order to boost agricultural output in poor countries and warning about the potential risks of the controversial investments’. The Telegraph felt ‘the World Bank appears deeply torn. ‘While the report endorses the Bank’s open-door globalisation agenda, the sub-text dissents on every page.’ Dow Jones says simply: ‘World Bank: Despite Benefits, Large Farm Deals Wreak Harm’.

‘Back to the land: Land acquisition in the global food economy’, 16 August is a good summary. ‘One reporter described being offered land at $2.91 a hectare with a return of 15-20 per cent. Investors are truly lapping it up.’ It has led ‘to a tsunami of large-scale farmland acquisitions from both corporations and governments.’ The World Bank report ‘has already been heavily pared-down after researchers experienced pronounced non-cooperation from governments and corporations alike.’

‘Innovations in Access to Land: Land Grab or Agricultural Investment?’, 5 August is an excellent summary.

‘World Bank warns on “farmland grab”’, 27 July is the famous leak of the World Bank’ report on land grabbing. It says ‘Investor interest is focused on countries with weak land governance.’ Although the deals promised jobs and infrastructure, ‘investors failed to follow through on their investments plans, in some cases after inflicting serious damage on the local resource base.’ In addition, ‘the level of formal payments required was low’, making speculation a key motive for purchases. ‘Payments for land are often waived and large investors often pay lower taxes than smallholders or none at all.’ The overall picture was one
of exploitation, and warned that investors either lacked the necessary expertise to cultivate land or were more interested in speculative gains than in using land productively. It stated that ‘rarely if ever’ were efforts made to link land investments to ‘countries’ broader development strategy’; that ‘consultations with local communities were often weak’; and ‘conflicts were common, usually over land rights.’

‘Is agriculture the next big investment thing?’, 24 July, citing a WDM report, is interesting on this topic as, in similar vein, is ‘Pension funds – future farmers’, 1 July.

‘Responsibly Destroying the World’s Peasantry’, Project Syndicate, 4 June, is a brilliant critique by Olivier De Schutter of the Principles for Responsible Agricultural Investment. He argues that ‘both the diagnosis and the remedy are incorrect. It is regrettable that, instead of rising to the challenge of developing agriculture in a way that is more socially and environmentally sustainable, we act as if accelerating the destruction of the global peasantry could be accomplished responsibly.’

‘One quarter of US grain crops fed to cars – not people, new figures show’, 22 January, is self-evident.

‘Is There Such a Thing as Agro-Imperialism?’, 22 November 2009 is an excellent 11-page article by Andrew Rice.

‘If words were food, nobody would go hungry’, 19 November, is outstanding.

‘To Grab, Or To Invest’, 18 November, offers useful comment on the World Summit on Food Security in Rome, as does ‘UN to regulate farmland grab deals’, 18 November.


‘Biofuels require comprehensive strategy – UNEP report’, 21 October, is excellent.

‘The other inconvenient truth: the crisis in global land use’, 6 October, is useful.

‘Wish you weren’t here: The devastating effects of the new colonialists’, 9 August, is outstanding.

‘FAO Paper on land is “Wishy-Washy”’, 9 July. Indeed!

‘The world must learn to live and farm more sustainably’, 5 July, is written by the Japanese Prime Minister, Taro Aso.

‘Fears for the world’s poor countries as the rich grab land to grow food’, 3 July, is a fine piece.

‘The Food Crisis Continues – in The Form Of A Global Scramble For Lucrative Farmlands’, 17 June, is a good article by Sam Urquhart.

‘Buying farmland abroad. Outsourcing’s third wave’, 21 May, cited the IFPRI Policy Brief, saying ‘between 15m and 20m hectares of farmland in poor countries have been subject to transactions or talks involving foreigners since 2006. That is the size of France’s agricultural land and a fifth of all the farmland of the European Union.’ This was a hugely influential article.
‘Hailed as a miracle biofuel, jatropha falls short of hype’, 5 May, is good.

‘Rich countries carry out “21st century land grab”’ New Scientist, 9 December 2008 is important, given the source, especially linked to an editorial of 3 December, ‘International land grab sparks food war fears’, which said: ‘As demand for food grows, those who have the necessary funds are snapping up vast swaths of land to ensure their own security. Millions of hectares of grain, rice, maize and biofuel plantations could follow oil and water resources by becoming a new friction point for conflict - not least with the locals who are kept locked outside rich farms’ gates. The wars over oil of the recent past will pale in comparison to the global struggle for food that could result from the land grabs going on now.’

‘Food crisis leading to an unsustainable land grab’ and ‘World land grab map’, 22 November, are useful.

‘Biofuels: From hope to husk’, 21 October, is good.


‘Hunger. Strikes. Riots. The food crisis bites’, 13 April, is self-explanatory, as is ‘Crop switch worsens global food price crisis’, 5 April.

‘Biofuels “Crime against Humanity”’, 27 October 2007, so said Jean Ziegler, Olivier De Schutter’s predecessor as UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food.

Africa – general
Over the past 6 months there has been a plethora of media coverage of land grabbing in Africa, much of it inspired by the Oakland Institute’s publications and the IDS Sussex conference. So, there are headlines such as ‘Land Grabs in Africa Usher in a New Form of Colonialism’, ‘African land grab threatens food security’, and ‘Unscrupulous Politicians Cashing in On Africa’s Land Deals’. Water is a key factor, as seen in ‘Africa for Sale. Land and Water Grabs Spell Disaster for Rural People and Rivers’ and ‘African land grab could lead to future water conflicts’. Someone said ‘Agricultural farmland investment is booming in Africa – But can it be done ethically?’, another invites readers to ‘Meet The Millionaires And Billionaires Suddenly Buying Tons Of Land In Africa’. Meanwhile, ‘US universities in Africa “land grab” [and they] ‘must halt land grab investments”’, ‘Black College Bets On African Land, But Threatens African Lives’ and ‘Hedge funds “grabbing land” in Africa’.

‘For Some Brazilian Farmers Africa is the New Frontier’, 29 September 2011, is a relatively new development.

‘Africa for Sale. Land and Water Grabs Spell Disaster for Rural People and Rivers’, 15 September, from International Rivers, is important.

‘How would an investor export maize or rice from a famine-hit country?’, 8 August, is an excellent question posed by Chido Makunike in African Agriculture.

‘The new African land grab’, 30 June, is an excellent analysis by Joan Baxter in Al Jazeera. She wrote the Sierra Leone and Mali reports for the Oakland Institute.
‘Petition calls for halt to new “land grab” in Africa’, 22 June, features the Dakar Appeal Against Land Grabbing.

‘Stop demonising foreign investors in agriculture, they’re not grabbing land’, 13 June, argues Calestous Juma.

‘Biofuels boom in Africa as British firms lead rush on land for plantations’, 31 May, is very useful.

‘Why the reports of Bangladesh farming mega deals in Africa sound strange’, 23 May, says that ‘The latest farming deals are all being reported from the Bangladeshi side with an almost we-can’t-believe-we-have-negotiated-such-good-deals breathlessness; This doesn’t sound like a foreign private company official negotiating with the government of a country where he is seeking to do business. It sounds more like a conquering general dictating the terms of surrender to a vanquished army!’

‘Low cost, high returns make Africa attractive to India Inc’, 5 April, argues that the ‘cost of production of mines in most African countries was almost half that of India because of the easy availability of resources, cheap labour and relatively high selling price...[The] majority of fertile land in Africa is still left untouched. There is a lot India can do in it.’

An interesting exchange on 11 February between Camilla Toulmin of IIED and Bill Gates on ‘investment being held back because of Western groups’ ways of looking at things’. Gates argues that ‘most of those land deals are beneficial’ but Toulmin challenges him to help open up national debates on agricultural investment deals.

Useful summary Guardian pieces on land grabs on 28 and 26 January.

‘Land: The new international strategic asset. How Africa is losing big time’, 27 December 2010 offers a trenchant critique: ‘many of the corruption-ridden governments in Africa are rushing to make land deals with multinationals without proper consultation with the people and without proper studies as to the economic, social and environmental cost of such deals.’

‘Africa mulls biofuels as land grab fears grow’, 30 November, concludes ‘biofuels are certainly not the silver bullet,” said the UNEP spokesman Nick Nuttall. ‘Africa needs to be careful about the choices it makes with biofuel production.’

‘Africa shouldn’t rush into land deals: FAO’, 11 October, cites Paul Mathieu: ‘Land has become a very visible and hot issue because many actors have realised that it is going to be scarce and a very valuable asset in the future. What is important is to make well-informed choices and not to rush quickly to allocate large tracts of land.’

‘African delegation encourages Turkey to lease farmland on continent’, 4 October, includes a comment from a Ugandan minister ‘Uganda has around 4.9 million acres of agricultural land that sits idle. We have demand from many countries. Turkey should not come late in using our fertile land.’

Two excellent pieces by Katie Allen in The Guardian. ‘Friends of the Earth urges end to “land grab” for biofuels’, 30 August, draws attention to a new report by FoE, Africa: up for grabs. The scale and impact of land grabbing for agrofuels. Sun Biofuels describe this report as ‘emotional, anecdotal and insulting.’ ‘The land rush doesn’t have to end in a poor deal for Africans’, on 16 August covered almost a whole printed page in the paper under the title ‘Rich pickings in new scramble for Africa’. The sub-title and photo were also changed for the
electronic version. The title was changed again to ‘Buying Africa for a song’ in the version which appeared on 27 August in the South African Mail & Guardian. ‘The land rush is gaining momentum, with new investors entering the fray. Pension funds are the latest players... The sheer numbers of Africans dependent on agriculture should raise alarm bells over what is at stake if opaque, bargain-basement deals are to continue...African governments must consult their people, strive for national food security and know the value of what they are selling. They must also know what not to sell - too often land is classed as "unused" and flogged on when, in reality, it is vital hunting ground or a water source for local communities and ecosystems...World leaders...must ensure that food security for the rich does not result in more hunger for the poor.’

‘This Time for Africa: Africa calling Indian farmers’, 11 August is informative about attracting Indian farmers to Africa.

‘Africa-ME "agricultural tie-up ideal”’, 22 July, is a useful analysis, based on a report by Standard Chartered Bank.

‘European demand seen powering Africa biofuels growth’, 1 July, is interesting.

‘Africa: What Will Continent Export If It Leases Farmland to Arabs?’, 4 May, is a pertinent question.

‘Rawlings calls on African governments to institute protective land laws’, 9 April, is an interesting intervention by the former Ghanaian President.

