Lund University
Department of Political Science

STVK01
Tutor: Catia Gregoratti

Foreign direct investment in farmland in developing countries

– Accumulation by dispossession in Kenya

Astrid Tronarp

Acknowledgments

This Bachelor thesis was made possible through a Minor Field Study (MFS) scholarship from the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), which I am very grateful for. There are a number of persons I wish to express my sincere gratitude to. First, I would like to thank Charlotte Billgren, PhD at Linköping University, who mediated contacts in Kenya. These contacts have been invaluable in my fieldwork in Yala Swamp, Kenya. Many thanks to Dr Richard Abila at Kenya Marine and Fisheries Institute (KMFRI) in Kisumu for your kindness and help. I would also like to express my gratefulness to my field assistant, interpreter and driver, Robert Oketch at KMFRI, who was a great source of inspiration and gave me enormous support during my field studies. Additionally many thanks to the respondents from the local communities around Yala Swamp and the informants, which participated in this study. I would also like to thank my supervisor and tutor Catia Gregoratti, Post Doc at Lund University, for encouraging me to perform and complete this thesis. Thanks to all of you who have taken your precious time to comment on the language and structure of this thesis, it has been very helpful.

(Yala Swamp. Photo: Astrid Tronarp)

Abstract

There is a new accelerating trend of foreign direct investments (FDI) in farmland in developing countries. After recent crises in food and energy, as well as the financial and environmental crises, the demand for farmland has increased significantly. Powerful economic actors lease large areas of farmland outside their own national borders in order to secure access to food, energy and other supplies at home. The new trend of FDI is concentrated to developing countries in general, and to African countries in particular. There is an ongoing debate whether FDI generates development opportunities for the host country or leads to exploitation of the already poor. Powerful global institutions, within a neoliberal context, are promoting FDI and are describing it is an opportunity for developing countries to gain economic development. Because of the new trend of FDI, there is a large research gap in the field. This thesis aims to help filling the gap. The thesis analyzes how the local farmers have experienced a case of FDI in farmland in Yala Swamp, Kenya. A semi-structured approach, based on David Harvey's theory of accumulation by dispossession, was used to conduct interviews in Yala Swamp as a part of a Minor Field Study.

The study shows that the FDI in Yala Swamp is a clear illustration of accumulation by dispossession. The interviewees experience suppression of the commons, proletarianization, and overall imperial impacts on their lives and the environment contiguous to the swamp.

Key words: FDI, accumulation by dispossession, farmland, developing countries, Kenya
Words: 9953

List of abbreviations

FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FIAN	FoodFirst Information and Action Network
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
IFC	International Finance Corporation
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
KMFRI	Kenyan Marine and Fisheries Institute
KWF	Kenya Wetlands Forum
LBDA	Lake Basin Development Authority
MFS	Minor Field Study
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NEMA	National Environmental Management Authority
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
UN	United Nations
WB	World Bank
WTO	World Trade Organization

Table of contents

1 Introduction

There is a new and accelerating trend of foreign direct investment (FDI) in farmland in developing countries (Friis – Reenberg 2010:1, Shepard – Anuradha 2009:1-5), but land acquisition by foreign investors is not a new phenomenon. An early form of FDI is the colonization by European powers in America, Asia, Africa and the Pacific, which date back to the 19th century (Spieldoch – Murphy 2009:40). Recent crises in food, finance, energy and the environment have generated a shift of the perspectives on land ownership and the demand for farmland is increasing. Powerful economic actors lease large tracts of farmland outside their own national borders in order to secure access to food, energy and other supplies at home (Friis – Reenberg 2010:1). The actors are states, companies and private investors and their large-scale investments are characterized by different intentions and agendas (GRAIN 2008:2-8, Shepard – Anuradha 2009:2-5). The new trend of FDI in farmland is concentrated to developing countries in general and to African countries in particular, this due to the low land costs and the relatively low population density. The new investors are mostly newly rich countries such as the oil-rich but food insecure Gulf States. Western companies are also investing, commonly with the purpose to achieve comparative advantages and for bio-fuel production (Friis – Reenberg 2010:1, 6). According to the study performed by Friis and Reenberg in 2010 the magnitude of land deals in Africa between August 2008 and April 2010 was estimated to a minimum of 51,4 million hectares (ha) and a maximum of 63,1 million hectares (ha), compared with approximately 90,2 million football fields. The total number of land deals was 177 (Friis – Reenberg 2010:42). However, these figures are highly uncertain because of the lack of transparency.

Several global institutions, such as the World Bank (WB), World Trade Organization (WTO), International Finance Corporation (IFC) and institutions which fall under the UN, such as the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and even the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), believe that FDI in farmland is desirable for various reasons and a possible solution to the problem of global food insecurity (Shepard – Anuradha 2009:9, Lamb 2010:34-36, WTO 2010, African Research Bulletin 2010). Some of these institutions are very powerful actors in global governance, far beyond their own specific service areas (Murphy 2000:791). However, there is an ongoing debate whether FDI is a development opportunity or if it leads to exploitation of the world's poorest countries (see Cotula et al. 2009).

The new trend of FDI in farmland is a current and accelerating phenomenon but the academic research on the subject is still inadequate, even though it is increasing. There is a large research gap in the field that needs to be filled, and this thesis aims to help filling the gap. That, and the extension of the phenomenon,

makes it highly relevant to study the case from a scientific perspective. The study is also of high relevance from a societal perspective because the new trend of FDI in farmland presumably has major impacts on local communities (see Esaiasson et al. 2007:31f). In the light of the new trend of FDI in farmland in developing countries I believe it is of interest to examine how the local farmers in the host countries are affected by the phenomenon. I intend to look at one case of FDI in farmland in a developing country, more specifically the FDI by the American company Dominion Farms in Yala Swamp, Kenya.

1.1 Problem formulation and purpose

My aim with the field study in Yala Swamp, Kenya, is to investigate how the local farmers perceive the consequences of FDI in farmland. The current debate in media and among different organisations is whether the new trend of FDI is developing opportunities for the host country, especially in terms of economic development, or whether it might lead to exploitation of the already poor, which is also called land grabbing (Friis – Reenberg 2010, Cotual et al. 2009). The concept of land grabbing refers commonly to large-scale land acquisition for agricultural production by foreign investors (see Shepard – Anuradha 2009, GRAIN 2008).

Several NGOs are stressing that the phenomenon leads to exploitation and suppression of the world's most vulnerable people. At the same time several powerful global institutions are promoting FDI in farmland in developing countries, the polarisation of the possible effects of phenomenon highlights an obvious research problem.

Due to the fact that the new trend of FDI is highly concentrated to Africa I have chosen to conduct a qualitative case study of FDI in farmland in Kenya, which is a often mentioned country in terms of FDI in farmland (see FIAN 2010) and also allows for language benefits since English is one of their official languages. I have looked at a case of FDI by the American company Dominion Farms in the wetlands Yala Swamp in the south-western part of Kenya. My central question in this study is:

- How have the affected farmers in Yala Swamp, Kenya experienced the land lease to Dominion Farms?

To investigate my main research question I will look at different aspects of the farmers' lives based on David Harvey's theory accumulation by dispossession (see chapter 1.3). I intend to highlight the situation from the farmers' own perspectives in order to stress an, according to me, important aspect of the new trend.

1.2 Methodology and material

A qualitative method will be used to confront my central question, more specifically a descriptive case study. This method is favourable to use in examination of research gaps and complex phenomena because it enables a descriptive and nuanced picture (Gummesson 2003:116, 122). I have conducted semi-constructed interviews, with both respondents and informants, this is appropriate to do when the aim with the research is to study people's lives and their perspectives on specific questions (Kvale 1997:100).

My material consists of both primary and secondary sources. The primary material consists of respondent interviews, informant interviews and the Memorandum of Understanding, which was signed between Siaya County Council, Bondo County Council and Dominion Farms. The informant interviews are used as sources and they have been reviewed with a source-critical method. I have combined these sources with secondary material such as reports and articles (see Esaiasson et al. 2007:258, 313-323).

