

# **Women's Land Rights and Tenure Security in Uganda: Experiences from Mbale, Apac and Ntungamo<sup>1</sup>**

**Barbara Gärber**

## **Abstract**

Even though women are the main agricultural producers in Uganda, only few of them enjoy secure rights to the land they till as control of land is mainly concentrated in the hands of men. Despite the government's deliberate efforts to redress gender-based inequalities in land access and ownership abuse of women's land rights is still common, especially in the rural areas where women are frequently dispossessed of their land by members of their own families. Fieldwork in Mbale, Apac and Ntungamo Districts has indicated that in a context of increasing land scarcity and high population pressure, men are increasingly taking advantage of their superior position within the patrilineal tenure system, advancing their own interests at the expense of weaker and, in most cases, female family members. At the same time, women's ability to successfully defend their interests in land is severely limited as they often lack both the social ties and financial capability necessary to assert their rights in a corrupt and male-biased institutional environment.

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper is based on the author's diploma thesis entitled „Caught between Customary and State Law: Women's Land Rights in Uganda in the Context of Increasing Privatization of Land Tenure Systems“. The University of Vienna is gratefully acknowledged for funding the fieldwork carried out in Uganda.

## Introduction

In many parts of rural Africa land constitutes the primary source from which millions of people derive their daily livelihoods. This is also the case in Uganda where land is by far the most productive asset with agriculture accounting for 43 percent of the national GDP, 80 percent of employment and 85 percent of export earnings (cf. FAO 2010). Representing 80 percent of the agricultural labor force, women carry out most of the agricultural work producing up to 80 percent of food and cash crops (cf. UNDP 2012). Despite their essential contributions to the national economy, however, only few women enjoy secure rights to the land they till. In fact, with control and ownership of land mainly concentrated in the hands of men, most women are crucially dependent upon male family members for access to land (cf. Nyakoojo 2002: 4, Rugadya 2007: 1).

Customary land tenure explicitly recognizes women's vulnerabilities arising from their dependence upon men and for a long time proactively provided for the protection of their land rights in both, their maiden and matrimonial homes. However, the customary safeguards ensuring women's tenure security have largely been eroded under the pressures of increasing land scarcity, rapid population growth and increasing individualization of land rights. Male family members that are supposed to hold land in trust for the entire family have increasingly turned themselves into individual landowners, gradually depriving weaker family members of their rights in family land (cf. Adoko/Akin/Knight 2008, Adoko/Levine 2008).

When Uganda underwent a major land and legal reform exercise during the 1990s law and policy makers made a conscious effort to redress gender-based imbalances existing in land access and ownership and put in place a gender-responsive legislative and policy framework safeguarding and strengthening women's rights in land (cf. Obaikol 2009). Even though the legal environment has never been more favorable to women in Uganda, the situation on the ground is still far from satisfactory. Abuse of women's land rights is particularly widespread in the rural areas where women are frequently denied access to land by members of their own families (cf. Adoko/Akin/Knight 2011).

Drawing on relevant secondary material and field evidence collected in Mbale, Apac and Ntungamo Districts, this paper seeks to point out the reasons for women's insecurity of tenure in the Ugandan context. The focus

is thereby on customary tenure which continues to be the dominant form of landholding in the country. Considering that in customary settings women's vulnerabilities vary significantly according to marital status and changing family circumstances, special emphasis is placed on the differences that exist between various groups of women. After a brief account of the land reform process and the changes it brought about for women, this paper takes a closer look at practice on the ground. In doing so, it first provides a detailed analysis of the various factors determining women's access to and control over land before it goes on to discuss the existing threats to women's land rights.

### **Gender and the Land Reform Process in Uganda**

In line with contemporary economic thought and international donor policies, land reform in Uganda was premised on the understanding that there is a direct link between formalized property rights to land and economic growth. Accordingly, the new land law contained within the 1995 Constitution and 1998 Land Act aims to facilitate the gradual transition from customary to freehold tenure through the formalization of informal customary land rights (cf. Hunt 2004, Joireman 2007). At the same time, however, a deliberate effort was made to enhance tenure security on customary land. In a radical move, customary tenure, including all its norms and institutions, was formally recognized alongside freehold, leasehold and mailo<sup>2</sup> tenure. This fundamentally altered the nature of Uganda's tenure system given that now, for the first time in history, customary claims in land are equal in weight and validity to formally documented land claims and recognized as private property rights. Customary land owners, whether it be individuals, families or communities, may now acquire certificates of customary ownership as documentary evidence for their ownership rights or form communal land associations for

---

<sup>2</sup> The mailo system of land tenure has its roots in the 1900 Buganda Agreement between the British Crown and the kingdom of Buganda, by which a number of chiefs were granted individual ownership rights to private estates called "mailo". Although, in practice, mailo tenure is equivalent to freehold tenure it was reinstated by the Constitution due to its symbolic significance (cf. McAuslan 2003: 5, Walubiri 1994: 156ff.).

any purpose related to communal land ownership and management (cf. Adoko/Levine 2008: 102f., Mugambwa 2006: 23ff.).

Particular attention was also paid to the recognition and protection of women's rights. The new Constitution explicitly prohibits discrimination on grounds of gender and provides for gender equality in all sectors of society, also in regard to the acquisition and holding of land. Article 26 (1) lays down the fundamental right of every person to own property, whether individually or in association with others, whereas Article 31 (1) grants both men and women "equal rights in marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution." Under Article 33 (1) women are accorded "full and equal dignity of person with men" as well as the right to "equal treatment with men [...] in political, economic and social activities." Adding to that, clause (6) of the same article prohibits any "[l]aws, cultures, customs, or traditions which are against the dignity, welfare or interest of women or which undermine their status."

Women's interests in land are protected also by the Land Act. Section 27 explicitly holds that any decision taken in respect of customary tenure that denies "women or children or persons with disability access to ownership, occupation or use of any land" or violates any other rights granted to them under the Constitution shall be null and void. Section 39 furthermore prohibits a person from engaging in any transaction in respect of family land without the prior consent of the resident spouse while Section 38A explicitly protects the right of a spouse to have access to and live on family land during the subsistence of marriage.

The protection granted to women was further enhanced by the legal recognition of customary tenure given that the customary provisions safeguarding women's claims in land now have full judicial force in state law and are to be upheld also by state courts, provided that they not violate any rights granted by the Constitution (cf. Adoko/Levine 2008: 103).

In order to improve service delivery and ensure proper implementation of the new law on the ground, the Land Act also set up an ambitious structure of decentralized land management institutions, providing for the establishment of District Land Board, District Land Offices and Registries, Sub-County Area Land Committees and District Land Tribunals (cf. OAG 2010: 10ff.).

## **Women and Land: The Reality**

The following section takes a look at the reality on the ground in order to assess the extent to which women have actually been able to benefit from the protective legislation. Based on 13 focus group discussions and 8 key informant interviews conducted in Mbale, Apac and Ntungamo Districts, it first provides an analysis of the land rights granted to women in practice, most notably their breadth and duration, before it goes on to discuss the different vulnerabilities experienced by different groups of women. In order to preserve their anonymity, all interview partners are referred to by their first names only.

### Access to Land

With over 75 percent of land being held under customary tenure, customary law continues to be the crucial determinant of women's access rights to land in most of Uganda, Mbale, Apac and Ntungamo being no exceptions (cf. FAO 2010). While access by virtue of family membership certainly remains the most common way for women to gain access to land, a rising number of females acquire customary land also through inheritance or donation. Where the prospect of acquiring family land is slim, access to land is increasingly achieved also by means of purchase or borrowing.

### *Family Access*

Under customary tenure “[l]and is held in trust by the family, for all past, present and future generations, with the current adult occupants responsible for managing it, in the role of trustees.” (Adoko/Akin/Knight 2011: 2). Accordingly, customary land ownership is by families, not individuals, and constitutes a form of trusteeship that is associated with the responsibility to protect not only the land itself but also the land rights of all family members (cf. LEMU 2008: 2). The nature and scope of the land rights granted to individual family members are derived from their position within the family and therefore vary at different stages in life. In the case of women, marital status plays a crucial role as it determines where and in which family a woman can claim land (cf. LEMU 2011: 3).