‘How food and water are driving a 21st century African land grab’, 7 March, is excellent. In the same edition, Lorenzo Cotula of IIED argues that ‘Deals can be good news when not made behind closed doors’, concluding that ‘The decisions taken now will have repercussions for the shape of agriculture, food security and land access in Africa for generations to come. Today's choices must be based on strategic thinking and vigorous, transparent public debate, rather than piecemeal negotiations behind closed doors.’

‘Gaddafi asks food summit to stop African “landgrab”, 17 November 2009 is self-explanatory.

‘UN attempts to slow the new scramble for Africa’, 7 November, refers to the code of conduct and cites David Hallam of FAO.

‘Food for Thought’, FDI Magazine, 15 October, is an interesting piece by Adrian Lewers of Lloyd’s insurer Beazley.

‘China’s eye on African agriculture’, 2 October, is very interesting.

‘Wish you weren’t here: The devastating effects of the new colonialists’, 9 August, is a fine piece by Paul Vallely

‘Foreign Investors Snap Up African Farmland’, 30 July, is also excellent.


‘Africa: Tractored out by “land grabs”’, 11 May, is excellent and includes a land grabbing map.

‘Africa: Food to eat or to run your car?’, 23 October 2007 is a great title!

**Algeria**

‘Algeria invites interest from farmland investors’, 21 September 2011, ‘Algeria has for the first time formally invited expressions of interest from investors, including foreigners, seeking to acquire stakes in the country’s farming sector.’

**Benin**

‘Chinese Entrepreneurs to Invest in Benin Palm Oil Production’, 16 July 2011, ‘A delegation of Chinese agricultural engineers and entrepreneurs decided to invest at least 1 billion CFA Francs ($2.15 million) in Benin’s palm oil industry after a visit to the western African nation.’

**Cameroon**


**Congo**

‘The South Africa-Congo concession: Exploitation or salvation?’, 7 January 2010 is a good article, one of many on this emerging South Africa-Congo link.

**DR Congo**

‘DR Congo: Chinese company to invest $1 billion in 3 million hectare oil plantation’, 28 July 2007 offers a detailed analysis.

**East Africa**


**Egypt**

‘Egypt eyes Sudan for wheat needs’, 24 November 2010 and ‘Egypt: Seeking to grow cereals on African farmland’, 11 October 2010 are revealing.

**Ethiopia**

Media coverage of land grabbing in Ethiopia continues to grow exponentially, offering contrasting opinions. Recent headlines include ‘How a Big Dam Fuels Landgrabs, Hunger and Conflict in Ethiopia’, ‘Investments in Ethiopia farming face criticism from activists’, ‘Ethiopia: A country for sale. The deal of the century’, and ‘Land deals in Ethiopia bring food self-sufficiency and prosperity’; the latter the view of the Ethiopia Ambassador in the UK. The Indian influence is reflected in ‘Ethiopia: Best pickings for Indian Investors to Chose From’, ‘Punjab farmers to grow multiple crops in Ethiopia’ and ‘Come and farm our virgin lands, Ethiopia tells India’. Survival International produced a predictable ‘Exposed: Ethiopia gives farmland to foreigners while thousands starve’.

There is a strong flow of Ethiopian political opposition writing on the issue, such as ‘Oromia/Ethiopia: Land Grabbing and Its Dire Consequences’, *Gadaa.com*, 11 February
2011 which offers a good analysis and this warning: ‘The land question in Ethiopia is a potential time bomb waiting to explode. Any land deal, that has not been agreed to by nations and nationalities in Ethiopia, will not be honored and will bring neither lasting peace nor development in the country and for the investors, too.’

‘Ethiopia at centre of global farmland rush’, 21 March, by John Vidal is excellent. Vidal also made a film (see section VI below).

‘Land grab fears for Ethiopian rural communities’, 15 December 2010, is excellent.

‘Ethiopians say Indians grabbing land, Indian farmers claim it is official’, 25 September, neatly sums up one of the key issues.


‘Ethiopia: Land grabbing and the emergence of “cereal republics”’, 4 February, offers a good analysis.


‘Is There Such a Thing as Agro-Imperialism?’, 22 November, is an excellent 11-page article by Andrew Rice with a heavy emphasis on Ethiopia.

‘Ethiopia. Now is harvest time’, 3 September, ‘Indians and Saudis are preparing for their first harvest on Ethiopian soil. Ethiopia intends to make over 2.7 million hectares to foreigners.’

‘International agricultural land deals award Ethiopian virgin lands to foreign companies’, 13 August, is an excellent, detailed piece.

Ghana
‘Ghana: Jatropha biofuel push faces protests’, 5 April 2011, cites Anna Antwie of ActionAid Ghana, ‘We do not understand how our governments can willingly take our food, land and water to meet the fuel luxuries of the wealthy in the North, when we already face problems of food security and environmental destruction at home.’

‘Ghana: Land grabs force hundreds off farms, growers say’, 7 September 2009 in order to make way for a multinational firm, Biofuel Africa, to cultivate jatropha.

‘Ghana’s Jatropha conundrum – more questions than answers’, 30 May, offers an excellent analysis.

Kenya
Recent headlines ‘Kenya: Dominion Farms Chief Fears for His Life’, 30 August 2011 and ‘Biofuels land grab in Kenya’s Tana Delta fuels talk of war’, 2 July, are indicative of heightened tensions.
‘Land Rush in Africa’ [Kenya], 25 November 2009 is very interesting.

‘Ministry says it was not consulted over Qatar land deal’, 16 January. ‘Lands Minister James Orengo said he learned of the now controversial deal through the Press and that no key official of his ministry had wind of the project.’

Liberia
‘Citizens Reject Sime Darby’s Request... For Another 15,000 Hectares, Write Gov’t’, 26 August 2011, ‘Liberia: “Halt Sime Darby Plantation Expansion”’, 14 July and ‘Grim Prospects for Sime Darby in Bomi’, 5 April, are all indicative of growing resistance; the palm oil company was ‘finding it very unlikable and difficult to reclaim the lands from the people.’

‘Is palm oil a kernel of development for African countries like Liberia?’, 8 March, concludes: ‘Under pressure in Indonesia and Malaysia for their part in deforestation, the options in Asia for leading players in the palm-oil industry are increasingly limited. So they are turning their attention to Africa, where some countries are keen to cash in on one of the world's most profitable agro-industries.’

Madagascar
‘Land rental deal collapses after backlash against ‘colonialism” [Madagascar], 14 January 2009, is about the famous Daewoo deal.

‘Daewood to cultivate Madagascar land for free’, and ‘Food security deal should not stand’, 19 November 2008 were brilliant whistle-blowing pieces, the latter an editorial, which began ‘Pirates are not the only source of concern off the African coast. The deal South Korea's Daewoo Logistics is negotiating with the Madagascan government looks rapacious.’ It warns against resurrection of old-style colonialism: ‘That day must not come.’

Mali
There has been regular media coverage of Libya's 250,000 acre concession in Mali, Malibya, e.g. ‘Mali opposition party demands details of land leases, warns of possible “land grab”’, 10 February 2011, which cites a farmer saying ‘We here in Africa were colonized once, we would be stupid to let it happen again.’

‘PARENA: Memorandum on land acquisitions in the Office du Niger’, 7 February, offers useful detail, while ‘Africa’s Flourishing Niger Delta Threatened by Libya Water Plan’, 3 February, is excellent, as is ‘Mali: whose land is it anyway?’, 28 November 2010.

‘Libyan land grab of Mali’s rice-producing land’, Via Campesina, 10 September 2009 is a good case study.

Mozambique
In his invaluable ‘Land Moves up the political agenda’, Mozambique political process bulletin, 48, 22 February 2011, veteran Mozambique watcher Joseph Hanlon notes that there has been an official halt to large land grants, the creation of a new Land Consultative Forum, that biofuel expansion has been slower than expected, and offers some detailed case studies and a corrective against sensational media accounts, e.g. ‘The Chinese land grab myth.’

More recently, he has updated this with ‘Fight over foreign investment & land’, Mozambique 184, 5 September 2011, in which he writes, ‘Since the end of 2009, Mozambique has not made any large land concessions to foreign investors, while it tries to work out a policy in the face of sharp internal divisions. One group wants to encourage big plantation investment, such as the huge sugar estates and large forestry projects, as well as promoting biofuels.'
The other group wants to promote domestic investment and smaller scale commercial farming.

This headline provoked controversy: ‘Mozambican government provides 60,000 km² of land to Brazilian farmers’, Macauhub, 15 August 2011

‘EU, Brazil, Mozambique to sign bioenergy pact’, Reuters, 12 July 2010 in which ‘unlike Brazilian bioethanol, which is subject to high import tariffs at EU borders, African-produced biofuel would be subject to minimal tariffs.’

‘Unease over jatropha claims grows in Mozambique’, 15 November 2009. ‘If anyone tells you he’s an expert in jatropha, he’s lying’ says Nico Strydom of Sun Biofuels.

‘Mauritius leads land grabs for rice in Mozambique’, 1 September. ‘The people of Mozambique have so far been kept in the dark about this large-scale transfer of their lands and even key officials do not fully understand the motivation behind the surging foreign interest in investment in the country’s agriculture.’


‘The Zambezi Valley: China’s First Agricultural Colony?’, Online Africa Policy Forum, 8 June 2008 is probably an exaggeration (see Hanlon 22 February 2011 above).

**Namibia**

‘Namibia Bans Large-Scale Jatropha Plantations as It Plans Further Study’, 31 May 2011, ‘due to its negative impact on food security, land tenure, and loss of access to communal land; climate change implications; yield rates; and low financial viability.’

‘Jatropha: From buzz to bust in Namibia’, Reuters AlertNet, 1 June 2010 is a very sad story. ‘Officials have grown wary of investors that promise instant riches for the local population’

**Nigeria**

‘Nigeria. States Seek Review of Land Law to Boost Investment’, 20 September 2011, because ‘one of the major problems militating against attracting FDI in Nigeria is the current provisions of the Land Use Act. There is an urgent need for the Federal Government to review it with a view to making it proactive, investor-friendly and easier for land to be used as collateral.’ However, ‘Nigerian farmer leader talks about resistance to land grabs’, 11 August, and ‘We’ll Resist Ogoni Land Grabbing – MOSOP’, 18 June.

**Senegal**


‘Can Research Strike a Balance Between Food and Fuel Crops?’, 30 September 2010 offers an interesting analysis.