1.3 Theoretical framework

Because of the new character and the complexity of the phenomenon more research in the field is needed in order to obtain scientific answers to the question. I will use David Harvey's theory accumulation by dispossession to highlight the phenomenon from a critical perspective, since I consider it desirable to confront the hegemonic position in the field, namely that FDI is a developing opportunity that should accelerate. Furthermore, will perform a theory consuming study.

Harvey's theory is highly influenced by Marx's theory about primitive accumulation (see Marx 1981:628-671), and considers the neoliberal globalisation of capitalism as a new form of imperialism. Harvey means that Marx's features of primitive accumulations are still relevant and powerful. However, Harvey argues that it is an ongoing process and therefore accumulation by dispossession is a more suitable name for it (Harvey 2003:137-182).

1.4 Concept – FDI

The thesis includes a concept that must be clarified in order to simplify and concretize further reading. The concept is *Foreign Direct Investment.*

- *Foreign Direct Investment*: investment is made to serve the business interests or other interests of the investor in a different country distinct from the investor's country of origin.

1.5 Delimitations

FDI in farmland in developing countries has increased significantly the past years (Friis – Reenberg 2010:1, Shepard – Anuradha 2009:1-5). The underlying driving forces of the FDI differ between different investors. However, due to restraints in money and time, I have not been able to investigate all types of investors and recipient countries. I have chosen to examine one case of FDI in farmland in a developing country in Africa, which is the continent in which the new trend has had greatest impact (Friis – Reenberg 2010:1). The investor is the American company Dominion Farms and the host country is Kenya. Thus, the study has no generalizing ambitions. However, the result may be used to say something about FDI in farmland in similar contexts. The results may be valuable for further research in the field, for comparative research or as a part of quantitative research.

1.6 Disposition

In chapter 1 I have introduced the research issue and my central question. I have also briefly described the method, material, theory and delimitations. I will in chapter 2 describe the general background context in Yala Swamp and the specific context of the land lease to Dominion Farms. In chapter 3 I intend to examine the theoretical framework of this study and in the following chapter 4 the methodology used in the study. In chapter 5 I will analyze the empirical data collected in Kenya. In chapter 6 I will give an account for the conclusion and further reflections. In chapter 7 references are found and chapter 8 constitute the appendix.

2 Background

In order to deal with the central question in this study it is advantageous to have some background knowledge about the situation in Yala Swamp. Therefore I intend to briefly describe the local context. I will first give an account for the general situation in Yala Swamp such as the geographical location, eco-system and socio-economic conditions. Then I will account for the land lease to Dominion Farms and its specific circumstances.

2.1 Yala Swamp

Yala Swamp wetlands are the third largest in Kenya after Lorian Swamp and the Tana River Delta, and are located on the north-eastern shoreline of Lake Victoria. In total the swamp cover an area of 17 500 hectares[1](ha), however there are reports which claims that the swamp is much larger than that (KWF 2006:8). The wetlands have a rich ecosystem and are an important habitat for certain species of animals, which have disappeared from other parts of Lake Victoria. The rich wildlife in the swamp includes various species of fish, birds and other animals. This wildlife is of crucial importance for the food security in the communities around the swamp (KWF 2006:8). Fisheries in the Yala Swamp wetlands are also a fundamental source of income for the local communities. Fishing in the Yala Swamp area generates on average an income that is nearly four times higher than farming (Abila et al. 2007:521). Yala Swamp also has a significant growth of emergent papyrus, which the local communities use in many ways, such as roofing material, mats, pottery and cottages industries. The area also has an abundant grass crop, which traditionally is used by the communities for grazing their cattle (KWF 2006:8,16). The wetlands have a very fertile soil and are therefore suitable for farming which gives very high production (NEMA Bondo 17-12-2010). Yala Swamp is situated in Siaya County and Bondo County, which are both a part of the Nyanza province, which has a very high population density (Ewald et al. 2004:21). The population density in this area is increasing and at the same time this part of Kenya is suffering land shortage, which creates conflicts about land. The Nyanza province is also characterized by increasing poverty and the highest share of population with HIV and AIDS in Kenya (Ewald et al. 2004:22).

[1] 1 hectares is equal to 100*100 meters

2.2 The foreign direct investment – Dominion Farms

Yala Swamp is a so called 'trust land', which means that the government is holding the ownership of the land for the benefit of the local communities (Bondo County Council 17-12-2010). The swap has been reclaimed sine the 1960s. The Lake Basin Development Authority, on behalf of the Kenyan government, was managing Yala Swamp before the land lease to Dominion Farms (von Post 2006:3). The work of LBDA was however characterized by mismanagement and corruption. For that reason the Kenyan government started looking for private investors for the management, whom they believed could use the wetlands more effectively (Bondo County Council 17-12-2010).

Dominion Farms is a part of the Dominion Groups of Companies based in Edmon Oklahoma, USA. In 2003 the Dominion Farms started to negotiate with Siaya County Council about a proposal of establishing rice production in Yala Swamp. Since a part of the swamp belongs to the Bondo County Council they were also involved later on in the negotiation process (Bondo County Council 17-12-2010, MoU 2003). The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was signed in May the same year between the Siaya County Council, the Bondo County Council and Dominion Farms. The MoU is covering an area of approximately 6900 hectares with a land lease for 25 years, with an option to renew for another 20 years (MoU 2003).

In the Memorandum of Understanding the rent progress for the 25 years is set as following:

- Year 1-3, 2340 000 KES/year (about 375 KES/hectares)[2]
- Year4-6, 2730 000 KES/year
- Year 7-25, 3120 000 KES/year

(MoU 2003:2f).

The rent-agreement has recently been questioned. The County Councils have realised that the pre agreement for the next 25 years rent is not to their advantage. They now claim that the agreement was not properly done and consulting meetings have begun in order to review the MoU (Siaya County Council 24-01-2011). In addition, Dominion Farms has recently requested to prolong the MoU with an additional 25 years.

[2] 375 KES/hectares is about 4,37 USD/hectares (OANDA)

3 Theoretical Framework

David Harvey's concept of accumulation by dispossession is a useful tool to understand the effects of FDI in farmland in developing countries. The theoretical framework enables a broad analysis of the accelerating trend of FDI in farmland in developing countries, particularly in African countries. The phenomenon could also, for example, be addressed through ideas of corporate responsibility. However, with those ideas it would not be possible to highlight the relation between the interests of the American company on the one hand and the interests of the local farmers in developing countries on the other. The American company is a part of an advanced capitalist economy and its relations with Kenya must be analysed within the broader dynamics of global capitalism and the relations between the developed part of the world and the developing countries. Harvey's theory of accumulation by dispossession allows a theoretical analysis of how capital accumulation affects local communities in developing countries. Other authors who have investigated similar phenomena have successfully used Harvey's theoretical framework to understand FDI in developing countries (see Spronk – Webber 2007, Gordon – Webber 2008).

Firstly, I will briefly describe the ideology of neoliberalism and its relation to primitive accumulation, since Harvey's theory inter alia is a critique of global capitalism, particularly in its neoliberal form. Secondly, I will describe the concept of Harvey's theory of accumulation by dispossession. Thirdly, I will distinguish important elements in his theory, which will constitute the framework for the analysis of the empirical data. I also used the elements in the collection of empirical data (see chapter 8.1 Appendix).

3.1 Neoliberalism – primitive accumulation

Neoliberalism is the dominant ideology of today's world and it has a hegemonic position in the modern policy-making process and globalisation. However it is important to distinguish between the two phenomena, neoliberalism and globalisation. They are related to each other but refer to different mechanisms (Saad-Filho – Johnston 2005:9). Globalisation is an old process while neoliberalism arose as a government reaction to the economic crisis due to the oil shock 1973-74 (Saad-Filho – Johnston 2005:10, Lapavitsas 2005:33). The ideology is based upon a set of theoretical claims such as that markets are optimal and self-regulating social structures and it opposes government intervention in the market system. "It is claimed that if markets were allowed to function without restraint, they would optimally serve all economic needs, efficiently utilise all

economic resources and automatically generate full employment for all persons who truly wish to work" (Shaikh 2005:41). From a neoliberal perspective poverty, unemployment and economic crises in today's societies are due to restrictions on the market from inter alia states and labour unions (Shaikh 2005:42).