As daughters, unmarried women have access to land in their maiden homes which they are entitled to use for cultivation. In most cases, nevertheless, the land used does not belong to the unmarried girl, but to the family as a

whole. Once she gets married and leaves her natal family, the land cultivated by her will be used by someone else.

Upon marriage, a woman moves to her husband's home where she is allocated a piece of land to provide for herself and her children. In all districts visited, customary marriage requires the husband to pay brideprice to his wife's family. Depending on the agreement between the spouses' families, it is mostly paid in cash and livestock. Due to increasing poverty the payment of brideprice is nowadays often spread out over a long period of time; even though strictly speaking, this means that the couple is not yet married but merely cohabiting, they generally consider themselves husband and wife irrespective of whether or not the payment of brideprice has actually been completed (cf. M/FGD4, M/KI2, A/FGD3).

In the event of widowhood, women are free to choose whether they want to stay with the late husband's family or return to their maiden homes. In practice, however most widows prefer to remain in the matrimonial home to continue the cultivation of their fields. A widow only has to leave the deceased husband's family if she decides to remarry as from that point on she will be able to access land in her new husband's home with the land cultivated by her during the first marriage being left for her children (cf. M/FGD2, A/FGD6, N/FGD1). Whereas in Mbale and Apac widow inheritance is still practiced, the custom is unheard of in Ntungamo. Making a widow one of her late husband's brother's wife, the underlying purpose of this customary institution is to ensure women's continuing rights of use of the land they have been cultivating throughout their marriage (cf. Adoko/Levine 2008: 108f.). In Apac and Mbale the prevalence of the practice varies from one village to another. While generally on the decline, mostly due to the spread of HIV/AIDS (cf. M/FGD2, A/FGD4, A/FGD5), widow inheritance is still commonly practiced in some communities (cf. M/FGD4, A/FGD3, A/FGD6). Where the practice is still prevalent, it was generally emphasized that widows are free to decide whether or not they want to be "inherited" at all and if so by whom.

In case of divorce or separation a woman usually has no choice, but to return to her maiden home where she is given a piece of land by her parents or brothers. Her children remain on their father's land unless they are still too small to be separated from their mother. In some communities, however, a woman may be allowed to remain on the matrimonial land

depending on the circumstances of the divorce or separation (cf. M/FGD3, A/FGD3).

#### *Donation and Inheritance*

While access by virtue of family membership certainly remains the most common way for women to access land, an increasing number of females are acquiring land also by means of inheritance or donation. This is quite remarkable given that in patrilineal societies, as they are found in Uganda, customary land is usually traced through the male line and passed on from father to son. In fact, girls are hardly ever considered in the distribution of family land due to the assumption that they will leave their natal family upon marriage and be given land by their husbands (cf. Ovonji-Odida et al. 2000: 20). However, due to increasing marriage instability and the perception that girls are more reliable in the maintenance of property than boys, customary inheritance practices are slowly changing with land increasingly being passed on to daughters as well (cf. Bibaako/Ssenkumba 2003: 249f.).

This was also confirmed by men and women consulted in Mbale, Apac and Ntungamo. Whether or not land is actually allocated to girls in their natal homes depends on the individual family. In some cases parents distribute land to unmarried daughters only, while others keep land also for those who have already left the family to provide for them in the event of divorce or separation (cf. M/FGD4, A/FGD3, A/FGD5, A/FGD6). The amount of land given to girls usually varies according to the number of boys in the family and the overall availability of land (cf. M/KI1, A/FGD5, N/FGD1). In Ntungamo, where inheritance by daughters is still very rare, girls are more likely to be given land if there are no sons in the family (cf. N/FGD1). However, the shares allocated to daughters are in most cases considerably smaller than those distributed to their brothers (cf. M/FGD1, M/FGD2, A/FGD2, N/KI1). In fact, sometimes only one plot of land is retained for all the girls in the family whereas every son receives his own separate share (cf. N/FGD1).

While land is increasingly passed on to daughters as well it is still uncommon for a husband to bequeath land to his wife, although three female respondents in Apac reported that they had been considered in their

husbands' wills and inherited a piece of matrimonial land (cf. A/FGD2, A/FGD4, A/FGD5).

### *Purchase and Borrowing*

In an environment of increasing land scarcity and progressing monetarization of local economies access to land is increasingly achieved also by means of purchase (cf. M/FGD4, M/KI2, A/KI1, A/KI1, N/KI1, N/KI2). The progressive commercialization of land has often been said to be particularly beneficial to women given that, ideally, land markets allocate according to purchasing power and not along gender lines. Hence the option to purchase land, so the argument goes, provides an avenue through which women can circumvent the customary mechanisms of land acquisition that tend to favor men and own land in their own right (cf. Chimwohu/Woodhouse 2006: 361, Lastarria-Cornhiel 2003: 6). However, the reality on the ground is somewhat different. Despite the fact that the Ugandan Constitution provides for gender equality in respect to the acquisition and holding of land, the majority of women in Uganda have not been able to benefit from the emerging land markets (cf. Bomuhangi/Doss/Meinzen-Dick 2011: 6). This is mostly due to the fact that “often women enter the market system with no property, little cash income, minimum political power, and a family to maintain.” (Lastarria-Cornhiel 1997: 1326)

In fact, women in most communities confirmed that with agriculture being their main source of income they often lack the financial means to actually purchase land from the market. Adding to that, in the case of married women it is usually the husband who controls the family income; consequently, the majority of land purchases have been made by male family heads (cf. M/FGD4, A/FGD1). In most cases, however, women considerably contribute to the land purchases undertaken by male heads of household providing both cash and labor. Nevertheless, their contribution is hardly ever formally acknowledged as the sales agreement is usually in the husband's name with the wife's name listed only as a witness, if at all (cf. A/FGD3, A/FGD6, N/FGD1, N/FGD2). In Apac, on the contrary, it was noted that where the family seeks additional land to expand the matrimonial home, couples are increasingly purchasing land jointly with



both their names on the sales agreement (cf. A/FGD1, A/FGD2, A/FGD3, A/FGD6).

Although it is still uncommon for rural women to purchase land independently, in all districts visited a few female respondents had managed to muster the resources necessary to buy their own piece of land. While some of them had benefitted from monetary employment, most of them had raised money digging in other people's gardens, selling livestock as well as food and crops derived from family land (cf. M/FGD2, A/FGD2, A/FGD3, A/FGD4, A/FGD6, N/FGD1, N/FGD2).

Whereas single women are relatively free to transact in land, married women often cannot enter the land market without their husbands' approval (cf. M/FGD2, N/FGD1). According to Tamale (2004: 58) this is due to the fact that in most patriarchal societies even where women have managed to leave the domestic sphere and enter into monetary employment, "men still take control of [their] finances and have the final say on how they are to be used."

Social judgment is another constraint limiting many married women in their attempts to enter the land market as wives seeking to purchase their own land are often viewed as having the sinister intention of escaping their marriage and entertaining other men (cf. UWONET 2003, qtd. in Tripp 2004: 11f.). This social pressure has led many women to the conclusion that, as wives, they have "no right to purchase land in their own benefit." (N/FGD1) In light of the reservations against married women buying their own land, it is not surprising that it is mostly single women that have been able to take advantage of the land market. As a matter of fact, the majority of women in the communities consulted who had managed to purchase land independently were widowed, divorced or separated (cf. M/FGD2, A/FGD2, A/FGD4, A/FGD6, N/FGD1, N/FGD2). Whereas there is less social pressure on single women, many of them are still facing enormous difficulties when trying to access the land market. Especially women who have a family to maintain often find it difficult to withdraw their labor from subsistence production in order to accumulate the money necessary to purchase additional land (cf. M/FGD2, N/FGD1).