**Sierra Leone**

Conflicts over land grabbing are evident in these headlines: ‘Sierra Leone opposition urges scrapping of land deals’, ‘Controversy, mixed reactions in Sierra Leone to new biofuel investment’ and ‘Sierra Leone Denies Selling Lands “Illegally”’. 
South Africa
There has been a whole flurry of press cuttings on the theme ‘South African farmers looking for greener pastures abroad’ (11 January 2011), including Georgia (9 & 24 June 2011, 31 December & 9 November 2010), but, in response to current political unrest there, are shunning Libya and are now wary of North Africa (24 & 21 February 2011).

‘The South Africa-Congo concession: Exploitation or salvation?’, 7 January 2010. For Agri-SA, ‘There are three main reasons we are in the Congo. The first is to diversify our businesses; the second is to assist local farmers to commercially develop their own land; the third reason is to assist the government of South Africa to fulfil the expectations of the world in stabilising the African continent through the exchange of skills and technology.’

‘South Africa’s white farmers prepare to trek to the Congo’, 21 October 2009. ‘South Africa’s beleaguered white farmers are jumping at the opportunity to expand deep into the continent. We do not have enough land or water [in South Africa] and land reform is putting a lot of pressure on these natural resources.’

‘South Africa: maize farmers lobby to supply biofuel industry’, 28 January 2008. They were unsuccessful. ‘Monsanto criticises South African decision on maize as a biofuel source’, 12 December 2007. The decision was to exclude maize.

Sudan
These recent headlines tell their own story: ‘Divvying up South Sudan’, ‘Investors in scramble for South Sudan’s fertile land’, ‘The secret sale of a country’ and ‘The scramble for the South’, the last a fine piece in Africa Confidential, 1 April 2011.

‘South Sudan land grab threatens rights: report’, 23 March, cites a worrying report by Norwegian People’s Aid; its press release cites sensible recommendations.

‘UAE has over 2,800 sq km in Sudan farms’, 13 October 2010, is self-explanatory.

‘Egypt signs deal to allow farmland access in Sudan’, 6 September. This will allow Egyptian companies access to 1.04 million acres at Al Gezira.

‘Sudan Looks to Attract Middle Eastern Investment in Farmland’, 17 December 2009. ‘Sudan wants to attract foreign investors to cultivate vast tracks of land that are currently unused in Africa’s largest country.’

‘Arab world looks to Sudan as bread basket’, 1 February. Short piece, good title.

‘US investor buys Sudanese warlord’s land’, 9 January. ‘Mr Heilberg is gambling on a warlord’s continuing control of a region where his militia operated in the civil war between Khartoum and south Sudan. “You have to go to the guns, this is Africa,” Mr Heilberg said. He refused to disclose how much he had paid for the lease.’

‘Foreigners export their harvest from a hungry Africa’ [Sudan], 3 October 2008. ‘Since the beginning of the year, Sudan has leased almost two million acres to foreign companies.’

‘Sudan woos investors to put $1bn in farming’, 11 August. ‘Everyone coming to Sudan is asking about agriculture, to the extent that we are struggling to cope...There are hundreds of projects and millions of hectares available.’
**Tanzania**


*Tanzania Biofuel Project’s Barren Promise*, 9 March 2011 is an interesting case study: ‘Five years after its ambitious launch, Bioshape’s plantation has produced only a scar on the landscape. Jobs promised to villagers have not materialised, and they have seen only a fraction of the promised compensation for the land they were persuaded to give up.’

‘Newly launched liquid bio-fuels development guidelines received with guarded optimism’, 21 January, is a very useful source of information.

‘Tanzania: Farmers Want a Piece of the Pie From Agro-Investors’, 25 August 2010 is an interesting article.

‘Jatropha biofuels: the true cost to Tanzania’, 15 February, is an excellent analysis. ‘Billed as wonder crop, the establishment of jatropha plantations on the ground in Tanzania has been far from successful, or, in some cases, ethical.’

‘Public fury halts biofuel onslaught on farmers’, 5 October 2009. ‘Tanzania has suspended investments worth millions of dollars after a storm of protest over the eviction of farmers to make way for biofuels...The government was asleep and never knew when these people came. But now that we have discovered where we went wrong, we have to stop and set out clear procedures for biofuel investments.’

‘Rice farmers may be evicted by new biofuel companies’, 28 September, is also excellent and the report it cites made a big impact.

‘NGO raise alarm over land rows’, 27 May, citing Haki Ardhi.

‘Biofuels and neo-colonialism’, 6 April, is an excellent analysis featuring the activities of SEKAB, a Swedish company, in Tanzania, which subsequently withdrew from Africa. Highly critical of a fudged ESIA report by the Swedish consultancy company, ORGUT.

‘Biofuels cause land scramble in Tanzania’, 7 February, gives lots of examples.

‘Food security concerns in Tanzania as investors scramble for land for biofuel crops’, 27 May 2008, is excellent.

‘Africa: Food to eat or to run your car?’, 23 October 2007 is a great title and features Tanzania.

**Uganda**

‘British firm illegally evicts 20,000 Ugandans’, 24 September 2011 was inspired by Oxfam’s new report *Land and Power* and its quarrel with the New Forests Company.
‘North invites Indian investors’, 23 August, in which ‘Northern Uganda has offered Indian agricultural investors land to carry out commercial farming...under joint venture agreements with the locals. They “are free to come and use our land if they are willing to engage the local community before setting up businesses,” said Mark Moro, a representative of the region’s landowners.’

In May/June there was controversy over whether or not Uganda had offered to lease land to Bangladesh.

‘Uganda offers farmland for Indian investment’, 20 August 2010 in which the Minister for Agriculture said ‘Uganda has huge tracts of farmland that could be leased or bought by foreign companies. The government gives land on lease, which are usually long leases ranging from 49-99 years. These can be extended... huge tracts of farmland could be leased or bought by foreign firms’.

‘Negotiate land deals carefully’, 3 July 2009 is clearly good advice.

West Africa
‘Land deals’, West African Observer, 3/4, July-December 2009, 4-12 is a very useful collection of short pieces featuring local perceptions in which ‘uncertainty and fear prevail’, and asks ‘are win-win partnerships possible?’

Zambia
‘Nansanga bloc farmers face homelessness’, 17 August 2011 paints a bleak picture. ‘All we see are advertisements in the newspapers that the buyers of this land have been given offer letters, meaning that we have to vacate this land. So, where shall we go all of us? We are talking about a population of over 9,000 people, not animals.’

‘Civil Society Communiqué on Large Scale Land Acquisitions in Zambia’, 21 October 2010 offers an interesting perspective.

‘US, UAE firms eye Zambian farming land’, 12 June 2009. ‘Agriculture Minister Brian Chituwo told Reuters a Dubai company is looking at 200,000 hectares, but we have 900,000 hectares of prime land available so the issue of land really should not be a problem. Zambia's lack of exchange controls and the fact that it had lots of land available made it an ideal place for agricultural investment. We are utilising only an estimated 14 percent of our land. We have well over 30 million hectares of land that is begging to be utilised.’

‘Zambia’s opposition condemns Chinese biofuels project’, 2 April. ‘The project would only benefit the Chinese labourers he expected would be brought in to work on the plantation.’

Zimbabwe
‘Dubai’s big property investment in Zimbabwe’, Realestateweb, 12 May 2009. ‘Dubai has confirmed making a sizeable investment in Zimbabwe land - but is dodging questions on the acquisition.’

Middle East – general
‘Middle East’s Investments in African Farmlands Are Rooted in Food Security Fears’, 22 March 2011 and ‘Investing abroad to secure food at home’, 9 March, typify Middle East engagement in Africa so they ‘will be relying less on the open market.’ In similar vein is ‘Unused land in Africa “could feed the Gulf”’, 2 February.
‘Political risks to Saudi farm investment abroad’, 23 August 2010 is useful. ‘Investing in agriculture abroad is easier said than done because the investments are often politically charged and local players could regard Gulf investors as potential “land grabbers”.’

‘Gulf states face food crisis’, 27 May, is good, as is ‘Africa offers “food security”’ [to Gulf states], 3 December 2008.

**Asia – general**
‘Asia: Land grabs threaten food security’, 10 June 2009 is informative.

**Bangladesh**
‘Bangladesh firms join Africa land rush’, June 2011, but by 16 August ‘Govt to re-evaluate proposed contract farming deal in Africa’.

‘Govt prods local investors to farm cotton, food in Africa’, 30 March, offers an intriguing glimpse of how a ‘new investor country’ views land in Africa.

**China**
‘China rejects [German] claims of Africa land buy-ups’, 29 July 2011, ‘China has never had plans to buy land overseas and China has never purchased land in Africa...The claim is completely unfounded. China had set up 10 agricultural demonstration centres in Africa and dispatched nearly 1,000 experts and technical staff to help countries there handle food safety issues which had been warmly welcomed’.

**India**

‘This Time for Africa: Africa calling Indian farmers’, 11 August, is interesting, as is ‘Punjab’s African plot’, 11 July, which stresses the advantage of ‘easy access to the lucrative European market’, while ‘The New Landlords’, 26 September 2009 provides a useful analysis of Indian companies farming abroad. ‘Africa, squatting always at the bottom of the food chain, is rapidly being turned into a giant land mall. The irony of a famine-prone continent being used to bail out the world’s food crisis is lost on no one.’
IV: JOURNAL ARTICLES

The April 2011 conference on global land grabbing at IDS, Sussex, has certainly accelerated the pace of journal articles. It was co-sponsored by the Journal of Peasant Studies which issued a set of papers on land grabbing on the eve of the conference (38, 2, March 2011) and has recently published another (though with no articles on Africa) on new frontiers of land control (39, 4, September 2011) and will later be publishing a selection on ‘green grabs’. Development and Change will also be publishing papers from the Sussex conference.

In June 2011, the Review of African Political Economy included (38, 128) very useful articles by Roth Hall on land grabbing in Southern Africa and by Saturnino M. Borras, David Fig and Sofia Monsalve Suarez on the infamous ProCana case in Mozambique. In the same month, Nature produced, as a supplement, a collection of short articles on biofuels. In March there appeared a series of articles on global land grabs in Development, 54, 1, while in September 2100 there was an excellent collection on the politics of biofuels, land and agrarian change in the Journal of Peasant Studies, 37, 4, October 2010.

In addition, Nidhi Tandon’s article in Gender and Development, 18, 3, November 2010, on the impacts of land grabbing for women farmers – ‘wholesale sell-out’ - is worth drawing attention to, as is Ruth Hall’s work in progress piece on land deals in Southern Africa in ICAS Review Paper Series, 2, February 2011.