Neoliberalism asserts that free trade will create economic development, because it will foster weak persons/countries and level the powerful persons/countries (Shaikh 2005:48). However, neoliberal ideas are well integrated in the new wave of globalisation. An indicator on increasing economic globalisation is FDI. Globalisation also includes that political, social and cultural processes, the transnational relations have accelerated the past 30 years. Thus, "capitalist globalisation must be understood as an unfolding tendency, rather than an accomplished condition" (Colás 2005:71f). The primary driving force behind FDI is to gain financial returns by obtaining natural and human resources, penetrate markets and increase operating efficiency (Stutz – Warf 2007:387). Several neoliberal thinkers and institutions argue that foreign direct investment in developing countries is desirable. Hence they mean that foreign direct investment and transnational corporations have high potential to increase the economic development process in developing countries (Stutz – Warf 2007:393, see chapter 1).

Nevertheless, the adoption of neoliberalism, particularly in developing countries, has had negative impacts on the vulnerable population in the societies (Lapavitsas 2005:39). However, it is important to note that the developing countries are not only victims of the process, there are forces within developing countries which sympathize with neoliberal ideas and the globalisation of capitalism (Stutz – Warf 2007:401). There are different critical views on the neoliberal assumptions, for example Marxists asserts how capitalist markets have expanded "through force and coercion". Furthermore they see capitalism as more than just an economic ideology, they mean that capitalism also is a set of social relations that embrace the political authority of states and other aspects such as cultural and ideological structures (Colás 2005:73f).

"Accumulation of capital is one of capitalism's defining characteristics" (Byres 2005:83). The accumulation of capital (buildings, machinery, raw materials, implements) is driven by competition and when its characteristic becomes structural it is capitalist accumulation. These processes are the contents of Karl Marx's concept primitive accumulation (see Marx 1981:628-671) defined as "the transfer of assets, most notably land, by non-market means, from non-capitalist to potentially capitalist classes, and usually with state compliance or mediation" (Byres 2005:83f). The competition and conflicts over land has increased during neoliberalism. For example the access to land been reduced for the poor peasants in Africa, and the people have been forced into petty trading or has become part of the labour force. Developing countries have usually not gone through successful capitalist industrialisation that according to the ideology of neoliberalism will generate employment (Byres 2005:88).

3.2 David Harvey – Accumulation by dispossession

David Harvey is a professor of anthropology at the graduate centre of the City University of New York. He has been prominent in the development of modern geography, and heavily influenced by Marxism he has developed a theoretical framework, accumulation by dispossession, with which he especially criticizes neoliberal global capitalism.

There is an ongoing debate whether the economic crisis related to neoliberalism is due to overaccumulation or underconsumption. According to Harvey the geographical expansion of capitalism may lead to a stabilization of the economic system since it open up markets for both investment goods and consumer goods, however it is characterized by imperialistic activities (Harvey 2003:139). In accordance with the capitalistic system markets should open up in order to make cheaper inputs such as land, raw materials, intermediate inputs and labour power, accessible for the global market (Harvey 2003:139). "The idea that some sort of 'outside' is necessary for the stabilization of capitalism therefore has relevance" (Harvey 2003:141).

"[C]apitalism always requires a fund of assets outside of itself [...]If those assets, such as empty land or new raw material sources, do not lie to hand, then capitalism must somehow produce them" (Harvey 2003:143).

Harvey argues that the main effect of neo-liberalisation has been redistributive rather than generative. The neoliberal form of globalisation has found ways to transfer capital and other assets from the large population groups to the upper class and from the poor countries to the rich countries (Harvey 2007:34). According Harvey, market liberalization does not create a world were everyone benefits, instead it produce greater social inequalities and by extension chronic crises of overaccumulation. Since it, primitive accumulation, is an ongoing process and not a single phase Harvey has substitute these processes by the concept accumulation by dispossession (see Harvey 2003:144). Marx's description of primitive accumulation includes various processes, the same processes are still relevant and powerful in the case of accumulation by dispossession. The processes are the following:

- *commodification and privatization of land and the forceful expulsion of peasant populations*
- *the conversion of various forms of property rights into exclusively private property rights*
- *suppression of the rights to the commons; commodification of labour power and the suppression of alternative (indigenous) forms of production and consumption*
- *colonial, neo-colonial and imperial processes of appropriation of assets (including natural resources)*

- *the monetization of exchange and taxation, particular of land*
- *the slave trade*
- *the national debt*
- *the credit system as radical means of primitive accumulation*

Furthermore, Marx argues that the state has an important and crucial role in promoting these processes, which also Harvey believes (Harvey 2003:145, 2007:34f). The power of the state is often used force such processes, for example privatization, even if the popular will is against the transformation (Harvey 2003:145f, 148, 2007:36).

However, there are some differences between the features of primitive accumulation and accumulation by dispossession. Some of the mechanisms of primitive accumulation have an even stronger role today, such as the credit system and finance capital. Accumulation by dispossession is also characterized by new mechanisms such as intellectual property rights, like the patenting and licensing of knowledge (Harvey 2003:147f).

The process of accumulation by dispossession is growing fast due to the structures, institutions and economic policies shaping neoliberal globalisation (Harvey 2003:144f, 2007:35). Furthermore, accumulation by dispossession is made possible through mechanisms of privatization, financialization, the management and manipulation of crises and state redistributions (Harvey 2003:145).

Accumulation by dispossession can be seen as the necessary cost of making a successful breakthrough into the neoliberal capitalist system and economic development. The motives can be either internally driven or externally imposed by the neo-colonial development. Commonly accumulation by dispossession is driven by a combination of both external and internal factors (Harvey 2003:154). In the case of Yala Swamp the FDI is driven by both the company Dominion Farms and the County Councils in Siaya and Bondo. The company strive to make profits on their business and the Councils very much welcome FDI in their counties and promote further investments (Siaya County Council 24-01-2011, Bondo County Council 17-12-2010).

There is a significant gap between the neoliberal rhetoric, where capitalism will benefit all, and the reality, were a small elite benefits on the expense of others (Harvey 2007:42). Furthermore, Harvey argues that it is important to highlight the democratic deficit within the processes of capital accumulation and within the powerful neoliberal institutions, such as the WTO and WB, whom, inter alia, are driving forces behind the globalisation of the neoliberal agenda (Harvey 2007:42f).

3.3 Accumulation by dispossession and its elements

I will use Harvey's theory of accumulation by dispossession as the theoretical framework for my case study of how the affected farmers in Yala Swamp have experienced the land lease to Dominion Farms. It allows a theoretical analysis of how the broader dynamics of the global economic system, and how local communities are affected by the investments. I have chosen to concretize the theory in order to make it manageable for my analysis of the case study. Harvey includes the same eight elements to accumulation by dispossession as Marx did to primitive accumulation (see chapter 3.2). Due to the restraints of time and finances I will not be able to highlight all eight elements in this study. I have therefore chosen to focus on the elements that have direct impacts on the individuals in Yala Swamp. I will not examine the elements that occur on a higher societal and structural level; monetization of exchange and taxation; the slave trade (which continues especially the sex trade); usury, the national debt the use of credit systems (see Harvey 2007:34f). They are, of course, of great importance but do not fit within the framework of this study. Since these elements occur on a higher societal level I believe it will not affect my results in this thesis. I will investigate the first five of the eight elements, which are the following:

1. *The commodification and privatization of land and the forceful expulsion of peasant populations.*
2. *Conversion of various forms of property rights into exclusively private property rights.*
3. *Suppression of the rights to the commons.*
4. *Commodification of labour power and the suppression of alternative (indigenous) forms of production and consumption*
5. *Colonial, neo-colonial and imperial processes of appropriation of assets (including natural resources).*

(Harvey 2007:34f)

To simplify and structure the analysis I have chosen to merge some of the elements, which are highly integrated with each other. I have done this to create a more efficient analytical tool. I call the first element "property rights and the suppression of the commons", because I believe that the processes are direct related with each other and a casual link between them often occur. The second element is "proletarianization", in which I include the farmers' access to land. This because limited access to land usually is a underlying factor of proletarianization. The third and last element is "imperial processes" in which I include overall processes: impacts on the social and cultural structures, impacts on the consumption and production of goods, impacts on the environment and democratic aspects of the decision-making process regarding the land lease. I chose to include the democratic aspects in the element "imperial processes" because Harvey claims that the accumulation by dispossession overall is characterised by democratic deficit (see Harvey 2007:42f). I am aware that my

three elements still are integrated with each other, but I see the division as a useful analytical tool that enables a more efficient and clear analysis. These three theoretical elements are also a part of my methodology since they have been used as the basis of my interview guides (see chapter 8.1 Appendix).

