Titling against grabbing? Critiques and conundrums around land formalisation in

Southeast Asia

Philip Hirsch University of Sydney

Land titling in SE Asia

• Key arguments/assumptions:

- Benefits for states legibility, control, revenue
- Security on the part of farmers \rightarrow productive investment
- "Property effect" → collateral, fungibility as capital
- Motor of economic development
- Land titling programs
 - Colonial antecedents
 - World Bank/AusAID/LEI approach in Thailand, Laos, Philippines, Java
 - LMAP (Cambodia)
 - Red book in Vietnam

Land grabbing in SE Asia

- Historically land rich land for the taking
- Increasingly taken from someone else
- Cambodia economic land concessions, urban development
- Laos plantations, dams, mines
- Thailand forest reserve land
- etc

Claims and counterclaims

- Does title enhance security of tenure?
- Does titling reinforce existing inequality or merely formalise/secure existing patterns of land ownership?
- Is the problem with titling that it goes too far or not far enough?
- Does titling broaden or narrow land ownership?
- Is titling consistent with national land policy and prevailing political economy of land?
- Does titling lead to more intensive/productive use of land?

Concluding conundrum

- Most farmers and other landholders are pleased to obtain formal title over plots of land that they hold individually under more weakly demarcated and state-recognised arrangements....
- ...but the process of land titling in some areas can weaken security in others and can entrench or exacerbate existing inequalities in access to land.