Scientific journals have carried articles on biofuels, usefully collated in African Agriculture and Nature.

Below are highlights from some of the key journal articles cited in my bibliography.

In the Journal of Peasant Studies, 37, 2, April 2010, Annelies Zoomers adopts a broader perspective of this complex phenomenon by examining ‘seven processes during the current land grab’:

1. offshore farming – FDI in food production;
2. FDI in non-food agricultural commodities and biofuels;
3. development of protected areas, nature reserves, ecotourism and hideaways;
4. Special Economic Zones (SEZs), large-scale infrastructure works, urban extensions;
5. large-scale tourist complexes;
6. retirement and residential migration;
7. land purchases by migrants in their countries of origin.

She argues that because the ‘processes of land grabbing are broader and deeper than assumed, codes of conduct or contractual arrangements will neither help to stop nor turn the tide.’ (430). Moreover, ‘the global land grab is to a large extent the result of the liberalisation of land markets, which became a major policy goal in the course of the 1990s and has contributed to the commoditisation of land and other natural resources.’ (431). Codes of conduct are likely to ‘pave the way for further land commoditisation’ (443) while, she believes, ‘creating a win-win situation is hardly possible.’ (444)

In a very important and, in my view, extraordinary helpful article, which has been undergoing regular revision, Saturnino M. (Jun) Borras and Jennifer Franco, have also presented a detailed attack on the dominant codes of conduct / ‘win-win’ approach adopted by the World Bank and other agencies. Like Zoomers, they point out that this approach has its origins in the push for privatisation of land tenure which the Bank and other donors have promoted for a decade and more. In a new dimension of this, customary land holders are now being urged to have their land titled and registered – as a defence against global land grabbing. They
argue that this view is ‘deeply flawed’ as ‘there is much evidence to show that formal land property rights are no guarantee against dispossession’. (10)

A new twist is the call for ‘better land management’ to bring order to land conflicts, and the new ‘discoveries’ (by satellite imagery) of vast areas of ‘reserve agricultural land’ which can be exploited without, apparently, affecting either food production or local land rights. As the authors wryly note, satellite imagery ‘does not picture people or their historical land-based social relations and livelihood practices’. (9)

Borras and Franco suggest that we need more nuanced and careful approaches in our analysis of land grabbing, and they usefully point out the need to be more precise in our categorisation of land deals, not least because ‘the nature, direction, pace and extent of changes in land use in the context of (trans)national commercial land deals are diverse and complex.’ (33) To help with this, they set out a table on ‘character, direction and orientation of land use change’, identifying 13 different types of change, e.g. from food production for the local market to biofuel production, from forest lands to biofuels for use and the local market etc.

They argue forcefully that the ‘dangerously seductive call’ for codes of conduct (the new ‘magic bullet’) cannot be defended either as an important opportunity for rural development or even on pragmatic grounds, as IFPRI and others do, since their adoption will only increase the likelihood of poor people losing their land. Codes could only be voluntary and it would be impossible to bring to account those who violate them. They are ‘likely to facilitate, not block, further land-grabbing and thus should not be considered, even as a second-best approach.’ (32)

They note that not all those who are critical of land grabbing share the same analysis of the problem and of what is to be done; there is great diversity.

They point out the role of corrupt local rulers and elites in the selling off of land, helped of course in Africa by the strong notion, inherited from colonial times, of the President as residual owner of the land, which is well captured in Liz Alden Wily’s paper, Whose land are you giving away, Mr. President? Like many others, they attack the notion of vacant / empty / unused land, and relate it to how the state sees itself in terms of landholding, referencing James Scott’s hugely influential Seeing Like A State.

They also note that ‘local communities’ are not of course uniform, that people have different interests, and that consequently neither representation nor consultation are simple.

They stress the need ‘analytically and politically, to take a disaggregated view of the “rural poor”’ and that ‘it is important to remember that land use change will have a differentiated impact among these various strata of the rural poor and between the rural poor and the non-poor including rich farmers, landlords, moneylenders and traders.’ (20)

Along with others (such as IIED), they highlight the great power imbalances that exist between foreign investors (often protected by international law) in alliance with local elites on the one hand, and small farmers on the other: ‘different social groups join the negotiation table with different degrees of political power.’ (11)

On dispossession too they argue the need for careful empirical investigation. While ‘there is indeed a threat of massive dispossession of peasants as a result of current (trans)national commercial land transactions’, in many countries in Africa the more likely outcome will be ‘displacement or dislocation’. (29)
They conclude with some interesting ideas about what they term ‘land sovereignty’ in contrast to the ‘food sovereignty’ promoted by La Via Campesina.

They suggest that ‘we need a framework that takes the messy, complex actually existing land-based social relations as the starting point, emphasizing rural poor people’s effective access to, control over, and use of land. We therefore propose a shift from the call for ‘land tenure security’ – or indeed, ‘land governance’ – to a call for ‘land sovereignty’. (34)

To be useful, the notion of land sovereignty should be interpreted in a broad and flexible manner depending on specific concrete circumstances... In terms of systems of property rights, these can be communal, community, state, or private property rights, held individually or collectively... The notion of land sovereignty necessarily politicizes and historicizes the depoliticized and ahistorical popular mainstream conception of land governance... Land sovereignty is thus used in the hope that it can also contribute to the construction of a counter-narrative in reaction to the aggressive neoliberal ‘land governance’ perspective [of the World Bank]... Land governance is a view and initiative ‘from above’. Land sovereignty brings the ‘people’ back in... In a way, land sovereignty is the notion of a ‘people’s (counter)enclosure campaign in the midst of widespread attempts at TNC-driven and state-sponsored enclosures worldwide. (36)

Borras and Franco conclude: ‘We contend that land-grabbing is not inevitable, that it can be prevented, and that concerted efforts should be undertaken to stop it.’ (32)

On the eve of the April 2011 IDS Sussex conference on Global Land Grabbing, the Journal of Peasant Studies, 38, 2, March 2011 has published a short ‘Forum’ of papers from Klaus Deininger, Olivier De Schutter and Tanya Murray Li by way of an prelude to the conference. In their introduction, Saturnino M. (Jun) Borras, Ruth Hall, Ian Scoones, Ben White and Wendy Wolford, explain that they set up the Land Deal Politics Initiative (LDPI) http://www.iss.nl/ldpi as a loose research and action network because ‘in-depth and systematic enquiry that takes into account the political economy, sociology and ecology of contemporary land deals is urgently needed.’ (210) and

We see our work as building relevant and useful analyses that will be critical in two senses: on the one hand, critical of simplistic mainstream interpretations and policy prescriptions inspired by techno-economic optimism as well as administrative managerialism, and on the other hand, critical of naïve populisms not based in socially differentiated local realities. We endeavor to contribute to constructing a sophisticated analytical approach to land grabbing that recognizes potential benefits as well as risks, and situates both in localized contexts. (211)

They conclude:

We hope that the forum will inspire and provoke deeper rethinking and contribute towards a more meaningful and productive debate around global land grabbing, rooted in grounded and nuanced analysis, within academic, activist, policy, and political circles. (214)

The three contributors to the JPS forum offer very different perspectives. Klaus Deininger, a key author of the World Bank’s September 2010 report, Rising Global Interest in Farmland essentially summarises that report, including what Ian Scoones describes as its ‘heroic assumptions’ and concludes:
in many cases public institutions were unable to cope with the surge of demand and quickly screen out nonviable proposals, and...legal provisions were unclear and not well-disseminated or known by right holders. As a result, land acquisition often deprived local people, in particular the vulnerable, of their rights without providing appropriate compensation. In addition, consultations—if conducted at all—were superficial and did not result in written agreements, and environmental and social safeguards were widely neglected. In a number of countries, investors are treated more favorably than local smallholders, for example in terms of tax payments and the ability to obtain land and other resources. Rudimentary project proposals, lack of technical knowhow, and optimistic revenue projections together with highly opaque ways of processing and approving projects, implied that many projects either did not start production at all or operated only on a small fraction of the land they had been allocated...In some cases, investors who were unable to turn a profit due to unrealistic plans then started to encroach on protected areas, or on land that had explicitly been set aside for use by local people, causing environmental damage and threatening local food security.

Yet despite all this, ‘while it does present challenges, heightened investor interest also provides large opportunities.’ (244)

In his article, ‘How not to think of land grabbing’, Olivier De Schutter, the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, argues:

Large-scale investments in farmland have been criticized, chiefly, because of questions about the capacity of the countries targeted by these land deals to effectively manage these investments in order to ensure that they contribute to rural development and poverty alleviation. This article questions the idea that this is the only or even the main problem raised by such investments. If weak governance were the only problem, then appropriate regulation—and incentives to manage such investments correctly—would indeed be a solution. However the real concern behind the development of large-scale investments in farmland is that giving land away to investors, having better access to capital to 'develop', implies huge opportunity costs, than if access to land and water were improved for the local farming communities; that it directs agriculture towards crops for export markets, increasing the vulnerability to price shocks of the target countries; and that even where titling schemes seek to protect land users from eviction, it accelerates the development of a market for land rights with potentially destructive effects on the livelihoods, both of the current land users that will face increased commercial pressure on land, and of groups depending on the commons—grazing and fishing grounds, and forests...we need to do more than impose a discipline on land-grabbing: we need a real alternative to this kind of investment in land. (249)

De Schutter argues that even in countries where land is available and there are important yield gaps and hence the case for large-scale investments is strongest, ‘it remains an open question whether [they] are the most desirable option once we take as the benchmark the need to improve the situation of the rural poor.’ (263). Because poor countries seeking to attract foreign capital are competing with each other, this results ‘in a tendency to lower the level of requirements imposed on investors’ (264), while host states have ‘weak capacity to manage the investments in farmland’ (265) and are often ‘bound by investment treaties that include a prohibition on performance requirements.’ (266). Hence
No attempt to ‘regulate’ or to ‘discipline’ large-scale investments in farmland can ignore the reality of these obstacles... Considered separately, each of these obstacles is important, but taken together, they appear almost insuperable, at least for the foreseeable future... It shows how unrealistic it is, in the current context, to presuppose that the countries targeted by these investments will have the capacity to manage them effectively and in the interest of the local communities. (267)