3.3.1 Property rights and the suppression of the commons

"*The corporation, commodification, and privatization of hitherto public assets have been signal features of the neoliberal project. Its primary aim has been to open up new fields for capital accumulation in domains formerly regarded off-limits to the calculus of profitability.*" (Harvey 2007:35)

The power of the state is often used to enforce such processes, sometimes against the popular will. The neoliberal strategy aims to open up formerly non-profitable fields for capital accumulation, which has led to an increasing depletion of common resources such as water, air and land (Harvey 2007:35). This process can be described as a new wave of enclosing the commons.

"Since privatization and liberalization of the market was the mantra of the neo-liberal movement, the effect was to make a new round of 'enclosure of the commons' into an objective of state policies." (Harvey 2003:158)

One of the most startling forms of dispossession is the one of common property rights, which people have struggled with for ages to achieve. All these processes include transfers of assets from public and popular to private and class-privileged groups (Harvey 2007:36), which in extension creates uneven societies. Those components have also been the base for the formulation of interview questions (see chapter 8.1 Appendix). I will investigate how the farmers in Yala Swamp experience the privatization of the land in Yala Swamp and the suppression of the commons in that area.

3.3.2 Proletarianization

In the neoliberal context, "what accumulation by dispossession does is to release a set of assets (including labour power) at very low (and in some cases zero) costs" (Harvey 2003:149). Furthermore, overaccumulated capital can get hold of the released assets and turn them into profitable use (Harvey 2003:149).

"[T]his entailed taking land, say, enclosing it, and expelling a resident population to create a landless proletariat, and then releasing the land into the privatized mainstream of capital accumulation." (Harvey 2003:149)

This land less proletariat is put in a vulnerable situation where the capitalists strive to release the assets (in this case labour power) at costs as low as possible.

"The rolling back of regulatory frameworks designed to protect labour and the environment from degradation has entailed the loss of rights. The reversion of common property rights won through years of hard class struggle (the right to a state pension, to welfare, to national health care) to the private domain has been one of the most egregious of all policies of dispossession pursued in the name of neoliberal orthodoxy." (Harvey 2003:148)

"'The process of proletarianization, for example, entails a mix of coercion and of appropriations of precapitalist skills, social relations, knowledges, habits of mind, and beliefs on the part of those being proletarianized" (Harvey2003:146).

The position of women in developing countries has been significantly changed due to globalisation of capitalism, and women now constitute the main labour force in many sectors. It is because they usually constitute cheaper labour. Another feature of proletarianization is to create a proletariat for short terms, and then announce that their labour power is made redundant (Harvey 2003:164). This process leads to that the people neither are employed nor have access to land. Those components have also been the base for the formulation of interview questions (see chapter 8.1 Appendix). I intend to investigate how the farmers themselves experience the proletarianization.

3.3.3 Imperial processes

"This issue is of critical importance in any political evaluation of contemporary imperialistic practices. While levels of exploitation of labour power in developing countries are undoubtedly high and abundant cases abusive practices can be identified, the ethnographic accounts of the social transformations wrought by foreign direct investment, industrial development, and offshore production systems in many parts of the world tell a more complicated story" (Harvey 2003:163)

The imperial processes affect both the people and the environment and may lead to exploitation because of lack of rights.

"The rolling back of regulatory frameworks designed to protect labour and the environment from degradation has entailed the loss of rights" (Harvey 2007:36)

In this element I will describe the general imperialistic processes in relation to the land lease. I intend to examine for overall impacts on the local context, traditions, culture, environmental changes and other changes caused by the land lease and impacts on production and consumption of goods I also intend to highlight possible democratic imbalances in the decision process. Since imperial processes usually are characterized by democratic deficit or imbalance (Harvey 2007:42).

Those components have also been the base for the formulation of interview questions (see chapter 8.1 Appendix). I intend to investigate how the farmers have experienced the overall processes related to the land lease to Dominion Farms.

4 Methodology

The acceleration of FDI in farmland in developing countries in recent years makes it an interesting area of research, and there are several research gaps that need to be filled. Due to the fact that the phenomenon is relatively new and complex, qualitative research is first and foremost needed to fill the gap (Marshall – Rossman 1989:9f). My study is based on a Marxist philosophy of social science, which to some extents affects my methodological framework, and I believe that my empirical data can be transformed into a dialectical perspective (see Rosenau 1988:436f)

First, I will examine qualitative case studies and their importance in the field of the new trend of farmland investments. Thereafter I will give an account for the method of the interviews, the structure of the interviews and the selection of the interviewees. I will describe the analytical method I have used in my analysis. Finally, I will examine some reflections on the fieldwork in Kenya.

4.1 Qualitative research method

A case study is used to study one or several cases in order to describe specific analytical units in detail (Teorell – Svensson 2007:82f, Lundquist 1993:104f). Furthermore, qualitative research is a good way to understand and create knowledge about new and complex phenomena (Marshall – Rossman 1989:9f). For all these reasons mentioned above, a qualitative method is preferable for my case study in Yala Swamp. I admit to a non-positivistic position and believe that interviews and interaction with the local community is valuable and can produce new knowledge. Science should be systematic in a methodical manner, which refers to high intersubjectivity with reproducible data or quantitative data (Kvale 1997:61). In order to achieve high intersubjectivity I have recorded my interviews, when I was permitted to do so, and transcribed it directly afterwards. Regarding validity and reliability it is important to reflect over possible problems during the study (Teorell – Svensson 2007:55-59). In order to deal with reliability problems I have used an interview guide to structure my interviews. I have worked hard to do correct operationalizations of the theoretical elements in the study. The theoretical elements have been used in the design of the interview guides, this have assured me that I am really measuring what I intend to measure in order to achieve high validity

4.2 Method for the interviews

4.2.1 Qualitative semi-structured interviews

I have used semi-constructed interviews to gain knowledge about how the affected farmers have experienced the land lease to Dominion Farms. Doing qualitative semi-structured interviews are appropriate when the aim is to study people's lives and their perspectives on specific questions (Kvale 1997:100), which is my purpose with this study. I prepared the interviews with the farmers and the representatives from Siaya County Council and Bondo County Council with semi-structured interview guides (see chapter 8.1 Appendix). The guide included specific topics to be covered with suggested questions (Kvale 2007:57). The interviews with NEMA officers from Bondo and Siaya were of a more open character. Where I inter alia confronted them with the information I had obtained from the other interviews, since they have the authority to react to environmental mismanagement in Kenya. My semi-structured interviews contained both closed and open questions. By having this kind of structure I believe I have obtained valuable information from the interviewees. The specific questions were constructed with my research question and analysis in mind, while the open questions provided me with important information about how the interviewees experience their surroundings and their own specific situation (see Kvale 2007:57f).

I have strived to structure the interviews thematically and dynamically, which contribute to knowledge generation and create good interview interaction (Kvale 2007:57). I tried to formulate the questions in an everyday language of the interviewees in order to achieve dynamic conversations. To achieve that to the greatest possible extent I discussed the interview guides with my supervisor in field before conducting the interviews.

After the interviews I had debriefings where I asked the interviewees if they had something to add or if they wondered about anything concerning the interview or the study. This sometimes resulted in new information about the circumstances in the case (see Kvale 2007:56).