Borrowing is another means by which women gain access to land, particularly if they lack the financial means to buy their own piece of land. In many cases women choose to enter into so-called sharecropping

arrangements, meaning that, instead of paying rent in cash, the agricultural produce derived from the borrowed land is shared between the woman and the land owner (cf. N/FGD1, N/KI1). It needs to be pointed out, however, that women entering into such informal arrangements are often faced with high levels of tenure insecurity considering that the land owner usually has the power to terminate the contract at any time (cf. Bibaako/Ssenkumba 2003: 255).

### Control over Land

Access to land does not necessarily guarantee a person's control over the land used given that, in practice, access, use and decision-making rights to family land are often held by different family members. In fact, contrary to the longstanding policy assumption that households are units of congruent interests in which all rights and resources are shared equally, there are significant power inequalities between male and female family members affecting both property relations and decision-making processes at household level (cf. Agarwal 1997: 3f., Rugadya 2007: 3). These power imbalances also manifest themselves in the varying degrees of control exerted by different family members over the land cultivated by them and the agricultural produce derived from it.

### *Use of Land and Agricultural Produce*

Marital status does not only determine a woman's access rights to land but also affects her decision-making power over land and the production process.

In regard to what gets grown on matrimonial land, married women in Mbale and Apac usually decide jointly with their husbands, although some of them are free to decide by themselves. Only in rare cases is the decision solely the husband's (cf. M/FGD1, M/FGD2, A/FGD6). In many households the upward trend towards mutual consultation and joint responsibility between spouses in the production process is also reflected in the dynamics of decision-making concerning the agricultural produce. However, even though it is becoming increasingly common for husband and wife to decide jointly over the harvest by mutual consent, the ultimate decision-making power still lies with the husband who is generally free to decide whether or not to include his wife in the decision-making process. In fact, some women

noted that even in families where decisions are usually taken jointly by both spouses, husbands may still go ahead and sell the agricultural produce without their wife's consent, while women feel they have no right to the same (cf. M/FGD1, A/FGD2, A/FGD3, A/FGD5, A/FGD6).

In Ntungamo, mutual consultation and joint decision-making of both spouses are still uncommon and in some cases even totally unheard of. Actually, the majority of married women consulted reported to be denied any right to take part in decision-making processes at household level and to have little choice but to follow their husband's instructions. Even in families where women are included in land-related decisions it was generally emphasized that the husband still has the final say (cf. N/FGD1, N/FGD2, N/FGD3).

As opposed to married women, widows, divorcees and separated women in all communities visited are relatively free to decide what crops to plant on their land and how to go about the marketing of their agricultural produce. Indeed, only a few widows in Ntungamo stated that their decisions are subject to the approval of the deceased husband's brothers (cf. N/FGD1, N/FGD3). It is, however, common for single women to include their adult children or parents in their decisions (cf. A/FGD2, A/FGD3, A/FGD5, A/FGD6, N/FGD2).

In the case of young girls that have not yet married it is predominantly the parents who decide what gets grown on the land cultivated by their daughters. Accordingly, the control over the agricultural produce and the proceeds derived from it also lies with the parents (cf. M/FGD1, A/FGD3, A/FGD5, N/FGD1).

Apart from their marital status, the mode by which the cultivated land was acquired is another relevant factor affecting women's decision-making power. Women who have purchased land in their own name are generally free to decide over the land and the agricultural produce, although some choose to include their children in their decisions (cf. M/FGD2, A/FGD2, A/FGD4, A/FGD6, N/FGD1, N/FGD2). Nevertheless, where a given piece of land has been purchased jointly by both spouses the husband is again in the more powerful position (cf. M/FGD2, N/FGD1).

*Allocation of Land*

As already indicated earlier on, customary land is normally handed down from father to son. Whereas customary practice on the ground is slowly changing with land increasingly being given to daughters as well, the allocative power over land is still vested in the same person. In fact, in all districts visited, the allocation of land to children has remained the sole responsibility of the male family head who is usually free to decide whether or not to include his wife or other family members in his decisions. Only where a family head dies intestate, the responsibility for the allocation of land usually devolves upon the widow, provided that she remains on the matrimonial land after her husband's death (cf. A/FGD4, N/FGD2). In Ntungamo, however, some widows are still required to seek the approval of their late husband's family before any land can be allocated to their children (cf. N/FGD2).

While married, women usually have no allocative power over family land, including the piece of land allocated to them upon marriage. In fact, there is an unvoiced assumption that the land used by them will automatically revert to their husbands or children upon their death. Only women who have purchased or titled land in their own name can freely dispose of their land as desired (cf. M/FGD4, A/FGD4, N/FGD3).

*Alienation of Land*

Land sales are increasingly taking place also within the customary sphere. Since arable land is becoming scarce, the income derived from agriculture is often too meager to cover basic household expenses. With the spread of HIV/AIDS further adding to the burdens of poverty, the sale of land is in many cases the only option left to meet urgent financial needs such as payment of bride price, school fees, medical bills and burial expenses (cf. M/FGD2, M/FGD3, A/FGD1, A/FGD3, A/FGD5, A/FGD6, A/KI1, N/FGD2, N/FGD3).

In all communities visited land sales are predominantly carried out by male family heads due to the general understanding that under custom "land belongs to men." While in Mbale and Ntungamo husbands are relatively free to engage in land transactions and often do so also without prior consultation of their wives or other family members, customary law in Apac imposes certain restrictions on sale of land. Considering that among the

Langi people the clan still exercises considerable authority over land, there is a strong perception that "land is for the clan." (A/FGD4) As a consequence, transactions taking place on clan land need to be sanctioned by the responsible clan authorities before they can be effected. However, where an intended land sale is based on a genuine reason, the clan is generally unlikely to withhold its consent (cf. A/FGD1, A/FGD2, A/FGD3, A/FGD4, A/FGD5, A/FGD6).

In all three districts visited there is a common mutual understanding that women cannot sell family land without the permission of a male family member (cf. M/FGD2, M/FGD4, N/FGD1, N/FGD2). In practice, however, women are only seldom granted the right to engage in land transactions. Actually, only a few women in Mbale were confident that in the case of an emergency their parents would allow them to sell part of the land used by them in the maiden home (cf. M/FGD2, M/FGD4).

#### Threats to Women's Land Rights and Tenure Security

As has been outlined earlier on, land ownership in the customary sense constitutes a form of stewardship that "comes with the responsibility to protect the land itself, and to protect the land rights of all those with a claim in that land" (LEMU 2008: 2). With increasing individualization of land rights, however, customary ownership has become increasingly confused with the Western concept of individual land ownership (cf. Adoko 2000: 2). In consequence, the people supposed to hold the land in trust for the whole family have turned themselves into individual land owners leaving weaker family members without protection and vulnerable to land rights abuse. This development has worked to the detriment of women in particular as they often lack both the social and physical strength to successfully defend their claims in land (cf. Adoko/Akin/Knight 2011: 2f.). To make matters worse, the protection originally granted to women under customary law has been significantly weakened as in the face of increasing land scarcity, rising land values and fierce competition for land social norms are frequently abandoned in favor of personal profit (cf. Adoko/Levine 2008: 106). In this context the very people responsible for safeguarding a woman's interests in land are often the ones depriving her of her land rights (cf. LEMU 2009: 3). How this situation plays out in practice and how this has affected women of differing marital status will now be discussed in more detail.

*Widows*

Under custom there is an inherent assumption that once married a woman will stay on the matrimonial land for the rest of her life, as, ideally, her interests in the husband's land are safeguarded also upon widowhood through the customary institution of widow inheritance (cf. Adoko/Akin/Knight 2011: 3). However, looking at the situation on the ground, it quickly turns out that the reality is somewhat different. Considering that in many communities in Mbale and Apac widow inheritance is no longer practiced while in Ntungamo it is generally unheard of, the customary protection once granted to widows has largely been eroded (cf. M/FGD2, A/FGD3, A/FGD5). At the same time, no alternative practice has yet taken its place, leaving numerous widows in a position that “customary law did not previously encounter – unmarried, and within the clan, although not of it.” (Adoko/Levine 2005: 41). As a consequence, a widow's possibility to stay on the matrimonial land has come to depend a great deal upon her personal relationship with her in-laws (cf. M/FGD2, A/FGD1, N/FGD3).