De Schutter believes strongly that

The priority of low-income, food-deficit countries should be to feed themselves, rather than having to buy their food from abroad or, of course, to rely on food aid; and to combat rural poverty by ensuring that the incomes of rural households increase. However that is precisely not what shall happen if the production increases achieved by developing farmland are shipped abroad, and if that production is done moreover through large-scale plantations, which will worsen, rather than improve, the situation of those who most need to be supported—small-scale farmers and other marginalized groups in rural areas. (273)

On regulation, he argues

The commodification of land, which the global phenomenon of land-grabbing is accelerating, entails risks that go far beyond what the current proposals for regulating it seem willing to recognize. Since both the investors and the governments in host countries have every incentive to shield the deals they negotiate from outside scrutiny, voluntary approaches to discipline land-grabbing are bound to fail. What is needed is to insist on governments complying fully with their human rights obligations, including those related to the right to food, and to the right of all peoples to freely dispose of their natural wealth and resources and not to be deprived of their means of subsistence. Because they ignore human rights, the Principles on Responsible Agricultural Investment neglect the essential dimension of accountability [and] fail to provide an alternative to what they acknowledge may produce seriously disruptive effects on the livelihoods of those concerned. (274)

What we need now is a vision that goes beyond disciplining land deals and providing policymakers with a checklist of how to destroy the global peasantry responsibly. If it is to be truly responsible, agricultural investment must be investment that benefits the poor in the South, rather than leading to a transfer of resources to the rich in the North. It must be investment that truly reduces hunger and malnutrition, rather than aggravating them. (275)

The third author in the new *JPS* forum, Tania Murray Li, focuses on labour. She argues that

Placing labor at the center of the global 'land-grab' debate helps sharpen critical insights at two scales. At the scale of agricultural enterprises, a labor perspective highlights the jobs generated, and the rewards received, by people who work in and around large farms. This approach guides my critical reading of the report prepared by a World Bank team that argues for large-scale land acquisition as a way to reduce poverty. Using data from within the report itself, I show why poverty reduction is a very unlikely result. I develop the argument further by drawing on research in colonial and contemporary Indonesia, where large-scale plantations and associated smallholder contract schemes have a long history. A labor perspective is also relevant at the national and transnational scale, where it highlights the predicament of people whose labor is not needed by the global capitalist system. In much of the
global South, the anticipated transition from the farm to factory has not taken place and education offers no solution, as vast numbers of educated people are unemployed. Unless vast numbers of jobs are created, or a global basic income grant is devised to redistribute the wealth generated in highly productive but labor-displacing ventures, any program that robs rural people of their foothold on the land must be firmly rejected. (281)

Li strongly critiques the World Bank report for taking a ‘complex political economic problem driven by unequal power’ and putting it into ‘components that can be addressed by technical means.’ (292). For example, on page 125 of that report, she finds that ‘every action described as a technical fix would require the wholesale restructuring of the actually-existing power relations revealed in the case material presented in the report.’ (292) Even a rights-based approach is still limited to a technical fix: its tools are naming, shaming, and enjoining relevant authorities to be proactive in the protection of rights and redress of injury. It cannot change the political economic context that translates paper rights into real ones. (292-3)

The Bank assumes that the nations of the global South will, sooner or later, experience an agrarian transition similar to the one that occurred in Europe in earlier centuries, characterized by the shift from farm to factory, country to town, and for those who stay in the countryside, a transition from subsistence production to high value commodity production or wage work on large farms (293)

But ‘where will these people go, and what will they do?’ she asks of those expected to ‘migrate’ out of agriculture, noting that the idea that hundreds of millions of people in Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, notably those who have been, or are about to be, ejected from their ‘inefficient’ farms, could prosper by this route is a mirage. (294-5)

She concludes:

When a farmer I interviewed [in Sulawesi, Indonesia] who had been dispossessed multiple times posed the question ‘where is the place that is really for us?’ it was a real answer he demanded. (296)

Turning now, and more briefly, to a few other articles.

Ruth Hall, a member of the Land Deal Politics Initiative, has written an extremely useful article on ‘The many faces of the investor rush in Southern Africa: towards a typology of commercial land deals’. Drawing on Borras and Franco’s analysis of land use change, she differentiates between a range of activities and seeks to respond to the enormous oversimplification of media-driven understandings. ‘What is striking in Southern Africa’, she notes, ‘is the prevalence of land acquisitions for purposes other than food production... large food production deals seem scarce indeed.’ (15). There are a lot of deals involving conversion of land use from food to non-food through mining, tourism and plantation forestry deals. These trends are ‘unravelling the modest gains made in the region towards securing and redistributing rights to land.’ (18) In contrast with trends elsewhere in Africa, what is happening is largely legal. ‘What is being grabbed is not only the land but also the water and
the minerals and the cheap labour with which to exploit these.' (22). This has a rather familiar ring to it!

An excellent and very informative analysis of ‘Changing North-South and South-South Political Economy of Biofuels’ by Paul Dauvergne and Kate J. Neville in *Third World Quarterly, 30*, 6, September 2009, concludes sombrely that ‘biofuels seem poised to lead to even more degradation of vulnerable ecosystems in some of the world’s poorest places.’ (1100)

The IIED writers, Lorenzo Cotula and Sonja Vermeulen, have written an article in *International Affairs, 85*, 6, November 2009, about agricultural land investment which replicates much of their IIED-commissioned work. They suggest that ‘investors and their home governments would do well to make a more measured assessment of their capacities and risks with regard to direct land investments’ (1244) and rightly point out that

> The land investment story currently unfolding in a number of developing countries reflects deep global economic and social transformations with profound implications for the future of world agriculture. Decisions taken now will have major repercussions on the livelihoods and food security of many people for decades to come. (1244)

The same authors have a later article in the *Journal of Peasant Studies, 37*, 4, October 2010, on consultation in large-scale biofuels land deals. Here they acknowledge that ‘when tested within real negotiations, government agencies invariably align with the investor rather than the local land users.’ (914)

In the same edition of *Journal of Peasant Studies*, Jennifer Franco et al examine assumptions in the EU biofuels policy and find ‘frictions with experiences in Germany, Brazil and Mozambique.’ They conclude that ‘critical research can help to deepen understanding of the key challenges facing those who oppose the current corporate agrofuels project.’ (692)

A short briefing by Thomas Molony and James Smith in *African Affairs, 109*, July 2010, notes ‘There are indications that, because many African countries do not yet have well-thought-through biofuels policies that consider land tenure, ad hoc decisions about land use could have longer-term repercussions’ (493). They further note that ‘lack of transparency and paucity of regulation in foreign biofuel investment is evident in Tanzania, where there appears to be no consistent strategy regarding biofuel investment or how to regulate it.’ (494). In this context, at a meeting in the House of Commons in London in January 2010, I asked the Tanzanian High Commissioner, Mwanaidi Sinare Maajar, ‘what if, at a time of great food insecurity, a foreign company working in your country exported food back home?’ She replied ‘we would not allow it; in fact we are in the process of drawing up a code of conduct which would prevent such a thing happening, and if any company refuses to sign it, then they won’t be allowed to operate.’ A code of conduct on biofuels was finally published in November 2010 - and we must fervently hope that she is proved correct.
V: BOOKS

Four new books on biofuels, three from Zed Books, are highly worthy of mention.

First, in May 2010, Pluto Press published François Houtart’s *Agrofuels: Big Profits, Ruined Lives and Ecological Destruction*, £13.99. According to the foreword by Walden Bello, Houtart ‘brings his formidable strengths to deconstructing the agrofuels bonanza.’ Agrofuels ‘are not what they’re cracked up to be. Their advantages over fossil fuels are oversold. They have negative social, economic, and ecological side effects that outweigh their positive impacts. All this Houtart documents with admirable detail.’ On the back cover, Olivier De Schutter, the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, writes ‘Unique...it offers a much-needed political economy perspective on the issue....The book is vital reading for all those interested not only in agrofuels, but also in the direction of our civilisation and its shameful waste of natural resources.’

De Schutter is right. It is an excellent book, deserving of a wide readership. Houtart locates agrofuels within the twin crises of energy and climate, examines various changing perspectives on agrofuels, and notes that ‘there is an ideological war going on, which is fought with words.’ (ix). ‘There really is a crisis looming, and the whole problem lies in finding out how to avert it: new energy sources, particularly non-renewables, savings in the various fields of consumption, another development model?’ (19). A constant theme is that the dominant neo-liberal capitalist model ‘does not take externalities into account, i.e. the factors that do not directly enter the economic calculations of the market.’ (71). The dominant ‘development model’ offers ‘spectacular growth for some 20 per cent of the world’s population, leaving in limbo the “useless masses”’ and ‘the same principle is applied to the new energies and agrofuels: their adoption has to be moulded by the capitalist accumulation process: the concentration of land, monoculture, exploitation of labour, and control of the multinational’s over marketing.’ (72). In any analysis, ‘for a realistic calculation we must include the whole agrofuel cycle, from production to distribution’ (76). Agrofuels remain small and to make ‘a serious contribution to solving the energy contribution would therefore involve a considerable increase in production, above all in the South, with the ecological and social consequences that we know.’ (76).

‘There is, however, a different development model, based on peasant production and which aims at satisfying local needs, a solution that has the merit of respecting biodiversity.’ (112)

‘According to the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, some 60 million people in the world risk being expelled from their land to make way for the crops necessary to produce agrofuels. Others must remain in the plantations to work in deplorable, sub-human conditions that do not respect the fundamental rights of workers.’ (119).

Agrofuels ‘will inevitably compete with food production’. (122). The logical solution is to extend monoculture, diminish costs by economies of scale and reduce labour costs by mechanization, concentrate ownership of land, increased fertilizers and chemical products, universalize certain breeds of livestock, and create a world agricultural market. ‘To achieve the Herculean task of being able to feed from 9-10 billion people by the middle of the twenty-first century, only the large companies, capable of transcending national frontiers, are able to meet the challenge....Using these arguments, the discourse becomes moralizing and almost messianic, above all when it is a question of agrofuels.’ (123). ‘As long as profits on investment are not affected by pollution of soil, water and atmosphere, or by the collective cost of uncontrolled urbanization, or by the resistance of peasants who have been evicted and displaced, all these factors are ignored.’ (123).

The agrofuel sector has created much interest among business circles (129), including the oil companies and the automobile industry. ‘For the first, it is a question of conserving
monopolies established over energy resources, and for the second, to keep control over new fuels.' (130). ‘There are gigantic lobbies at work on the parliaments and governments.’ (134)

‘The enormous extension of monoculture ends by creating desertification, depleting the soils, diminishing underground water and destroying biodiversity.’ (144).