4.2.2 Selection of interviews

To begin with it is important to decide what constitutes the population of the study (Teorell – Svensson 2007:83). I have had an intensive design of my study, and I focused on one case of FDI in farmland in a developing country, more specifically the land lease to Dominion Farms in Yala Swamp in Kenya. The population in my study consists of peasants in Yala Swamp who have been affected by the land lease to Dominion Farms. I have strategically selected the interviewees to some extent (see Teorell – Svensson 2007:84), but there were some difficulties with this on site. When I did the interviews on the Siaya side of the swamp I came in contact with a village elder in that area who helped me to find interviewees. That

simplified the interview situation a lot because people treated me with respect and friendliness due to their respect of their village elder. On the Bondo side I came in contact with the officer in the district, which is one level above the village's elders, who helped me in finding interviewees. I explained the purpose of the study and the type of persons that I wanted to interview to the village elder and the officer, and the selection was therefore to some extent strategic. However, this may have had impacts on the sample.

I tried to choose the interviewees with a type quota sampling (Teorell – Svensson 2007:86f). I strived to cover different communities in Yala Swamp to get a broad picture of the situation. One goal was to get a gender balance of respondents. In this however, I did not succeed because it proved difficult to find female interviewees, which may have meant that I did not catch up all the aspects of the issue. However, the responses did not differ between the men and women I interviewed. I managed to get a relatively good geographical spread between the various communities bordering the Yala Swamp (see chapter 7 References). When I selected the informant interviewees I valued the centrality aspect of the person, informants who had knowledge or been a part of the decision-making process of the land lease to Dominion Farms (see Esaiasson et al. 2007:291, see chapter 7 References). Those interviews were performed to gain specific information about the situation in Yala Swamp.

4.3 Method of analysis – sentence concentration

To analyze my interviews I have used sentence concentration as a method. I have chosen this method since it makes it possible to shorten long parts of the interviews to more determined sentences with concise formulations (Kvale 1997:174). I argue that this method enables a concrete analysis of my empirical data. The analysis was divided into five stages. Firstly, I read the transcribed interview and got a general picture of the interview. Secondly, I determined the natural sentences units in the interview and thereafter formulated themes that dominate the sentences units. Then I asked my central question to the meaning units, "how have the affected farmers in Yala Swamp experienced the land lease to Dominion Farms?". Here I have used my theoretical framework, the three thematical elements: "property rights and the suppression of the commons", "proletarianization" and "imperial processes" (see chapter 3.3). As a final step the themes that were proven to be relevant through the comparison were brought together to stories and then forged together to a main story (see Kvale 1997:176f). I also have chosen to, in some cases, present brief quotations in order to highlight the peasants' experiences.

4.4 Reflections on the field work

During my field study in Kenya I approached several challenges, which I now aim to highlight. Robert Oketch, a researcher from the Kenyan Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (KMFRI), assisted me as interpreter and guide during my field studies in Yala Swamp. He was present at all interviews, expect one, and was interpreting at the majority of the respondent interviews with the farmers. Oketch is not a professional interpreter but he speaks fluent English and Luo, which is the tribe language spoken in this region. English is one of the official languages in Kenya, but generally the rural population has limited English skills. Oketch did not interpret simultaneously but waited until the interviewee had finished the answer and then gave a review of the response. This implies that some information, which could have been meaningful for the study, may have been lost on the way. Also the fact that English is my second language may have led to misunderstandings and misinterpretations. Still, Oketch was an advantage for my study since he has good knowledge about the language, the area and the cultural context. Moreover, the fact that I am a young white Swedish woman may have influenced the perception of me as a researcher and the interviewees' responses. Here I believe that the use of a black middle-aged interpreter may have neutralized that picture somewhat.

Another challenge was the interview environment, which I could not influence to any significant extent. At some interviews there were external disturbance, as the interview took place in a public place with other people around. It may have affected the interviews in such ways that the interviewees did not feel comfortable to answer the questions openly. However, the majority of my respondent interviews took place in the car where only the interviewee, the interpreter and I were present. However, I have not noticed any obvious difference in the answers between the different interview situations. Some informants were anxious about the interview before it took place. I had some apparent difficulties to arrange an interview with Dominion Farms, which never agreed on an interview. I did have an informal meeting with the owner of the company Calvin Burgess, the director of community development Chris Abir and a woman, to me unknown position at the company. They were deeply suspicious of my study and me. In order to let me interview the company and their employees they demanded me to stay at the facilities and use their interpreter. I declined this since I believed it would affect my independence and my ability to carry out scientific research.

5 Analysis - the case of FDI in Yala Swamp

The empirical data, which forms the basis for this analysis was collected in Kenya between 16-12-2010 and 24-01-2011. I performed 16 semi-structured interviews with affected farmers around Yala Swamp, where 10 of the interviewees were from the Siaya district and 6 interviewees from the Bondo district. I have also preformed semi-structured interviews with one representative from Siaya County Council and one from Bondo County Council, and unstructured interviews with the NEMA officers in Bondo and Siaya district. I have decided to keep all my respondent interviewees anonymous since the topic of this study is relatively sensitive. Some of the interviewees were employed, or had family members who were employed, by Dominion Farms and I do not want to jeopardize their employment. I have chosen to not publish the names of the other interviewees either, but they can be identified because of their work position but since they themselves have not expressed any desire for anonymity I do not believe that this constitute a problem. I will in this chapter present a descriptive analysis of the empirical data using my three theoretical elements (see chapter 3.3). In chapter 8.2 I address a deviant case of my study.

5.1 Property rights and the suppression of the commons

Yala Swamp is a so called 'trust land', which the communities nearby have been using for different purposes for generations. They have used the swamp for grazing their cattle, farming and it has also been the main source for papyrus, which inter alia is used as roof on their houses. A majority of the interviewed farmers experience Yala Swamp as their own land since they have used it for decades. After the land lease to Dominion Farms the farmers experience a major reduction in farming space. They have been forced to stop using the swamp for a wide range of purposes, and they are now only using the limited areas around their houses. The interviewed farmers believe it does not generate enough production to feed their families. All the interviewees experience loss of the commons (Yala Swamp). Further the land lease to Dominion has brought up a lot of conflicts over the land and some farmers resisted moving their farm from Yala Swamp, because the land resources were limited elsewhere. The resistance is not within the scope of this study, however it is still a relevant aspect of accumulation by dispossession (see Harvey 2003).

None of the interviewed farmers had moved their houses due to the land lease, however some of the farmers in the Bondo district had to move their houses. They were financially compensated by Dominion Farms, but according to those I talked to the compensation were below the market price of land in Kenya. All the interviewees experience that they have lost their right to the commons and that they have not been properly compensated for their loss. Furthermore, they experience that there are no other commons nearby which they could use instead, at least not as fertile as Yala Swamp. The suppression of the commons is a fundamental feature of the accumulation by dispossession according to Harvey's theory (Harvey 2007:35f). The Yala Swamp which is a 'trust land' has obviously gone through a transformation from public asset to private 'owned'. There has been a conversion of property rights ('trust land') into exclusively private property rights owned by Dominion Farms.

The farmers feel that they have been cheated by both Dominion Farms and the County Councils, since they believe the communities overall have not gained anything from the land lease, which they were promised.

The County Councils want to open up the market and very much welcome foreign investment in their Counties in order to promote economic development in the region (County Council Siaya 24-01-2011). At the same time Dominion Farms strive to gain profits on the investment, which they declared during my informal conversation with them. The land lease to Dominion Farms is a form of privatization of the commons, one element of accumulation by dispossession according Harvey's theory.

"Dominion has taken our farms. The life is difficult around here now, and the farm we have now is very small" (Interview 12)

"Before Dominion came we used to farm in Yala Swamp[...] But Dominion has taken everything and they do not treat us as human beings." (Interview 6)

"I used to get most of my income from the Swamp, fishing and grazing my cattle. But now we get nothing because Dominion has taken everything" (Interview 7)

"The people are still going there and they still use it for farming and grazing […] but they know they are not allowed to. They go there because of deficiency of land and some of them are resistant, they do not want to accept that the Dominion is there." (Bondo County Council 17-12-2010)

"Dominion has taken our grazing land. We have fewer animals now than before the Dominion came […] [W]e cannot get food. That is why we went to the swamp again and started farming" (Interview 12)

5.2 Proletarianization

Two of the interviewees personally worked for Dominion Farms, one man and one woman. Further, the majority of the respondents had a wife or other family member working for Dominion Farms. The interviewees overall view of the proletarianization is negative. All of the respondents experience that they have smaller access to farmland today then before the land lease to Dominion Farms. The consequence of that is that they do not get enough production on their farms, it has created, to some extent, a landless proletariat. According to the respondents Dominion Farms for the most part do not employ permanent staff from the area around Yala Swamp, instead they hire people from other areas such as Nairobi and Mombasa. The people employed from the area around the swamp are usually employed on a day-to-day basis as contractors, with limited rights. There has been a creation of a proletariat for short terms, and the labour powers have to some extent been a redundant.