In most cases, only few widows remaining in their marital homes are able to go on with their lives undisturbed. In fact, in an environment of increasing land scarcity where competition for land is fierce, they are increasingly falling victim to land grabbing as self-interested family members are trying to gain from their vulnerability. Affecting women disproportionately, land or property grabbing represents a form of gender-based violence “whereby an individual is forcibly evicted from her home by other family members, traditional leaders or neighbors, and is often unable to take her possessions with her.” (Izumi 2007: 12)

Property grabbing poses a serious threat to widows' tenure security also in Mbale, Ntungamo and Apac, especially if a widow does not have any sons as in this case the matrimonial land is usually inherited by one of the late husband's brothers (cf. M/FGD2, A/FGD1, A/FGD4, N/FGD3, N/KI2). In Rose's case, however her brothers-in-law could not be stopped from taking her land regardless of the fact that she is mother of two minor sons who both have hereditary claims to their father's land.

“Immediately after her husband's death, Rose's brothers-in-law turned against her and took over her matrimonial land, leaving Rose and her children confined to the matrimonial house. When

she tried to challenge them, they threatened to hurt her and her children if they ever dared to set foot on the land again. Subjecting Rose to constant harassment, her brothers-in-law eventually managed to drive her out of the matrimonial home. Scared and intimidated, Rose remained silent and left without taking any further action. She is now staying on a piece of land her husband had previously purchased. The land is, however, too small to properly provide for her and her children." (cf. A/FGD3)

Repeated intimidation of the victim is one of the most powerful tools employed by land grabbers. As could be seen in Rose's case, the psychological damage caused by constant harassment and abuse "erodes a woman's self-esteem, inhibiting her ability to defend herself to take action against her abuser." (Izumi 2007: 11) In many cases, this situation is further exacerbated by the lack of social support from the victim's personal environment. In fact, in light of the high prevalence of violence in land disputes witnesses to land and property grabbing are often too intimidated to testify against the perpetrator before a judge or any other local authority (cf. M/FGD1, M/FGD3, A/FGD1, A/FGD3, N/FGD3).

Some land grabbers, however, abstain from using threats of violence and resort to more subtle strategies to force their victim off her land. Sometimes, for instance, in-laws may pretend to assist the widow in the cultivation of her field and then, at the time of harvest, simply refuse to return to the part of the land cultivated by them (cf. N/FGD3). Christine's brother-in-law, on the other hand, slowly took over her land by gradual encroachment.

"While still alive, Christine's husband lent a small piece of land to one of his brothers for cultivation. After her husband's death, however, the brother started taking more and more land, slowly moving the boundary and encroaching upon Christine's field. When confronting him, she was told that she had no rights in his family's land given that "she never brought any land into her matrimonial home." Thereupon, Christine took the case to the clan leaders who have not yet reached a decision on the matter. However, in view of the fact that she is claiming clan land she is not optimistic that the clan will decide in her favor." (cf. A/FGD4)

The use of excuses to justify a widow's dispossession of her land is rather common as the family members involved often feel they need to provide an

explanation for their actions. Evictions may be “justified” on grounds of a widow's refusal to be inherited, her being childless or, as in Christine's case, her not having “brought any land into her matrimonial home” (cf. M/FGD2, A/FGD1, A/FGD4). For the most part, however, the excuses put forward are completely invalid as both men and women in the communities consulted emphasized that widows have the right to remain in their marital homes to continue the cultivation of their fields.

It was generally argued that widows enjoy higher levels of tenure security where they have been considered in the husband's will – provided that the will is actually respected and followed (cf. M/FGD2, M/KI4, A/FGD2, A/FGD4, N/FGD1, N/FGD3, N/KI1).

“When Peace's husband died of HIV/AIDS her in-laws refused to show her the will her husband had left and quickly took over the entire marital property including the land Peace had been cultivating during marriage. After all her attempts to reach an agreement with her late husband's family had failed she wanted a judge to decide over the matter, but unfortunately she could not afford the court fees. Meanwhile her in-laws have pledged the matrimonial land to secure a bank loan. Should they default on the loan, Peace has no hope to get her land back. (cf. N/FGD3)

While most widows subject to land rights abuse have their land grabbed by their in-laws, some fall victim also to their own children or those of their co-wives, especially in families where land is scarce and a lot of sons are competing for their father's land (cf. M/FGD4, A/FGD3, A/FGD6, N/FGD3). Once driven out of their marital homes many widows find themselves in a precarious situation as they are often unlikely to find enough land for themselves in their maiden homes, especially if their brothers have already started their own families and need the land to provide for their own wives and children (cf. M/FGD1, A/FGD1, A/FGD3, A/FGD4, N/FGD3). For widows the resulting landlessness is often particularly devastating, especially if alternative income opportunities are scarce. Given that their chances of remarrying are declining with age and the spread of HIV/AIDS, they often have little choice but to assume sole responsibility for the maintenance of their families. As a result, without access to land widows often struggle to properly provide for themselves and their children, let alone cover basic household expenses such as school fees and medical bills.



Therefore, in a society where people depend on land-related activities for their livelihoods depriving a widow of her land is in most cases tantamount to pushing her and her children even further into poverty (cf. A/FGD4, N/FGD1, N/FGD3).

#### *Divorced and Separated Women*

Divorced or separated women usually have no choice but to leave the matrimonial home and return to their natal families given that, unlike widows, they cannot lay any customary claims to their husbands' or partners' land once the relationship has ended. As a consequence, upon divorce or separation a woman is crucially dependent on her maiden family for access to land. Custom requires a woman's parents or brothers to provide for a returning daughter or sister; in a context of increasing land scarcity, however, family members are often reluctant to share their land. In fact, only a few women in all districts visited were confident that they would be given land in their maiden homes upon divorce or separation (cf. M/FGD4, A/FGD3, A/FGD5, A/FGD6, N/FGD2).

Generally, a woman's possibility to return to her natal home depends on a number of factors – whether or not her parents are still alive, the number of children following her to the maiden home and the reason for her divorce. Where the woman's parents are still alive, her likelihood of being accepted back into the family is much higher as parents are more likely to sympathize with their daughter than the rest of the family. In cases where the parents have died and all of the family land has already been divided among the (male) children, there is only little hope for women to be allocated their own piece of land. Especially if brothers have already started their own families, land is unlikely to be shared with a returning sister and her children (cf. M/FGD2, A/FGD3, N/FGD1, N/FGD2).

The number of children following the mother to her maiden home is another critical determinant of a woman's ability to access land in her natal family. In view of the fact that sons leaving their father's home are likely to lose their hereditary claims to his land, the divorcee's family is often concerned that in the end they will be the ones responsible for securing the children's access to land if they cannot go back to their father's place. Therefore, the more children a divorced or separated woman is taking with her, the smaller her chance of getting land in the natal home (cf. M/FGD2,

A/FGD1, A/FGD2, A/FGD4, N/FGD1). In Bwongyera, Ntungamo, it was furthermore noted that some parents will first consider the reasons for the divorce before deciding whether or not to allow their daughter to access land in the maiden home again (cf. N/FGD1).

Divorcees or separated women who have been denied access to land in their maiden homes are often forced to find an alternative source of income in order to purchase or rent a piece of land for themselves and escape landlessness.