‘The function of the development of agrofuels is indeed that of quick profits, a sure source of accumulation in the short term. But they are in fact in no way, or only slightly, a solution to the climate problem and only marginally so for energy consumption. Only massive production, covering hundreds of millions of hectares could make a substantial contribution to the energy crisis and one can hope that popular and political resistance will not permit it. The ecological and social effects are considerable.’ (147).

‘On the one hand, the climate and energy crises signify the end of the illusion of limitless growth and, on the other, the inequalities in the living conditions that have been created at the world level have ended in a social system that is economically and morally insupportable. The logic of capitalism is incapable of responding to the challenge.’ (149).

‘It is clear to everyone that the cycle of fossil fuels is coming to an end and that their negative effects on the environment are most harmful. So other solutions must be found. The utilization of agrofuels has a role to play but it is much less decisive than was at first thought. The conditions of accepting the production of agrofuels by the ecological and social movements can be summarized as follows: respecting biodiversity; limiting the agricultural frontier; respecting soils and underground water; promoting peasant agriculture; combating the monopoly of the transnational corporations. If these conditions were met, the production of agrofuels would automatically be oriented towards the needs of local populations...it is clear that this means a radical rejection of capital logic and subordinating the economy to basic human needs.’ (150-1).

‘There remains only one valid long-term solution, which is to change our ways of consuming energy, but that is contradictory to contemporary economic logic.’ (166).

Second, in November 2010, Zed Books published Food versus Fuel: An Informed Introduction to Biofuels edited by Frank Rosillo-Calle and Francis X. Johnson, £14.99. According to the publishers, the book ‘presents a high-level introduction to the science and economics behind a well-worn debate, that will debunk myths and provide quality facts and figures’. It ‘includes perspectives from ‘pro’ and ‘anti’ biofuels experts and activists, from the North and South’ and it aims ‘to bring a balanced approach to the current debate on the major issues affecting the development of biofuels in a concise and clear manner in order to provide an informed, nuanced but accessible introduction, grounded in science and economics rather than conjecture and controversy.’ Olivier Dubois, FAO’s Bioenergy Group Coordinator wrote: ‘While the food versus fuel debate still rages, this book fulfils an important role in introducing the pros and cons of biofuels in a rigorous, well-informed and accessible way that will surely improve the understanding of the issues by the general public. It will therefore help the debate move in a constructive way.’ The book does indeed include conflicting views and contains chapters on rural development, agriculture and land use issues and climate change.

‘Government policy in a number of OECD countries was implemented without sufficient analysis of the environmental, social and economic effects. Furthermore, dialogue between the countries that would import biofuels and those that would produce them was
minimal...The benefits and risks of biofuels are highly context-specific – a system that is sustainable in one country does not necessarily work in a neighbouring country.’ (9)

‘Producing biofuels requires huge amounts of both fossil energy and food resources, which will intensify conflicts among these resources. Using food crops to produce ethanol raises major nutritional and ethical concerns... Growing crops for fuel squanders land, water and energy resources vital to the production of food for people... Growing crops for biofuel not only ignores the need to reduce natural resource consumption, but exacerbates the problem of malnourishment worldwide by turning food into fuel.’ (48)

‘biofuels depend on economies of scale – the larger the agricultural and industrial production, the easier the management and the greater the potential profits – and so agricultural production is usually extensive’ (72)

‘Many of the crops used for biofuel production currently – such as sugarcane, oil palm and maize – have a relatively high requirement for water. Thus, moderate to high yields can only be obtained under irrigated conditions or in tropical regions with high rainfall. Extensive cultivation of biofuel crops for commercial purposes may lead to competition for water between biofuel production and subsistence food production.’ (146-7)

‘it is very important to recognize the importance of climate change and to initiate research on the assessment of climate change impacts on biofuels, and to developing adaptation strategies for different biofuel crops in different regions.’ (161)

Third, also in November 2010, Zed Books published James Smith’s Biofuels and the Globalisation of Risk: The Biggest Change in North-South Relationships Since Colonialism?, £18.99. Zed state that this ‘offers the reader a fresh and compelling analysis of the politics and policies behind the biofuel story, critically examining the technological optimism and often-idealised promises it makes for the future. Starting with a brief history of bioenergy policy, the book goes on to explore the evolution of biofuels as a policy narrative, as a development ideal and as a socio-technical system through a series of interlinked case studies from Africa, Asia and Latin America. Smith argues that the nature of biofuels, so debated and contested, allow us to understand the relationships between and possible impacts of climate change, globalisation and development in entirely new ways and in doing so allow us to better understand the shifting dynamics of risk, responsibility and impact that investment in biofuels creates. This essential new critique argues that the support for biofuels points to a deep reconfiguration of risk and responsibility and new forms of environmental determinism where the global south is encouraged to re-orient its agro-food systems towards biofuel crop production in order to allow the global north not to meaningfully engage with altering its levels of consumption, energy use or unsustainable development. Therefore, he argues, risks and responsibilities migrate from north to south and biofuels may constitute the biggest change in North-South relationships since colonialism.’

Frank Rosillo-Calle, co-editor of the earlier book, writes ‘Overall, I strongly recommend the reading of this book, for the expert and non-expert and politicians. If biofuels are to play an important role in our energy future, it is imperative we address all questions including uncomfortable ones, as Smith has done in this book.’

‘One of the most striking features of biofuels as a global solution is their huge potential to entirely reshape livelihoods, patterns of resource consumption, environments and agro-food production systems; there is a cost for every benefit, and that is often invisible under the veneer of technological promise...The production of biofuels risks reprioritizing land use
across the globe, and as yet we know relatively little about the implications of this. Biofuels are driving, and transforming, the increasingly entangled relationship between energy, food security and climate change...Biofuels represent both a promise of a technologically driven future and the spectre of a Rumsfeldian web of known unknowns and unknown unknowns’ (1-2).

‘Unfortunately biofuels, whatever their benefits, globalize risk. They build on existing inequalities, they extend existing contradictions, they draw on existing expertise and they perpetuate existing patterns of consumption. The global biofuel assemblage stabilizes these processes as rational and desirable and encourages significant changes in land use and livelihood for some (generally in the South) while perpetuating the conditions that generate inequality, expertise and political economy in the first place.’ (13)

‘US production of bioethanol is a history of sustained subsidization and import protection, which owing to a disparity between bioethanol subsidy and the oil price has ignited in the past few years. This has occurred in parallel with the politicization of biofuel production in the USA.’ (26)

‘Relatively powerless nations and communities bend to the will of international capital and in doing so open themselves up to new risks. Powerless governments struggle to develop policy frameworks to deal with new technologies, opportunities and the risks they pose. In this governance gap, capital and the private sector are unencumbered in their ability to reorganize land, livelihoods and production towards certain ends, and there are of course also risks in this.’ (33)

‘Use of biofuels appears intuitively sensible, since they unlock energy from the sun sequestered in plants to power cars, building on existing agricultural activity, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions into the environment. The reality is more complex, however, almost overwhelmingly so. We need more sophisticated analyses to temper our optimism.’ (43)

‘the notion that biofuels can be anything other than a relatively small net contributor seems somewhat unrealistic. There are simply too many costs and trade-offs.’ (48)

‘It is also undoubtedly true that in talking about huge, multinational, heavily subsidized and politically charged issues it may be difficult to detach the science from the politics, or the equation from the ideology.’ (50)

‘it seems very likely that biofuels – current generations – will be able to contribute little more than a fraction to fulfilling our energy demands. Our demands are too great and biomass is too limited, or at least needed for other purposes. This does not make biofuels unimportant, far from it, because the implications of our investment in them are out of all proportion to their potential contribution.’ (62)

‘We risk running ahead of ourselves. In our rush to replace oil we risk making investments and taking decisions that may be as irreversible as climate change increasingly appears to be. Our subsidies, securities and priorities shape choices the science cannot sustain or even provide insight into, and it is vitally important that we acknowledge this sooner rather than later. There is surprisingly little debate about the precautionary principle with regard to biofuels.’ (63)

‘Investment in biofuels is driving changes in land ownership and land use for large tracts in Africa, whether directly through control of land to grow feedstocks, or indirectly to grow food
to replace land lost to feedstock production elsewhere, or to hedge against rising food prices... Land is fuelling new global relationships, and the matrix of subsidies, blending targets and interests means that biofuel-oriented land use is likely to tend to the large scale; this is likely to limit benefits for local people and the countries in which land is being appropriated.’ (87-8)

‘Biofuels represent an opportunity for this agro-industrial complex to extend its reach into new commodities and new lands, and in so doing entrench global patterns of consumption and production. The small-scale biofuel producer, the small-scale farmer, the landless and, to a lesser extent, the African state itself risk being squeezed out, or down to the bottom, of the biofuel value chain. (88)

‘We are, in effect, expecting the rural poor in the developing world to alter their land-use patterns, their livelihoods and their externalities in order that we may maintain our consumption and energy-use patterns for as long as possible...This is profoundly unjust.’ (95)

‘Biofuels are inherently neither pro- nor anti-poor. They do, however, represent a new global compact between the rich and the poor. The poor are being asked to take responsibility and compensate for the political, energy and environmental needs of the rich.’ (114)

‘We need to think about using biofuels to generate power for those other than the powerful.’ (127)

Fourth and finally, in June 2011 Zed Books, in collaboration with the Nordic Africa Institute, published Biofuels, Land Grabbing and Food Security in Africa, edited by Prosper B. Matondi, Kjell Havnevik and Atakilte Beyene. The editors note that the scale and extent of current acquisition and future projections show disturbing trends in terms of how African farmers are at risk of losing their major source of livelihood. Through a mix of thematic chapters and country studies of Ethiopia, Tanzania, Zimbabwe and Ghana, the book examines the impacts of the expansion of large-scale biofuel production on African agriculture, land, food security, rural livelihoods, ecology and on climate change. The biofuel expansion is generating new economic alliances and production relations that are resulting in new forms of inclusions and exclusions of the rural population in Africa, they argue.