All the respondents consider the working conditions very bad. Some of them did not want to work for Dominion because of the low salary, long working hours and health problems associated with the workplace. First and foremost the farmers are dissatisfied with the salary at Dominion Farms, which they experience as too low. They mean that their payment is not enough to support their families. Even if they or someone in their family is working for Dominion Farms they still have to engage in farming in order to feed their families.

"My wife work at Dominion [...] What she is getting is very little, almost 120 KES[3] *per day, which is not enough [...] She works on contract basis, and sometimes she does not have a job for months."* (Interview 3)

"I work at the Dominion Farms [...] Whatever I am earning it is not enough, but it is just an assisting need to push the day." (Interview 1)

"I work for the Dominions. I started to work for them when they came, when they were just farming maize. And at that time we got paid well, 300 KES per day. But when they started to farm rice [instead of maize] they reduced the payment to 150 KES per day [...] The working conditions are becoming poorer and poorer." (Interview 16)

Another overall concern is the working hours, which are very long, 12 hours per day. The respondents believe that this is a very long time to stand in the water, sometimes even without a break for lunch. According to the respondents the company do not even provide the workers with rubber boots. Working in the rice fields also means health problems according the interviewees, for example

[3] 100 KES is about 1,21 USD (OANDA)

diseases, such as malaria, have increased since the land lease. Another health hazard is that Dominion Farms spray the fields with chemicals in order to maximize production, while the workers are out working on the fields. Respondents believe that this affect the workers' health.

"[T]hey [Dominion Farms] just spray over the workers without telling them, and we feel the spray. We usually cough due to the spraying." (Interview 16)

"The working conditions are bad, they [the workers] are in the water for a long time and Dominion are spraying when the workers are at the farm which is affecting them. I would not like to work there [...] It is better to do farming." (Interview 13)

The respondents experience the transformation from farming their own land to becoming a part of a labour force as negative, and they mean that the employees lack rights and can be fired at any time. To be a part of the workforce is an unsecure life. In the beginning, when Dominion came, both women and men were a part of the labour force, but now it is almost exclusively women who are employed as workers at the farm. Some interviewees believe this is because women usually do not complain. However, men still are considered the breadwinners.

"I feel that the transformation is negative because the payment is so low. I would like to work there if I can get a permanent employment. But if I would work as a contractor I would not earn enough. And I know they do not employ permanent labour from this area." (Interview 10)

"[Y]ou only work for one week then you are fired." (Interview 6)

"[I]t is better to have a farm and do farming than be employed." (Interview 7)

"I think the transformation is bad. It was better before when we could farm at the Yala Swamp." (Interview 3)

The interviewees believe that farming is a better way of life if they can get production to a large enough scale. The problem now is that the land, since the land lease, is not sufficient to feed the families and they need to have some family members working for Dominion Farms in order to survive. The land lease to Dominion Farms has somehow created a landless proletariat, which is a crucial element of accumulation by dispossession. This has led to major changes in their lives since they suffer from the shortage of land and are forced to become wageworkers, although it is associated with difficulties.

5.3 Imperial processes

It is apparent from the interviews that they experience that the land lease to Dominion Farms has in general changed their lives in a negative direction. The everyday life around the swamp is characterized by greater struggle then before the land lease, due to shortage of land and environmental problems. Moreover, several interviewees highlight the cultural aspect of the issue. For the interviewees Yala Swamp has a high cultural value since they have used it for decades and therefore the area is strongly connected with their history. Some families had to move their households due to the land lease, and the interviewees do not believe these families have been properly compensated for their loss. It depends in part on that the compensation was below the market price, but according the interviewees it also has to do with the land's cultural value. However, all of the respondents declare that their traditions have not changed due to the land lease to Dominion Farms. They still have the same traditions as before. It may be that more time is needed before such changes are noticeable or in fact that the land lease does not have impacts on the communities' traditions.

A negative change due to the land lease, brought up by the interviewees, is the prosperity of the communities. The production is much lower now than before Dominion came to Yala Swamp, which resulting in less consumption. The people are crying that the communities are getting poorer and poorer. Most respondents express a desire that the Dominion Farms should disappear from Yala Swamp so that they can continue with their lives as they were before Dominion Farms came to the area.

"We were depending on doing framing, fishing and grazing our cattle in Yala Swamp, and the swamp is now taken from us." (Interview 6)

One of the greatest issues addressed by the respondents are impacts on the environment caused by Dominion Farms. The company is spraying over the rice fields, which is just next to the communities and the spray has several negative impacts on their lives. According to the respondents the spray affects their livestock, crops and own personal health. They birds die due to the spray, something blocks their eyes and noses, which leads to death. This is a serious problem for the farmers around Yala Swamp since they use to have a lot of chickens, an important component of their diets. There are also some impacts on the other animals inter alia some cows have suffered miscarriage after they have grazed near Yala Swap. Further, they mean that the spray makes their vegetables and fruits dry up. Before they cultivate crops such as tomatoes and mangos with high harvests, which is not possible today.

"You cannot have chickens anymore because the spray Dominion is using is killing the birds. (Interview 5)

The interviewees experience that a lot of people get sick because of the spray Dominion is using. Further, respondents believe that the chemicals from the spray contaminate the water in a way that is affecting their health. But the issue have never been investigated by NEMA, according themselves because of lack of resources (NEMA Bondo 17-12-2010). The interviewed farmers mean that several women working for Dominion Farms have suffered miscarriage, the respondent blame the company for that because they are spraying the fields while they are working.

Another impact on the communities is that Dominion has blocked the road between the Siaya district and the Bondo district. This has had major impacts on the trade between the communities. Before Dominion came they used to trade frequently with each other, but today the distance is too far since they have to take a detour. Respondents on both sides of the swamp are highlighting this issue. Another serious aspect of the blocked road is that a relatively well-developed hospital is located on the Siaya side of the Swamp, and the people on the Bondo side have difficulties accessing to it.

Further, the land lease to Dominion Farms is characterized by democratic imbalance, were the farmers believe that they have not been included in the decision-making process. The interviewees expressed concerns about how bad they and their communities were treated by both the company and the County Councils. According to them they were not a part of the decision process at all, they were just informed about it at community meetings. However, the information seems to have been unclear since they describe the terms in different ways and do not know about all of the conditions included in the MoU.

6 Conclusion

This study, with David Harvey's theory of accumulation by dispossession as theoretical framework, describes how the affected farmers in Yala Swamp have experienced the FDI by the American company Dominion Farms. Accumulation by dispossession is assumed to take the empirical expression in terms of suppression of the commons, proletarianization and overall imperial processes (Harvey 2003). The study is based on analysis of empirical data collected in Yala Swamp, Kenya between 16-12-2010 and 24-01-2011.

Throughout the empirical data, the FDI by Dominion Farms in Yala Swamp has created capital accumulation through dispossession of the peasants. The company's ambition to create financial returns and the County Councils' ambition to increase the economic development in the area have affected the farmers adversely. There has been an obvious suppression of the commons in the area because of the land lease to Dominion Farms. The farmers are no longer allowed to use the swamp, which was an important area for different kinds of activities. There has been an enclosure of the common, Yala Swamp. This privatization of previously public asset has resulted in decreased production and hence consumption in the region. This means that the farmers are experiencing the daily life as more difficult than before the land lease. The FDI in Yala Swap is characterized by a transfer of assets from public to private groups, which creates an uneven society.