“When Betty returned to her maiden home upon separation, most of the family land had already been divided among her brothers who made it clear right from the beginning that they would not be able to share any land with her. Taking up casual work opportunities, Betty eventually managed to muster the funds necessary to buy herself a piece of land for settlement. However, the land purchased is too small to be used for agricultural purposes. Unable to afford an additional plot of land, Betty is now crucially dependent on her friends in the village for access to arable fields.” (cf. A/FGD6)

Even in cases where divorced or separated women have been accepted back into their natal families, their chances of actually living undisturbed on the land allocated to them are often slim. Their vulnerability to land rights abuse is particularly high once their parents have died (cf. M/FGD4, A/FGD1, A/FGD2, A/FGD3, A/FGD4, A/FGD5, A/FGD6, N/FGD1, N/FGD2).

“Upon separation Lilian was allocated a small piece of land by her father. However, ever since her father's death her brothers have been trying to force her off the land constantly harassing her and encroaching upon her field. They have been telling her to return to her husband's home regardless of the fact that the separation was over ten years ago. At one point, her brothers even claimed that Lilian had been adopted and therefore did not have any rights in her father's land. Fortunately, however, owing to the support received from the rest of the family, Lilian has so far managed to remain on her land. (cf. A/FGD2)

While most separated and divorced women lose land to their brothers, some have their land taken also by other male relatives.

“As her father had bequeathed her a piece of land, Gloria faced no difficulties when moving back to her natal home after her divorce. However, upon her return she found out that one of her half-brother's sons had taken part of her land and was unwilling to give it back. When all of Gloria's attempts to reach an agreement with her nephew failed, she reported the matter to the clan. After the clan's intervention, the nephew started to get even more aggressive and threatened Gloria to kill her if she took any further action. In order to demonstrate his power and determination to drive Gloria out of her home he even started to graze his animals on her land to destroy her harvest. To make matters worse, the nephew stabbed one of Gloria's brothers when he wanted to hire out part of the family land. Although the case was taken to the police, it was not followed up based on the fact that it was a “family issue”. Meanwhile, the nephew has started to plant mango trees on Gloria's land; however, due to the recent events she has not dared to confront him about it. (cf. A/FGD2)

Gloria's case clearly demonstrates just how violent land disputes can get and gives an explanation for why so many women are oftentimes reluctant to report their cases to local authorities.

In face of the risks and difficulties frequently experienced by women trying to return to their maiden homes upon divorce or separation many married women feel that they have no choice but to stay married, come what may. As one woman in Bumbobi, Mbale, put it, “[w]hen you go back [to the natal home] they say, you got married, there is no land here for you. So you stay married. If you don't, where to go? [...] [Y]ou will end up in slums!” (M/FGD1)

### *Married Women*

A married woman's vulnerability to land rights abuse stems primarily from power imbalances in decision-making processes at household level. In an attempt to strengthen women's bargaining power within the marital home Section 39 (1) of the Land Act prohibits a person from engaging in any transaction in respect of family land without the prior consent of the resident spouse.

In practice, however, only few women have benefitted from the so-called consent clause. In point of fact, women in all three districts visited reported that husbands frequently rent out or sell off parts of family land without their wives' consent and sometimes even without their knowledge. The latter is particularly common if the money gained is spent on alcohol or other women (cf. M/FGD1, M/FGD3, A/FGD2, N/FGD2, N/FGD3, N/KI1). In the rare cases where consent is sought, it is not always given voluntarily – on the contrary, initially withheld consent is oftentimes coerced (cf. M/KI1, A/KI1, N/KI1). Especially in Ntungamo it was noted that women trying to get in the way of their husbands' plans are likely to fall victim to domestic violence or might even be divorced as a punishment (cf. N/FGD2, N/FGD3, N/KI1). Women's lack of bargaining power is particularly alarming in view of the fact that it is mostly them who suffer the consequences of land sales as the land sold is rarely the husband's.

“Teddy and Edith's husband frequently engages in land transactions and has already sold off a considerable part of family land without prior consultation of his wives. According to him most of the land was sold in order to pay for the children's school fees. As a result of the growing land scarcity within the family, Teddy and Edith are now forced to share one plot of land, even though they once used to cultivate separate fields. They are worried that, if any more land is sold, they might no longer be able to properly provide for their children. At the same time, however, they feel that they lack the authority to actually challenge their husband in his decisions.” (cf. M/FGD1)

While land sales certainly constitute a major factor contributing to women's land loss in the marital homes, they are not the only threat to women's tenure security during marriage. Married and cohabiting women also become vulnerable to land rights abuse when their husbands decide to take another wife as in most cases the husband will take land from his first wife to provide for the second one, especially if he cannot afford to acquire an additional plot of land.

It is, however, not solely the first wife that is likely to have her land rights violated in a polygynous marriage. Once on the matrimonial land, the wives following the first one are often faced with even higher levels of tenure insecurity, particularly when the first wife's children come of age and start

claiming land in their father's home. Accordingly, where family land is scarce, second and third wives frequently find themselves threatened by the first wife's adult sons trying to take their land. The likelihood of a married woman actually having her land grabbed is particularly high in cases where the land cultivated by her now was initially the first wife's (cf. A/FGD3, A/FGD6, N/FGD1, N/FGD2).

“At the time when Esther's husband took her as his second wife, she was allocated part of his first wife's land for cultivation. Shortly after Esther gave birth to her only child, the first wife died leaving behind five children that Esther has been taking care of ever since. Recently, however, the two eldest sons of the deceased wife have started to disturb Esther, threatening to throw her out of the house and denying her access to the land she has been cultivating. Arguing that initially the land belonged to their mother, they are now claiming it for themselves.” (cf. N/FGD2)

Interestingly enough, not all potential threats to a married woman's tenure security originate from within her matrimonial home. In fact, married women having acquired rights to their fathers' land by virtue of donation or inheritance are vulnerable to land grabbing also in their maiden homes, especially if they are staying far away from their natal families (cf. M/FGD4, M/KI3, A/FGD1, A/FGD3, A/FGD6, N/FGD2).

“Before Ophelia got married her father allocated her a piece of his land. Upon the father's death however, Ophelia's brother quickly took over her field claiming that she had no right to any land in her maiden home as she had left the family long before to stay with her husband. By the time she managed to confront her brother in person, he had already sold off the land her father had given to her. Ophelia did not hesitate to take the matter before a judge. In court, however, she could not be helped as the buyer had already titled the land in his name while Ophelia did not have any papers to prove her ownership.” (cf. M/KI3)

### *Unmarried women*

Under custom, a woman who remains unmarried has the right to be given a piece of her father's land for her personal use. However, in her case there is no “trigger event”, such as marriage for sons, to ensure that she will

actually be allocated land. Considering that “not marrying” does not constitute a definite event, unmarried daughters are often not taken into account when family land is distributed due to the expectation that they will eventually get married and be provided for by their husbands (cf. Adoko/Akin/Knight 2011: 4).

Yet, while their parents are still alive unmarried women generally enjoy relatively secure access and use rights to their fathers' land. Once their parents have died, however, they often experience high levels of tenure insecurity as inheritance of land by daughters is still uncommon. As a consequence, family land is usually divided among the sons only, leaving unmarried women at the mercy of their brothers or other male relatives taking over the management of family land. The maintenance of good relations with male family members is therefore crucial if an unmarried woman is to enjoy continuing access to land in her maiden home after her parent's death. Otherwise, her lack of control over family land is likely to result in her undoing (cf. M/FGD1, A/FGD1, A/FGD2, A/FGD3, A/FGD6, N/FGD2, N/FGD3).

“Phiona lost both her parents while still in school. When her only brother died shortly after their parent's death, Phiona went to stay with her uncle. After completing senior four, she went back to her parent's home where she was taken in by her half-brothers and given a piece of land for cultivation. Continuing with school, she managed to do her A-levels, but the family lacked the financial means to send her to university. When Phiona suggested selling or renting out part of the land she had been using in her parent's home to raise the money needed for her education, her half-brothers immediately turned down her request. She kept on begging them until one day she was thrown off the family land without any warning. Now Phiona is staying with extended family, landless and destitute.” (cf. N/FGD3)

Nonetheless, it is not only daughters who were not considered in the distribution of family land that are prone to land rights abuse. On the contrary, even women who have been allocated a piece of land in their maiden homes are frequently falling victim to land grabbing by brothers, uncles and male cousins. Especially where there are a lot of sons competing

for their father's land, the women in the family are usually the first ones to lose out, as can be illustrated by Scoviah's case.