The editors argue that the rights of African smallholder farmers are under siege because the current direction of change does not provide any confidence that that they will ultimately benefit. They present ‘stories beyond the headlines’ as a basis both for learning and for providing a resource for action towards alternatives that might offer benefits for Africa. They call for a deeper understanding of the African environment and people, and question an externally driven ‘win-win’ paradigm. They note that most African countries have weak or nonexistent legal and administrative frameworks on land and resource rights and that rural land users have little legal redress when governments allow foreign investors to grab their land. Moreover, a lack of transparency and checks and balances in contract negotiations create a breeding ground for corruption and for deals that are not in the public interest. They believe there is no doubt that Africa does require economic development and external investment to unlock greater economic value of its land for its own people. However, the current trajectory has been dominated by investment in large-scale plantation agriculture that most often replaces and undermines the livelihoods of African peoples.

The editors believe that many African governments are just ‘muddling through with little guidance on how best to respond... The lack of clarity on land negotiations calls for action
and research to build a knowledge base of the many dimensions of land grabbing and agro-investments.’ (192) They note that hitherto ‘there has only been muted response from African-based institutions and intellectuals [and] it was only in 2009 that the African Union started to talk of a code of conduct for land deals. The capacity for engaging in these matters in Africa is weak and is further compromised by the lack of platforms and opportunities on which to engage on issues.’ (193) So they assert that ‘there is clearly a need for further enquiry into land grabbing, because awareness of the full impact is only in its infancy.’ (193) This supposes providing technical inquiries, commissioning research projects, and monitoring policy making and implementation as agro-investments go ahead. There is above all ‘a need to develop a questioning voice from within Africa, so that the deals secure sustainable benefits for the broader African societies.’ (193)

Zed Books are to be warmly congratulated for publishing these major contributions to aiding our understanding of the complexities of biofuels and their links to the phenomenon of global land grabbing.
VI: TV, VIDEO AND RADIO CLIPS

As mentioned in my introduction, I have included here a new section of 61 TV, video and radio clips. I have done so because I believe that these can be especially revealing of the attitudes of some of those engaged in the land grabbing phenomenon. Some stereotypes clearly emerge, e.g.

- **The president of the recipient country**, often corrupt, with insecure job tenure, who visits richer countries seeking investment in his country and is openly prepared to sell off the family silver: ‘here is 100 million acres of good arable land’ one such told a Saudi businessman.

- **The local government official**, in the area being conceded to outsiders, who sees the opportunity for considerable enrichment and is therefore somewhat economical with the truth.

- **The foreign investor**, usually a smooth talker, who promises hundreds, if not thousands, of jobs and a golden future for the local population.

- **The biofuels operator** or ‘champion’, generally with a multinational company and a smooth line in promises and disinformation: ‘It is true that we were a little reserved with our information policy.’

- **The local agent** out to make deals with foreign investors – ‘I can find 10, 20 or even 100,000 acres’ said one (in Benin) and happy to sell out his own people. The herders (in Ethiopia) ‘can just go somewhere else.’

- **The Minister of Lands & Agriculture** who says he knows nothing about the alleged land deals - and is probably telling the truth.

- **The Minister of Energy** who says that x million ha of land in his country could be used for biofuels without threatening food production (36m in Mozambique).

- **The aggrieved farmer**, who patiently explains to a journalist that what they were promised has not come about.

- **The very angry farmer** who has just been evicted without any explanation or compensation, and who has been denied access to justice.

- **The local spokesperson of an advocacy group** who is trying to raise awareness of these issues, but faces a huge uphill battle.

- **The international researcher** who writes about ‘win-win’ situations.

- **The media savvy person** who asks, what if, at a time of great hunger in, say, Ethiopia, an Indian company working there ships out food to feed people back home and disregards the starving locals?

- **The researcher from GRAIN** who asks why not invest in local farmers, rather than industrial agriculture?

Doubtless there are many more, but these were the ones who emerged most clearly.
TV & VIDEO

TROUBLE ON THE LAND, 27 September 2011 (6.08 mins)
Excerpts from Dan Rather Reports HD NET interview with Anuradha Mittal of the Oakland Institute on a plan to move 100,000 refugees in Tanzania from their homes to be replaced by a commercial farm owned by American investors, AgriSol Energy.

OXFAM SOUNDS UGANDA LAND-GRAB WARNING, 22 September 2011 (7.24 mins)
Al Jazeera report on Oxfam allegations that 22,000 Ugandans have been forced out of their homes since 2004. Followed by studio debate between Oxfam and the New Forests Company.

OXFAM CALLS ON THE NEW FORESTS COMPANY TO INVESTIGATE UGANDA LAND GRABS CLAIMS, 22 September 2011 (3.15 mins)
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wdqTFKHyE
Short YouTube piece by Oxfam with just words and images on the story featured above.

PANEL DISCUSSION: LAND – A GLOBAL SUPERMARKET?, 15 September 2011 (1 hour, 33 mins)
http://farmlandgrab.org/post/view/19312
Panel discussion featuring Nyikaw Ochalla (Anuak Survival Organisation, Ethiopia/UK) on Land Grabbing in Ethiopia; Brigitte Reisenberger (FIAN Austria) on Land Grabbing in Kenya; and Jennifer Franco (Transnational Institute, Netherlands) and Roman Herre (FIAN Germany) on Global Processes.

GLEN, GARY & ROSS – A FILM ABOUT LAND RIGHTS, 12 September 2011 (3.43 mins)
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Le06FhmuHII
Oxfam parody today of Alec Baldwin’s sales talk in the cult classic movie Glengarry Glen Ross. Shows the moment when workers from a real estate firm meet a representative from head office sent to motivate them to sell and buy land regardless of the consequences, or lose their jobs.

CAMEROONIAN FILMMAKER UNPEELS BANANA INEQUALITIES, 13 August 2011 (3.30 mins)
Excerpt from moving film The Big Banana featured on Voice of America News features people losing their land to a banana company. Film not allowed to be shown in Cameroon.

CLAIMS OF AFRICAN ‘LAND GRAB’ SPARK CONTROVERSY, 12 June 2011 (3.22 mins)
Anuradha Mittal of the Oakland Institute talks to CNN about Oakland’s new report, Understanding Land Investment Deals in Africa.

THE GLOBAL RESOURCE GRAB, 5 June 2011
3 Transnational Institute (TNI) interviews with
Yao Graham on the scramble for resources in Africa (1.24 mins)
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xGbSOxcfopU&feature=youtu.be
Jun Borras on reserve agricultural land (3.23 mins)

and Manahan Graham on water grabbing (5.09 mins)
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0Y6k7KCYCq&feature=related

DOCUMENTARY: PLANET FOR SALE, 3 May 2011 (54.22 mins)
http://ecadforum.com/ethiopianvideo/?p=1058

Brilliant ARTE documentary covering many aspects of the global land grabbing story, with Ethiopia featuring strongly.

ADAMA / ALDEIA NOVA, 3 May 2011 (7.44 mins)
http://farmlandgrab.org/post/view/18543

A truly remarkable ‘promotional video’ about the Israeli Vital Capital’s Adama project in Angola.

VIDEOS FROM THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON GLOBAL LAND GRABBING, 6-8 April 2011
http://farmlandgrab.org/post/view/18539

Series of over 30 presentations from a highly successful conference held at IDS, Sussex.

LAND GRABBING: THE NEW SCRAMBLE FOR AFRICA, 28 March 2011 (21.27 mins)
http://farmlandgrab.org/18508

Discussion on Kontext TV in Berlin with Evelyn Bahn (Inkota Network), Nnimmo Bassey (Nigeria), Wangui Mbatia (Kenya), Ibrahim Coulibaly (Mali).

ETHIOPIA’S LAND RUSH: FEEDING THE WORLD, 21 March 2011 (11.25 mins)

Excellent film by John Vidal of The Guardian. The ‘deal of the century’ for Karuturi in Gambella, Ethiopia, where there are now 896 investors.

LANDGRABBING IN MALI, 9 February 2011 (2.05 mins)
http://farmlandgrab.org/post/view/18136

Youncoule’ dif Pap Sacko talks briefly at the World Social Forum about the Malibya project in Mali.

GUARDIAN FOCUS PODCAST: LAND GRABS IN AFRICA, 28 January 2011 (24.09 mins)
http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/audio/2011/jan/28/guardian-focus-podcast-land-grabs

Excellent discussion involving Madeleine Bunting and John Vidal (Guardian), Devlin Kuyek (Grain), Camilla Toulmin (IIED), Susan Payne (Emergent Asset), Olivier De Schutter (OHCHR).

TANZANIA SELLING LAND TO KOREA, 24 December 2010 (4.01 mins)
http://farmlandgrab.org/post/view/18031

Fascinating CNN interview with Aloyce Msanja, head of Tanzania’s Development Authority, who talks of idle land and a win-win situation.

AGRICULTURAL LAND FOR INVESTORS – WHY SUDAN’S SMALL FARMERS ARE BEING DISPLACED, 21 December 2010 (5.52 mins)
http://farmlandgrab.org/post/view/17979
Short Deutsche Welle piece about plight of some small farmers in northern Sudan being ousted by Egyptian and Jordanian companies who produce food for their home markets.

THE RUSH FOR AFRICA’S LAND: MALIAN FARMERS DISPLACED, 21 December 2010 (4.18 mins)
Excellent short New York Times piece on Malian farmers threatened with displacement from their ancestral lands by Libyans because ‘they do not have the means to develop it, nor does the state.’

KARUTURI GLOBAL IN ETHIOPIA, 29 November 2010 (3.46 mins)
http://www.ethiopianreview.com/content/30502
Short Voice of America piece on the pros and cons of Karuturi Global’s presence in Ethiopia, featuring the views of Karuturi and Meles. One woman farmer welcomes the new investors, other farmers, speaking under anonymity, are critical.

GEORGIA CALLING ON SOUTH AFRICAN FARMERS, 19 November 2010 (12.06 mins)
http://farmlandgrab.org/post/view/18090
Over 60 South African farmers have applied to go to Georgia, backed by the Transvaal Agricultural Union and attracted by cheap freehold land. Georgian opposition not happy. Fascinating ABNDigital film.

ANSWERS TO THE GLOBAL FOOD CRISIS, 18 November 2010 (11.40 mins)
http://farmlandgrab.org/post/view/17988
Presentation by Anuradha Mittal of the Oakland Institute about land grabbing on etalks.tv.com.

AGRI-VIE, A PRIVATE EQUITY FUND, 17 November 2010 (6.30 mins)
http://farmlandgrab.org/post/view/18089
Interview with chief executive Herman Marais about the fund’s investment plans in East Africa and elsewhere.

LAND GRABS IN AFRICA, 7 October 2010 (12.31 mins)
http://farmlandgrab.org/post/view/18091
ABNDigital interview with Dennis Aliga, CEO of DMA Capital Group, who is very sanguine about ‘large scale land acquisitions’.