As a result of the loss of commons, the FDI in Yala Swamp has to some extent created a landless proletariat, which has to take up employment in order to be able to provide for their families. The interviewees experience the working conditions and salary at the company as bad, which is a significant part of capital accumulation by dispossession. It is about realising assets, including labour power, at very low costs and some instances zero costs (Harvey 2003:149).

Through the FDI, cheap labour has been generated in Yala Swamp, and the majority of workers are female. This is a common feature of the neoliberal globalisation (see Harvey 2003:164). However, it should be mentioned that the men still are considered as the breadwinners.

The interviewees have experienced overall imperial processes created by the company. The FDI by Dominion Farms has created environmental problems in the area, mostly due to the use of pesticides. The farmers believe the spray affects their personal health in terms of contaminated water, air and land. According to the farmers the pesticides also have negative impacts on their cattle and their production of fruits and vegetables. Another imperial process is the blocked road, which has had a major impact on the trade between the communities in the Siaya and Bondo districts. Furthermore, the blocked road makes health care more difficult to access for the Bondo-communities. In addition, the interviewees

experience that the FDI has had impacts on their culture since their history is highly connected with Yala Swamp.

The farmers have experienced that the land lease has been characterized by democratic imbalance. They do not feel that they were parts of the decision-making process, they were only informed about the land lease and its implications after the MoU was signed. Democratic imbalance is a fundamental feature of accumulation by dispossession. All interviewees in this study reach the same conclusion, the land lease to Dominion Farms have brought forth many problems in the area around Yala Swamp, the communities are still suffering and the MoU needs to be improved in order to benefit the local people (Siaya County Council 24-01-2011, Bondo County council 17-12-2010, NEMA Bondo 17-12-2010, NEMA Siaya 17-12-2010).

The interviewees' experiences of the FDI in Yala Swamp are a clear illustration of accumulation by dispossession. The theoretical concept of accumulation by dispossession as a dynamic interpretation of primitive accumulation has been a useful tool in order to demonstrate the process of capitalist imperialism in the case of Yala Swamp. The results could serve as a basis for further studies, of both qualitative and quantitative character, which are necessary in order to capture all aspects of the new phenomenon of FDI in farmland in developing countries.

7 References

7.1 Primary sources

MoU, Memorandum of Understanding, 2003, between Siaya County Council, Bondo County Council and Dominion Farms.

7.1.1 List of respondent interviews

Interviewee	**Date**	**Location**
Interview1 - Siaya	16-12-2010	Kanyamaji Village
Interview2- Siaya	16-12-2010	Komol Village
Interview3- Siaya	16-12-2010	Kanyamaji Village
Interview4- Siaya	16-12-2010	Kanyamaji Village
Interview5- Siaya	16-12-2010	Komol Village
Interview6- Siaya	16-12-2010	Gendro Village
Interview7- Siaya	16-12-2010	Gendro Village
Interview8- Siaya	16-12-2010	Gendro Village
Interview9- Siaya	16-12-2010	Gendro Village
Interview10- Siaya	16-12-2010	Kanjango Village
Interview11- Bondo	18-12-2010	Odhuro Village
Interview12- Bondo	18-12-2010	Odhuro Village
Interview13- Bondo	18-12-2010	Odhuro Village
Interview14- Bondo	18-12-2010	Ngunya Village
Interview15- Bondo	18-12-2010	Odhuro Village
Interview16- Bondo	18-12-2010	Odhuro Village

7.1.2 List of informant interviews

Interviewee	**Date**	**Profession**
NEMA- Siaya	17-12-2010	County Officer of NEMA
NEMA - Bondo	17-12-2010	County Officer of NEMA
Siaya County Council	24-01-2011	Administrative officer (since 2007)
Bondo County Council Bondo	17-12-2010	Work officer (since 2003)

7.2 Secondary sources

Abila, Richard – Mazera Mwakubo, Samuel – Muriira Ikiara, Moses, 2007. "Socio-economic and ecological determinants in wetland fisheries in the Yala Swap", Ecol Manage, vol. 15, pp.521-528.

African Research Bulletin: Economic, Financial and Technical Series, 2010. "Africa Great Land Grab, Policy and Practice", vol. 57, no. 5, pp. 18694A-18694C.

Byres, Terence J., 2005. "Neoliberalism and Primitive Accumulation in Less Developed Countries" in Saad-Filho, Alfredo – Johnston, Deborah (eds.) *Neoliberalism, A Critical Reader.* Chippenham and Eastbourne: Antony Rowe Ltd, pp. 83-90.

Colás, Alejandro, 2005. "Neoliberalism, Globalisation and International Relations" in Saad-Filho, Alfredo – Johnston, Deborah (eds.) *Neoliberalism, A Critical Reader.* Chippenham and Eastbourne: Antony Rowe Ltd, pp. 70-80.

Cotula, Lorenzo – Vermeulen, Sonja – Leonard, Rebeca – Keeley, James, 2009. "Land grab or development opportunity? Agricultural investment and international land deals in Africa" [Electronic] Available: www.ifad.org/pub/land/land_grab.pdf. Download date: [2010-04-14]

Esaiasson, Peter – Gilljam, Mikael – Oscarsson, Henrik – Wängnerud, Lena, 2007. *Metodpraktikan.* Vällingby: Elanders Gotab.

Ewald, Jonas – Nilsson, Anders – Närman, Anders – Stålgren, Patrik, 2004. *Strategic Conflict Analysis – Lake Victoria Region*. [Electronic] Available: http://www.sida.se/shared/jsp/download.jsp?f=SIDA3940en_ConfAna_Lake+Victoria_web.pdf&a=3226. Download date: [2011-05-20].

FIAN, FoodFirst Information and Action Network, 2010. *Land grabbing in Kenya and Mozambique, A report on two research missions – and human rights analysis of land grabbing*. [Electronic] Available: http://www.fian.org/resources/documents/others/land-grabbing-in-kenya-and-mozambique/pdf. Download date: [2011-05-23].

Friis, Cecilie – Reenberg, Anette, 2010. *Land grab in Africa: Emerging land system drivers in a teleconnected world.* GLP Report, no.1. Copenhagen:GLP-IPO.

Gordon, Todd – Webber, Jeffery R., 2008. "Imperialism and Resistance: Canadian mining companies in Latin America", Third World Quartely, vol. 29, no.1, pp.63-87.

GRAIN, 2008. "SEIZED! The 2008 land grab for food and financial security". [Electronic] Available: http://www.grain.org/briefings/?id=212. Download date: [2010-04- 15].

Gummesson, Evert, 2003. "Fallstudiebaserad forskning", in Gustavsson, Bengt (ed) *Kunskapande metoder inom samhällsvetenskapen*. Lund: Studentlitteratur, pp. 115-145.

Harvey, David, 2003. *The new imperialism*. New York: Oxford University Press

Harvey, David, 2007. “Neoliberalism as Creative Destruction”, The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, vol. 610, no. 21, pp. 22-44.

Kvale, Steinar, 1997. *Den kvalitativa forskningsintervjun*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Kvale, Steinar, 2007. *Doing interviews*. Chippenham: CPI Antony Rowe.

KWF, The Kenya Wetland Forum, 2006. *Rapid Assessment of the Yala Swamp Wetlands.* [Electronic] Available: http://kenyawetlandsforum.org/index.php?searchword=yala+swamp&ordering=&searchphrase=all&Itemid=1&option=com_search Download date: [2011-05-21].

Lamb, John E., 2010. “Addressing the legacy of Underinvestment in Agriculture“. [Electronic] Available: http://www.wto.org/english/news_e/news10_e/aid_17mar10_e.htm. Download date: [2010-05-10].

Lapavistas, Costas, 2005. “Mainstream Economics in the Neoliberal Era” in Saad-Filho, Alfredo – Johnston, Deborah (eds.) *Neoliberalism, A Critical Reader.* Chippenham and Eastbourne: Antony Rowe Ltd, pp. 30-40.

Lundquist, Lennart, 1993. *Det vetenskapliga studiet av politik.* Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Marshall, Catherine – Rossman, Gretchen B, 1989. *Designing qualitative research*. California: SAGE Publications Inc.

Marx, Karl, 1981. *Kapitalet*, translator Bohman, Ivan. Berlin: VOB National.