“Scoviah's father allocated his daughter two small pieces of land – one to build her house on and one for cultivation. Shortly after his death, however, Scoviah's brothers called in a clan meeting during which all of the family land, including the plots Scoviah had previously been allocated, was distributed solely among the sons of the deceased. When confronting her brothers, she was told that she could continue the cultivation of her field until she got married. The other piece of land on which Scoviah had been building her house was, however, immediately taken over by one of her brothers. With the support of a few women in her community Scoviah managed to take the case to court, but so far the judges have not yet reached a decision.” (cf. M/FGD4)

Scoviah's case clearly indicates that a deceased's will does not necessarily provide unmarried women with the desired protection, especially if the sons in the family feel disadvantaged.

In Mbale and Apac, it was pointed out that unmarried women are even more vulnerable to land rights violations if they did not grow up on their father's land – either because they were born out of wedlock or because they followed their mother to her maiden home upon divorce or separation. Given that in patrilineal societies unmarried girls are supposed to gain access to land through their fathers, their mothers' families are often reluctant to share with them, even more so if family land is scarce. At the same time their fathers are oftentimes unwilling to accept them back into their families, especially where they have lived away from them for too long (cf. M/FGD2, A/FGD2, A/FGD4, A/FGD5). The actual severity of the situation becomes obvious when looking the example of Enin's daughter.

“Shortly after her husband had taken another wife, Enin separated from him and returned to her natal family taking all her three children with her. A couple of years later, Enin's eldest daughter tried to go back to her father's home as there was no land for her in her mother's family. However, once on her father's land she was constantly abused by his wife and her children. At one point, they took all her clothes and burned them in front of their house. Scared and humiliated, the daughter eventually returned to her

mother's family. In view of what has happened to her daughter Enin is worried that if she dies her children will be chased off the land and won't have anywhere to go as they belong neither here nor there." (cf. A/FGD2)

The case of Enin's daughter clearly shows that women who did not grow up on their fathers' land often find themselves caught between their fathers' and mothers' families, neither of which feel responsible for safeguarding their access to land.

### **Competing Legal Systems and Land Rights Protection on the Ground – What is Going Wrong?**

The ongoing abuse of women's land rights inevitably raises the question of what is going wrong; why has the new land law failed to reach women on the ground?

Judging by the legal environment prevailing in Uganda victims of land grabbing should be sufficiently catered for in terms of land rights protection and unimpeded access to justice. The newly established land management institutions were designed to operate from district to sub-county level and should therefore be easily accessible to the majority of Ugandans, one would assume. The practical reality, however, looks somewhat different. Even more than ten years after the enactment of the land reform program the newly created system of land management is still far from functioning. Due to financial and human resource constraints many of the prescribed administrative bodies have either not yet been established or are so underfunded and understaffed that they are hardly operational (cf. Adams/Palmer 2007: 59, Joireman 2007: 472f.).

Where land management institutions are in place their members often lack the legal training necessary to adequately carry out the tasks at hand and therefore sometimes fail to properly apply the new legislation (cf. Mwebaza/Sebina-Zziwa 2005: 21, OAG 2011: 32ff.). Moreover, given that most land officials are only poorly remunerated, the costs associated with their work are frequently transferred to clients who are often in no position to raise the money requested (cf. IOM; UNDP; NRC 2010: 42). The problem of poor remuneration has furthermore created a fertile ground for corruption, rendering the services provided by many institutions



unaffordable to the majority of Ugandans (cf. Mwebaza/Sebina-Zziwa 2005: 30). In light of this it is not surprising that only few people have been able to actually benefit from the newly created system of land administration. In fact, next to no certificates of customary ownership have been issued so far and not one communal land association has been set up in the country (cf. Adoko/Levine 2008: 114, OAG 2011: 43).

Unfortunately, the state of Uganda's land justice delivery system is currently no better. Corruption and bribery are common also among LC court<sup>3</sup> members, and so is the absence of adequate skills and knowledge. In fact, when deciding on a case LC Courts often draw on a "mixture" of customary norms and statutory provisions and sometimes bills that Parliament has not even passed yet. It is therefore not uncommon for legal provisions to be applied in the wrong context or to be adapted so as to fit a specific case at hand (cf. Ahikire 2011: 26ff., IOM; UNDP; NRC 2010: 34). This selective application of different laws has put women at a significant disadvantage, particularly in land-related cases where LC Courts are to apply local custom. Due to their inadequate knowledge of customary law, court members are just as susceptible to the misconceptions of customary land ownership as anyone else (cf. LEMU 2009a: 2). Following the prevailing assumption that under customary tenure "land belongs to men", LC Court more often than not fail to acknowledge women's customary rights in land and, consequently, rule in favor of the male party to the conflict (cf. Adoko/Levine 2005: 37, Eilor/Giovarelli 2002: 18)

However, these are not the only obstacles faced by women trying to pursue their land rights in court. Due to the fact that LC courts are frequently staffed with local community members, court members and conflict parties are often familiar with each other and sometimes even maintain personal relationships. In a male-dominated institutional environment this has put women at a significant disadvantage as the predominantly male court members are generally reluctant to rule against a fellow clan man or meddle in their friend's family problems (cf. Ahikire 2011: 31). Thus, it is not

---

<sup>3</sup> Due to financial and human resource constraints funding to District Land Tribunals was stopped in 2006 with the pending cases handed over to Chief Magistrate Courts. At sub-district level the Local Council (LC) courts were reinstated and are now the first points of reference for land disputes on customary land (cf. Adams/Palmer 2007: 59, Ahikire 2011: 12).

uncommon for women trying to report their husbands or brothers to local authorities to be told to go home and resolve the conflict themselves (cf. M/FGD1, A/FGD4, A/FGD5).

However, even where a court rules in favor of a female plaintiff, this does not necessarily imply that her struggle is over as courts often lack both the means and authority to actually enforce their decisions (cf. Adoko/Levine 2005a: 15). As a consequence, where a judgment is not respected, the woman affected often has no choice but to appeal to a higher court and have the original suit restarted (cf. LEMU 2009a: 3). However, in face of the high costs associated with a new court case most women will refrain from doing so (cf. M/KI2, A/FGD6, N/FGD2, N/FGD3, N/KI1).

In view of the common failure of courts to uphold and protect women's interests it is not surprising that many women are hesitant to take legal action against those depriving them of their land rights. Given that the main perpetrators of land grabbing from women are family and clan members, the pursuit of land rights in court is already risky business for the majority of women as “[g]oing to State courts against a clan member is not just expensive but socially unacceptable.” (LEMU 2009: 2). Notably, women taking a family member to court are not only faced with a high risk of domestic violence but sometimes even expelled from their communities or abandoned by their husbands (cf. Eilor/Giovarelli 2002: 18). In consequence, many women remain quiet given that in the absence of a strong and reliable justice system taking a land grabber to court may actually do more harm than good.

To make matters worse, it is not only the state institutions that are currently struggling to fulfill their roles; customary institutions are not properly functioning either. Even though customary authorities are formally recognized under the Land Act, the government has done next to nothing to support them in the performance of their functions – and this regardless of the fact that they remain responsible for the administration of more than 80% of land in Uganda (cf. Adams/Palmer 2007: 57). The state's reluctance to assist customary authorities is particularly alarming in view of the fact that in a context of rapid population growth, increasing individualization of land tenure and a growing number of land disputes the tasks associated with customary land administration have become increasingly complex – and require funds customary institutions currently lack. Therefore, many of

them have failed to meet the challenges presented by the changing environment and are no longer capable of effectively executing their work (cf. LEMU 2009b: 2, ULA 2010: 17). Adding to that, even where customary institutions are still operational they often lack the necessary authority to actually enforce their decisions over land-related matters and disputes (cf. ULA 2010: 19).