PROTECTING LAND RIGHTS, 7 September 2010 (3.51 mins)
http://go.worldbank.org/CCXV6O5ZE0
Soft music, pretty pictures and voiceover of Klaus Deininger announcing the main findings of the World Bank’s report Rising Global Interest in Farmland.

“LAND GRABS” IN POOR COUNTRIES, 24 August 2010 (8.22 mins)
http://farmlandgrab.org/14979
Excellent Democracy Now! interview with the Oakland Institute’s Executive Director, Anuradha Mittal following its report, (Mis)investment in Agriculture.

HARVESTING RETURNS, 2 August 2010 (7.08 mins)
http://farmlandgrab.org/14861
Interesting CNBC interview with Richard Davis of BlackRock, who outlines the many reasons why ‘agriculture is a very good long-term story.’
GOOD FORTUNE (KENYA), 3 July 2010 (9.44 mins)
http://farmlandgrab.org/post/view/18082
Extract from a documentary by Transient Pictures about 'upgrading' in Kibera, Nairobi, and American Dominion Farms in western Kenya which threatens to flood more than 500 families.

BRAZIL, TANZANIA IN BIOFUEL DEAL, 8 July 2010 (1.49 mins)
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JWwYznNfRfo
Very short NTV Kenya piece focussing on the meeting of the Presidents of the two countries and Tanzania's wish to develop biofuels.

VOICES FROM THE LONDON INTERNATIONAL OROMO WORKSHOP, 3 July 2010
http://farmlandgrab.org/14316
Interviews with Professor Mekuria Bulcha, Malardalen University, Sweden (2.19), Dr. Bahiru Dhuguma, Agriculture Development Officer, USAID, USA (2.20), Dr. Marco Bassi, Oxford University (1.35), Nyikaw Ochalla, Anywaa Survival Organisation, UK (1.17), Gosaye Fida (1.43), Addise Dheressa (1.54)

ETHIOPIA'S ABUNDANT FARMING INVESTMENTS LEAVE MANY STILL HUNGRY, 22 April 2010 (8.01 mins)
http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/social_issues/jan-june10/ethiopia_04-22.html#
Excellent Public Broadcasting Service series of interviews.

BIOFUEL USE ‘COULD THREATEN THE POOR’, 15 March 2010 (2.44 mins)
http://english.aljazeera.net/news/europe/2010/03/2010315113843716570.html
Excellent Al Jazeera piece on the biofuels craze, featuring a willing farmer in East Sussex and Tim Rice of ActionAid demolishing EU policies and laying out the likely consequences for farmers in Africa and elsewhere.

ETHIOPIA LEASES HUGE TRACTS OF FARMLAND, 22 February 2010 (3.46 mins)
http://farmlandgrab.org/11299
Useful Voice of America piece on the activities of the Indian firm Katuri Global leasing 300,000 ha in Ethiopia.

LAND GRABBING IN ETHIOPIA & TANZANIA, 8 January 2010 (8.59 mins)
http://farmlandgrab.org/10157
Excellent Japan Broadcasting Corporation reports from Ethiopia & Tanzania followed by good studio interview with reporter.

INVESTMENT IN AFRICA – DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY OR LAND GRAB? 19 November 2009, 2 videos (14.11 & 8.13 mins)
http://farmlandgrab.org/9084
Detailed discussion with Riz Khan of Al Jazeera interviewing David Hallam of FAO, Devlin Kuyek of GRAIN & Nii Akuettah, policy analyst.

WIN-WIN OR NEO COLONIALISM?, 25 December 2009 (12.39 mins)
http://farmlandgrab.org/10001
Good France 24 piece on Benin farmers and followed by detailed explanatory interview with Jonathan Brooks, OECD.

ETHIOPIA LAND OF TOMORROW, 21 November 2009, 2 videos (5.57 & 4.56 mins)
http://farmlandgrab.org/9824
A glossy from Saudi-East African Forum, lovely pictures of Ethiopia, ‘uniquely suited for export-oriented investments...ideal for commercial production’.

CONCERN OVER FOREIGN LAND GRABS, 17 November 2009 (2.25 mins)
Good short Al Jazeera piece, interviews with Duncan Green, Oxfam, and Hassad Food of Qatar.

ETHIOPIA’S FARMLAND IN HIGH DEMAND, 22 October 2009 (1.01 mins)
http://farmlandgrab.org/8420
Very short piece from the Washington Post with pictures from Oromia.

BENIN FARMERS PRESSURED TO SELL, 10 July 2009 (9.54 mins)
Good France 24 piece on Benin farmers and interview with Olivier de Schutter, less good is Philippe Henson of Amnesty.

OUTSOURCING AGRICULTURE TO AFRICA, 5 July 2009, 2 videos (1.46 & 1.52 mins)
http://farmlandgrab.org/9833
Short instablogs arguing for and against, woman with a very posh voice, done in the form of cartoon and images.

MIDEAST GRABS LAND ELSEWHERE, 21 May 2009 (3.10 mins)
http://farmlandgrab.org/4749
Useful short CNN report. Takes a positive view.

SUDAN’S RURAL RICHES ATTRACT INVESTORS, 17 May 2009 (3.10 mins)
Very positive piece from Al Jazeera about Qatari and Saudi land investors in Sudan, a ‘Garden of Eden’. A farmer welcomes them, ‘no foreigners can steal my land, there are laws to protect me.’

UNSUSTAINABLE WORLD THE BIOFUEL QUESTION, 16 April 2008 (5.21 mins)
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/newsnight/7350714.stm
Excellent, critical piece on biofuels from BBC Newsnight with a British focus.

RADIO

LAND INVESTMENT DEALS AS A CAUSE OF AFRICA’S FOOD SUPPLY PROBLEMS, 16 August 2011 (6.43 mins)
http://fsrn.org/audio/land-investment-deals-as-a-cause-africa%E2%80%99s-food-supply-problems/8979
Good Free Speech Radio News interview with Anuradha Mittal of the Oakland Institute. Cites examples from South Sudan and Tanzania.

THE NEW AFRICAN LAND GRAB, 30 June 2011 (11.25 mins)
http://english.aljazeera.net/indepth/opinion/2011/06/201162884240129515.html
Good Al Jazeera report by Joan Baxter of the Oakland Institute.

HEDGE FUNDS AND AFRICAN FARMS, 13 June 2011 (27.30 mins)
CBC interview with Anuradha Mittal of the Oakland Institute about its reports on global land grabbing.

SIERRA LEONIANS LOSING OUT ON LAND ACQUISITION DEALS, 9 June 2011 (4.50 mins)
Conflicting views in this short BBC World Service piece about Addax Bioenergy company in Sierra Leone.

FOOD: THE HIDDEN DRIVER OF GLOBAL POLITICS, 17 May 2011 (25.28 mins)
http://www.npr.org/player/v2/mediaPlayer.html?action=1&t=1&islist=false&id=136394365&m=136401585
Excellent interview on National Public Radio with Lester Brown of the Earth Policy Institute.

MADAGASCAR: COMMUNITY RESISTANCE TO CORPORATE LAND THEFT, 6 April 2011 (28.20 mins)
http://montreal.mediacoop.ca/sites/mediacoop.ca/files2/mc/audio/Stefan%20Christoff/wsfmadagascar.mp3
Interesting interview at the World Social Forum in Dakar with Madagascan land activist Mamy Rakotondrainibe about the consequences of the Daewoo case.

LESTER BROWN: THE 21ST CENTURY GOLD RUSH – AFRICAN ARABLE LAND GRABS, 28 January 2011 (3.53 mins)
Excellent brief piece by Lester Brown (Earth Policy Institute) reveals how rich countries worried about their future food supplies, along with investment banks, are buying up arable land in Africa, yet are failing to deliver any benefits to local people.

LAND GRABBING IN MALI, 29 November 2010 (from 25.15 - 32.15 in a 45 min programme)
http://www.bbc.co.uk/iplayer/console/b00w794q/The_World_Tonight_29_11_2010
More BBC The World Tonight interviews in Mali by Kati Whittaker about serious land and water conflicts. Also features Mark Archdeacon-Butler of Tearfund and Lorenzo Cotula of IIED.

MODEL UN CONSTRUCTION, 17 November 2010 (10 mins)
Interview on *IRIN Talks Bulletin* 43 with Tinyade Kachika, author of Oxfam International-funded report.

**AFRICA’S GREAT LAND GRAB, 27 October 2010 (6.36 mins)**

Series of brief interviews on the *BBC World Service* with Tumusiime Rhoda Peace, AU Commissioner for Rural Economy and Agriculture, Josephat Mwanzi, BBC, Mouhamet Lamine Ndiaye, Oxfam’s Pan-Africa Head of Economic Justice. Focus is the launch of the AU’s Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa.

**DOWN ON THE FARM, 4 October 2010 (18 mins)**
[http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p00b0lg8](http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p00b0lg8)

Excellent programme on the *BBC World Service’s Business Daily*. Jeff Conrad of Hancock Agricultural Investment Fund say it’s good news for productivity; John Peck of Family Farm Defenders criticize the impact of investors on rural communities. Olivier de Schutter of the United Nations raises the alarm for farmers of the less developed world.

**LAND LEASING IN ETHIOPIA, 25 February 2010 (7.38 mins)**
[http://farmlandgrab.org/11359](http://farmlandgrab.org/11359)

From ‘serious’ *BBC Radio 4* programme *The World Tonight*, asks whether this is a shameless land grab by the rich or an opportunity for the poor. Interviews with a Dutch company.

**BIOFUELS IN SIERRA LEONE, 16 February 2010 (3.04 mins)**

Useful discussion of issues on *World Radio Switzerland* of a Swiss biofuels firm in Sierra Leone. Bringing jobs or starting a land grab?

**THE GREAT AFRICAN LAND GRAB, 14 January 2010, radio (30 mins)**
[http://farmlandgrab.org/10276](http://farmlandgrab.org/10276)

Outstanding broadcast from *Canadian Broadcasting Corporation*. Starts with Sierra Leone, turning from rice to sugar cane for biofuels. Excellent interviews with a variety of farmers, officials etc. A company ‘suggestion box’ is locked. Followed by comments from Devlin Kuyek of GRAIN.

**CONGO BRAZZAVILLE/SOUTH AFRICA LAND DEAL, (radio) 21 October 2009 (3.29 mins)**

Very critical comments on *BBC World Service* from Yao Graham, Third World Network-Africa.