Murphy, Craig N., 2000. ”Global Governance: Poorly Done and Poorly Understood”, International Affairs, vol. 76, no. 4, pp.789-803.

OANDA, webpage. [Electronic] Available: http://www.oanda.com/lang/sv/currency/converter/. Download Date: [2011-05-20].

Rosenau, Pauline M., 1988. “Philosophy, Methodology and Research: Marxist Assumptions about Inquiry”, Comparative Political Studies, vol. 20, pp. 423-454.

Saad-Filho, Alfredo – Johnston, Debroah (eds.), 2005. *Neoliberalism, a critical reader.* Eastbourne: Antony Rowe Ltd.

Shaikh, Anwar, 2005. “The Economic Mythology of Neoliberalism” in Saad-Filho, Alfredo – Johnston, Deborah (eds.) *Neoliberalism, A Critical Reader.* Chippenham and Eastbourne: Antony Rowe Ltd, pp. 41-49.

Shepard, Daniel – Anuradha, Mittal, 2009. *The great land grab, rush for world’s farmland threatens food security for the poor*. [Electronic]. Available: http://www.oaklandinstitute.org/?q=node/view/525. Download date: [2010-04- 26].

Spieldoch, Alexandra- Murphy, Sophia, 2009. “Agricultural Land Acquisitions: Implication for Food Security and Poverty Alleviation” in Kugelman, Michael – Levenstein, Susan L (eds.) *Land Grab? The Race for the World"s Farmland*. pp. 39-54. [Electronic] Available: http://www.wilsoncenter.org/topics/pubs/ASIA_090629_Land%20Grab_rpt.pdf. Download date: [2011-05-10].

Spronk, Susan – Webber, Jeffery R., 2007. “Struggles against Accumulation by Dispossession in Bolivia: The Political Economy of Natural Resources Contention”, Latin American Perspectives, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 31-47.

Stutz, Frederick – Warf, Barney, 2007. *The World Economy, Resources, Location, Trade and Development.* Upper Saddle River: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Teorell, Jan – Svensson, Torsten, 2007. *Att fråga och att svara*. Samhällsvetenskaplig metod. Malmö: Liber.

von Post, Sofia, 2006. *Conflict, Environment and Poverty, A minor Field Study from Yala Swamp, Kenya*. [Electronic] Available: http://liu.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2:22264. Download date: |2011-05-20].

WTO, World Trade Organization, webpage. [Electronic] Available: http://www.wto.org/english/news_e/news10_e/aid_17mar10_e.htm Download date: [2010-04-29]

8 Appendix

8.1 Interview guides

The interview guides have served as a base for the interviews. I conducted one guide for the interviews with the affected farmers in Yala Swamp, one guide for the interviews with representatives from Bondo County Council and Siaya County Council. I also followed up leads that the interviews brought up themselves. However, the interviews with the NEMA officers were in principal unstructured, where I confronted them with what emerged from the other interviews. This, because NEMA has the authority to react to, inter alia environmental mismanagement. The questions with the farmers are designed in an everyday language.

8.1.1 Interview guide – affected farmers in Yala Swamp

Introduce myself, briefly background information about the project. I here declare the structure of the interview, and ask for permission to use a recorder.

Introduction:
Family, doing for living, living conditions

1. Where do you live?
2. How does your family situation look like? (number of children/husband/wife/others)
3. What does your family do?
4. Who provides for the family?
5. How is the economic situation for your family?

Central questions:
Property rights and the commons

1. How have you experience the situation where Dominion Farms tanking over the land in Yala Swamp?
2. Do you believe that Dominion Farms taking over land in Yala Swamp have had mostly positive or negative impacts on you and your living conditions? Explain why and how?
3. Have you moved due to the land lease to Dominion Farms?
4. If yes have you been compensated for you land loss?
5. What kind of compensation? How much? Is it comparable with your land loss?
6. Have you experienced any loss of the communal space in Yala Swamp?

7. If yes, has that affected you personally? If yes, how?
8. Have you received access to other communal space nearby?

Proletarianization

1. Do you have access to land today?
2. If yes, it is enough for you and your family to be self-sufficient?
3. Do you or anyone in your family work at Dominion Farms?
4. If yes, do you/they earn enough to provide for the family?
5. Overall, do you experience the transformation from farming own land to be a part of a labor force as positive or negative? Explain how and why?

Culture/social structure/consumption and production

1. Has the land lease to Dominion Farms in Yala Swamp changed the community?
2. If yes, how?
3. Do you feel that the land lease has had any impacts on your culture/traditions?
4. If yes, how?
5. Do you believe that the land lease has affected the environment in Yala Swamp? Pollution, water resources, roads?
6. Do you experience that the land lease has had impacts on your production/consumption of goods? If yes, explain how.
7. Do you experience that you/your community have been a part of the decision-making process concerning the land lease to Dominion Farms?

Closure questions:
Overall impacts and outcomes

1. According to you what are the overall impacts on you and your family due to the land lease to Dominion Farms in Yala Swamp?
2. According to you what are the overall impacts on your community and other communities due to the land lease to Dominion Farms in Yala Swamp?
3. Would you like to add something to the interview?

8.1.2 Interview guide – representatives from Bondo and Siaya County Council

Introduce myself, briefly background information about the project. I here declare the structure of the interview, and ask for permission to use a recorder.

Introduction questions:

1. What is your name?
2. What is your position at the County Council?
3. For how long have you been working at the County Council?
4. Have you been involved in the decision-process concerning the establishment of the Dominion Farms in Yala Swamp?

Central questions:

1. What is the background story for the establishment of Dominion Farms in Yala Swamp?
2. When did you sign the contract with Dominion Farms?
3. What were included in the contract?
4. Why do you think Dominion Farms chose to establish in Yala Swamp?
5. Did Dominion Farms have any specific reasons for the establishment?
6. What were the County Council's expectations on the project?
7. How did the County Council implement the project in the local context?
8. Did you invite people from the villages nearby to participate in the decision-process?
9. Did the people from the villages nearby participated in the process of establishing Dominion Farms in Yala Swamp?
10. Did any farmers/people have to move due to the establishment of Dominion Farms?
11. If yes, how many?
12. Did you offer them any compensation for that? What, how much?
13. If yes, did they accept the compensation?
14. Do you know where those people live today?
15. Do some of the farmers/people from the surroundings work for the company today?
16. If yes, how many? Men/women?
17. Do you know something about their working conditions? Is it possible to feed an average family with the salary?
18. Do you believe that the company has had positive impacts on the local communities in Yala Swamp?
19. If yes how and in which areas?
20. Do you believe that the company has had negative impacts on the local communities in Yala Swamp?
21. If yes, how and in which areas?

Enclosure questions:

1. Did the project live up to your expectations that you had before the establishment of Dominion Farms in Yala Swamp?
2. Overall, what do you think of the company's impacts on the local communities in Yala Swamp?
3. What is the future plan for the project? Will you prolong the contract with Dominion Farms?
4. Would you like to add something to the interview?

8.2 Divergent case

Only one of the interviewees did not experience the land lease to Dominion as only bad. She thinks that the land lease to Dominion Farms has had mostly positive impacts on her living conditions. She stresses the fact that Yala Swamp did not belong to the communities before the land lease to Dominion Farms. For this reason she believes that it is fair that they have not been compensated for the

land lease of Yala Swamp. She further claims that before the land lease the swamp was really unequally distributed. She has been working for Dominion Farms since the company came in 2003. Her job is to chase away birds. However she points out that the working conditions have become poorer and poorer during the years.

"You stand in the water for 12 hours [...] we get an area which we have to finish, and if we do not do that we cannot even have a break for lunch"

The salary has been reduced by half since she started working for the company. Another problem according her is the chemical used for spraying, she usually cough due to the spray. She also highlights the problem with the blocked road between the Bondo and Siaya parts of the swamp, and believes that this hinders trade between the districts and reduces the proximity to the hospital for those living on the Bondo side. Although she is not satisfied with the working conditions she experiences being a part of a labour force is an easier way of life than farming. However, she experiences several elements of accumulation by dispossession.