The problem of declining clan authority has further been exacerbated by the fact that the Land Act installed a parallel system of state courts for the adjudication of customary land disputes, instead of reinforcing the existing customary institutions it has formally recognized (cf. LEMU 2011: 3). As a result, customary authorities and local state courts are oftentimes confused about their actual responsibilities and do not know how to relate to each other. Uncertain about the legal status of judgments granted by customary fora, state courts often simply restart already adjudicated cases instead of hearing an appeal against the decision of the respective customary institution. In such an environment any person losing a case at a customary forum can simply ignore the judgment and turn to another court (cf. LEMU 2009c: 3). In many cases, however, customary authorities are circumvented altogether. Due to the fact that state law is generally considered superior to customary law people have been increasingly turning to representatives of state administration (who often do not even have the legal power to decide over land-related matters) instead of addressing the responsible customary authority (cf. Adoko/Levine 2005: 46, Ahikire 2011: 13f.).

In many communities the increasing circumvention of customary institutions has severely affected their functionality. In an environment where they are no longer respected and constantly undermined by allegedly superior state institutions, customary authorities have increasingly started to neglect their responsibilities and pursue their own interests instead of protecting those of the vulnerable (cf. LEMU 2009c: 3). In Mbale and Apac it was noted that corruption and bribery have become common also within the clan with traditional leaders frequently siding with the party willing to "financially reward" them for their services, rather than the one in the right. In addition to that, some women expressed the sentiment that customary authorities are essentially biased towards their own clan and therefore reluctant to rule against a fellow clan man (cf. M/FGD1, M/FGD4, A/FGD1, A/FGD2, A/FGD4, A/FGD5).

## Conclusion

Women fully enjoying their land rights are clearly the exception rather than the rule. However, contrary to common belief, the main threat to women's tenure security in the Ugandan context does not emanate from inadequate or discriminatory laws, but from the constant violation of the rights granted to them under both customary and state law. It could be seen that in an environment of fierce competition for land, men are increasingly taking advantage of their superior position within the patrilineal tenure system, ignoring their responsibilities and advancing their own interests at the expense of weaker – and in most cases female – family members. At the same time, neither customary nor state institutions are currently functioning; on the contrary, what people on the ground are left with is a multiplicity of uncoordinated institutions whose members have fallen prey to corruption, frequently protecting perpetrators rather than victims. A certain degree of strength and power have therefore become essential if one is to successfully defend their interests in land. In a context of highly unequal gender relations this has put women at a significant disadvantage as they often lack both the social ties and the financial capability necessary to assert their rights in a corrupt and male-dominated institutional environment.

The example of Uganda clearly illustrates that it is one thing to put in place a gender-sensitive legal framework, but it is quite another to implement it for the benefit of women. If tenure security for women is to be achieved in the near future the government will have to find a way to ensure that the relevant customary and statutory provisions safeguarding women's interests in land are actually enforced on the ground; “[t]he laws to protect women are there, but until the desire to implement them is there, they are meaningless” (Adoko/Levine 2008: 118) – as practice on the ground has made painfully clear.

## References

- Adams, Martin; Palmer, Robin. 2007. Independent Review of Land Issues, Volume III, 2006-2007, Eastern and Southern Africa. <http://www.sarpn.org/documents/d0002625/index.php> (19.10.2012).
- Adoko, Judy. 2000. The Impact of the Presumption that “Women do not own land” and

- the Uganda Land Act. [http://www.mokoro.co.uk/files/13/file/lria/impact\\_of\\_presumption\\_women\\_do\\_not\\_own\\_land.pdf](http://www.mokoro.co.uk/files/13/file/lria/impact_of_presumption_women_do_not_own_land.pdf) (15.10.2012).
- Adoko, Judy; Akin, Jeremy; Knight, Rachael. 2011. Understanding and Strengthening Women's Land Rights Under Customary Tenure in Uganda. [http://www.mokoro.co.uk/files/13/file/lria/strengthening\\_womenslandrights\\_under\\_customary\\_tenure\\_in\\_uganda.pdf](http://www.mokoro.co.uk/files/13/file/lria/strengthening_womenslandrights_under_customary_tenure_in_uganda.pdf) (21.10.2012).
- Adoko, Judy; Levine Simon. 2005. A Land Market for Poverty Eradication? A Case Study of the Impact of Uganda's Land Acts on Policy Hopes for Development and Poverty Eradication. Land and Equity Movement Uganda. <http://www.land-in-uganda.org/assets/A%20Land%20Market%20for%20Poverty%20Eradication.pdf> (21.10.2012).
- Adoko, Judy; Levine Simon. 2008. Falling Between Two Stools: How women's land rights are lost between state & customary law in Apac District, Northern Uganda. In: Englert, Birgit; Daley, Elizabeth (eds.). Women's Land Rights and Privatization in Eastern Africa. Oxford: James Currey, Nairobi: EAEP; Kampala: Fountain Publishers, 101-120.
- Adoko, Judy; Levine, Simon. 2005a. Land Rights: Where We are and Where We Need to Go. A review of the situation of land rights in Apac District in Uganda, and of opportunities for land rights protection work, based on the work of LEMU in 2003-4. <http://www.land-in-uganda.org/assets/Land-rights-in-Uganda-%20where-we-are-now-and-where-we-need-to-go-Sep-2005.pdf> (21.10.2012).
- Agarwal, Bina. 1997. Bargaining and Gender Relations: Within and Beyond the Household. Food Consumption and Nutrition Department Discussion Papers No. 27. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Ahikire, Josephine. 2011. Cutting the Coat According to the Cloth: Decentralization and Women's Agency on Land Rights in Uganda. Center for Basic Research (CBR), Working Paper No. 97/2011. Kampala: CBR.
- Bikaako, Winnie; Ssenkumba John. 2003. Gender, Land and Rights. Contemporary Contestations in Law, Policy and Practice in Uganda. In: Wanyeki, L. Muthoni (ed.). Women and Land in Africa: Culture, Religion and Realizing Women's Rights. London/New York: Zed Books, 232-277.
- Bomuhangi, Allan; Doss, Cheryl; Meinzen-Dick, Ruth. 2011. Who Owns the Land? Perspectives from Rural Ugandans and Implications for Land Acquisitions. International Food Policy Research Institute Discussion Paper 01136. <http://www.ifpri.org/sites/default/files/publications/ifpridp01136.pdf> (15.10.2012).
- Chimwohu, Admos; Woodhouse, Phil. 2006. Customary vs Private Property Rights? Dynamics and Trajectories of Vernacular Land Markets in Sub-Saharan Africa. In: Journal of Agrarian Change, Vol. 6, No. 3, 346-371.
- Constitution of the Republic of Uganda, 1995. [http://www.justice.go.ug/docs/constitution\\_1995.pdf](http://www.justice.go.ug/docs/constitution_1995.pdf) (15.10.2012).
- Eilor, Elizabeth; Giovarelli, Renee. 2002. Land Sector Analysis. Gender/Family Issues and Land Rights Component. Final Report, The Government of the Republic of Uganda. Grant No. PHRD/02/04. Rural Development Institute.

- [http://www.foodnet.cgiar.org/scrip/docs&databases/ifpristudies\\_ug\\_nonscrip/pdfs/Land\\_Sector\\_Analysis\\_2002/Gender-family%20issues%20and%20landrights%20component.pdf](http://www.foodnet.cgiar.org/scrip/docs&databases/ifpristudies_ug_nonscrip/pdfs/Land_Sector_Analysis_2002/Gender-family%20issues%20and%20landrights%20component.pdf) (19.10.2012).
- Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO). 2010. Uganda. Full Country Report. Gender and Land Rights Database. <http://www.fao.org/gender/landrights/report/> (21.10.2012).
- Hunt, Diana. 2004. Unintended Consequences of Land Rights Reform: The Case of the 1998 Uganda Land Act. In: *Development Policy Review*, Vol. 22, No. 2, 173-191
- International Organization for Migration (IOM); United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC). 2010. Land or Else: Land-Based Conflict, Vulnerability, and Disintegration in Northern Uganda. Uganda Human Rights Commission. <http://uganda.iom.int/documents/Land.Or.Else.Oct.2010.FINAL.pdf> (10.10.2012).
- Izumi, Kaori. 2007. Gender-Based Violence and Property Grabbing in Africa: A Denial of Women's Liberty and Security. In: *Gender & Development*, Vol. 15, No. 1, 11-23.
- Joireman, Sandra. 2007. Enforcing New Property Rights in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Ugandan Constitution and the 1998 Land Act. In: *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 39, No. 4, 463-480.
- Land and Equity Movement in Uganda (LEMU). 2008. Fighting the wrong battles? Towards a new paradigm in the struggle for women's land rights in Uganda. <http://land-in-uganda.org/assets/Fighting%20the%20Wrong%20Battles.pdf> (15.10.2012).
- Land and Equity Movement in Uganda (LEMU). 2009. How does Land Grabbing Happen? Policy Document. <http://www.land-in-uganda.org/assets/Policybrief1-How-does-land-grabbing-happen-26-9-2008.pdf> (15.10.2012).
- Land and Equity Movement in Uganda (LEMU). 2009a. Why is the Legal System Failing to Protect People's Land Rights? Policy Document. <http://www.land-in-uganda.org/assets/Policybrief3-Why-is-the-legal-system-failing-to-protect-land-rights-26-9-2009.pdf> (15.10.2012).
- Land and Equity Movement in Uganda (LEMU). 2009b. Why is Land Administration Failing to Protect Land Rights? Policy Document. <http://www.land-in-uganda.org/assets/Policybrief2-Why-is-land-administration-failing-to-protect-land-rights-26-9-2009.pdf> (15.10.2012).
- Land and Equity Movement in Uganda (LEMU). 2009c. Why is Customary Protection Failing to Prevent Land Grabbing? Policy Document. <http://www.land-in-uganda.org/assets/Policybrief4-Why-is-customary-tenure-failing-to-prevent-land-grabbing-26-9-2009.pdf> (15.10.2012).
- Land and Equity Movement in Uganda (LEMU). 2011. How Can We Turn Legal Anarchy into Harmonious Legal Pluralism? Why Integration is the Key to Legal Pluralism in Northern and Eastern Uganda. <http://www.land-in-uganda.org/assets/legalpluralismpaper-June,2011positionpaper,final.pdf> (21.10.2012).
- Lastarria-Cornhiel, Susana. 1997. Impact of Privatization on Gender and Property Rights

- in Africa. In: *World Development*, Vol. 25, No. 8, 1317-1333.
- Lastarria-Cornhiel, Susana. 2003. Uganda Country Brief: Property Rights and Land Markets. <http://minds.wisconsin.edu/handle/1793/23090> (15.10.2012).
- McAuslan, Patrick. 2003. A Narrative on Land Law Reform in Uganda. Lincoln Institute of Land Policy Conference Paper. [https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/809\\_McAuslan.pdf](https://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/809_McAuslan.pdf) (10.10.2012).
- Mugambwa, John. 2006. Principles of Land Law in Uganda. Kampala: Fountain Publishers.
- Mwebaza, Rose; Sebina-Zziwa, Abby. 2005. Challenges to District Land Boards in the First Five Years of their Existence. Reviewing the District Land Boards. Uganda Land Alliance. <http://ulaug.org/new/wp-content/uploads/reviewing-landboards-1.pdf> (19.10.2012).
- Nyakoojo, Evelyn. 2002. Women and Land Rights in Uganda. Kampala: Eastern African Sub-regional Support Initiative for the Advancement of Women.
- Obaikol, Esther. 2009. Women's Land Rights and the Law. The Legislative Framework Governing Women's Land Rights in Uganda. Kampala: Uganda Land Alliance
- Office of Auditor General (OAG). 2011. Value for Money Audit Report on the Functionality of Land Management Institutions in Uganda. [http://www.oag.go.ug/uploaded\\_files/1305700704Functionality%20of%20Land%20Management%20Institutions%20in%20Uganda.pdf](http://www.oag.go.ug/uploaded_files/1305700704Functionality%20of%20Land%20Management%20Institutions%20in%20Uganda.pdf) (19.10.2012).
- Ovonji-Odida, Irene et al. 2000. The Impact of Spousal Co-Ownership of the Primary Household Property. A Short Study Conducted for the Land-Act-Implementation Project. Incomplete First Draft Report. Kampala.
- Rugadya, Margaret. 2007. Gender in Uganda's National Land Policy. Issues, Theories and Policy Responses: Implications for Poverty Social Impact Assessment in Uganda. [http://www.mokoro.co.uk/files/13/file/lria/gender\\_in\\_uganda\\_national\\_land\\_policy.pdf](http://www.mokoro.co.uk/files/13/file/lria/gender_in_uganda_national_land_policy.pdf) (15.10.2012).
- Tamale, Sylvia. 2004. Gender Trauma in Africa: Enhancing Women's Links to Resources. In: *Journal of African Law*, Vol. 48, No. 1, 50-61.
- The Land Act Chapter 227, 1998. [http://www.mlhud.go.ug/index.php?option=com\\_docman&task=cat\\_view&gid=36&trm=345&Itemid=60&limitstart=20](http://www.mlhud.go.ug/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=36&trm=345&Itemid=60&limitstart=20) (21.10.2012).
- Tripp, Aili Mari. 2004. Women's Movements, Customary Law, and Land Rights in Africa: The Case of Uganda. In: *African Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 7, No. 4, 1-19.
- Uganda Land Alliance (ULA). 2010. Milestones Towards the Integration of Informal Justice Mechanisms into the Formal System. Findings from Amuru, Apac and Katakwi Districts. ULA Research Series 00/2010. <http://ulaug.org/new/wp-content/uploads/Milestones-towards-integration-of-formal-and-informal-justice-systems1.pdf> (21.10.2012).
- United Nations Development Programme in Uganda (UNDP). 2012. Gender & Women's Empowerment. <http://216.172.164.85/~undpor/index.php/what-we-do/gender-women-s-empowerment> (21.10.2012).

Walubiri, Peter Mukidi. 1994. Land and Property Rights. In: Wengi, Okumu (ed).  
 Founding the Constitution of Uganda; Essays and Materials. Kampala: Uganda  
 Law Watch, 148-176.

### List of Focus Group Discussions and Key Informant Interviews

#### Mbale

M/FGD1	Bumbobi Community	09.08.2011
M/FGD2	Lukhonge Community	10.08.2011
M/FGD3	Lukhonge Community	10.08.2011
M/FGD4	Nakaloke Community	11.08.2011
M/KI1	Women Concern Ministry	09.08.2011
M/KI2	Probation and Social Welfare Officer	11.08.2011
M/KI3	Land Officer	11.08.2011
M/KI4	Mbale Paralegals	12.08.2011

#### Apac

A/FGD1	Upper Center	13.08.2011
A/FGD2	Angayiki	13.08.2011
A/FGD3	Abany Iping	15.08.2011
A/FGD4	Aduku Senior	15.08.2011
A/FGD5	Abotaber Village	16.08.2011
A/FGD6	Amilo	16.08.2011
A/KI1	Probation and Social Welfare Officer	16.08.2011
A/KI2	LEMU Apac	16.08.2011

#### Ntungamo

N/FGD1	Bwongyera	24.08.2011
N/FGD2	Nyanga	25.08.2011
N/FGD3	Rubaare Town	25.08.2011
N/KI1	Probation and Social Welfare Officer	23.09.2011
N/KI2	Land Officer	24.08.2011