

Food Self-Sufficiency and Partnership in Agricultural Production in Ghana

A case study of the Fievie Rice Project



Gifty Dzorka

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree Master of
Philosophy in Anthropology of Development
Department of Social Anthropology, University of Bergen



June 2016

Acknowledgement

I thank the Lord Almighty for His unfailing love and favour upon my life. I am highly indebted to my approachable supervisor, Dr. Margit Ystanes for her immeasurable support and constructive comments. Margit, I am always inspired by your kind words. It has been great working with you. I thank my family for their support, prayer and encouragement. I cannot mention all names here but I am highly indebted to my lovely aunt, Faustina Tsikudo for her unconditional love and prayers. I love you aunty.

I sincerely thank the Norwegian Educational Loan Fund for the scholarship awarded to me, which made my studies possible. I also grateful to the Nordic African Institute (NAI) for the travel support to Ghana in aid of my fieldwork. To social Science Faculty, I say a big thank you for the financial assistance granted to me during my fieldwork.

I also thank my fellow students of Master's of Anthropology of Development, especially, Ruth Isleny Bedoya Lopez, Mariam Namiiro, Augustine Agyan and Matous Jelínek for their constructive comments and contributions to this thesis. To Dr. Austin Abloh, Alexander K. A. Tsikudo, and Pascal Agbadi, special thanks to you for your comments and guideline. To all my wonderful friends especially, N'da Naa K. Nikoi, Patricia Konadu Kwakye, Comfort Worna Lotse, Daasebre A. Ahensan, Emmanuel Selom Kpikpi, Kingsley Ntiamoah Arthur and Divine Asafo, I say a big thank you for your support and encouragement.

Lastly, I am most grateful to the people I cannot name here. These are the people I have worked with in Fievie-Dugame. My study would not have been possible without you. My warm gratitude goes to you all especially, to my host family. You are wonderful people. God bless you all.

Dedication

To my Lord Jesus Christ

Glossary

- Abolo - Ghanaian food prepared from corn
- Akple - Local dish prepared from maize (corn) flour, associated with the people from the Volta region of Ghana
- Aparatorwo - The Ewe language term for farm contract workers
- Ewe - The people of Volta region of Ghana
- Fufu - Ghanaian food prepared from boiled cassava, yam or plantain
- Kokontetasi - Ghanaian dish prepared from cassava and corn flour
- Liha - Locally made drink from maize
- Tokor - A social unit called gate
- Togbe - Chief
- Tuo Zafi - A local dish usually prepared by the people from the Northern part of Ghana
- Kenkey - Ghanaian food prepared from corn dough

Table of Contents

Contents

Acknowledgement	i
Dedication	ii
Glossary	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Abstract.....	vi
CHAPTER 1	1
Food Self-Sufficiency; Partnership in Agricultural and Food Production	1
Introduction.....	1
Theoretical framework.....	2
The political ecology approach	2
The Phenomenological Approach	5
Research questions	7
Background to the study.....	7
Global food concepts and Fievie people's food system	7
Rice production in a maize consuming society: the paradox of global interest and local food security.....	11
Why the need for agricultural development and investments in Ghana?.....	12
The emerging concept of partnership in agricultural investment	14
Is the land good for rice production or there is need for rice production?	17
Main Arguments.....	19
The Study Site and the Fievie People.....	20
Research Methodology	23
Entering the Research Field.....	26
Challenges on the field	28
Ethical consideration and a note on anonymity.....	29
Thesis Outline	30
Chapter 2.....	31
Local Social Organization and the Meaning of Land	31

Suburbs, Gates and Houses.....	32
Communal labour and fines.....	36
The Political chair/Chieftaincy.....	37
Local Actors and Land Resource Management and Distribution	39
The meaning of land in Fievie.....	44
Concluding Remarks	48
Chapter 3.....	50
The meaning of Food; following the ways of maize and rice in Fievie.....	50
Food ways, culture, identity and symbols.....	51
The conceptual and discursive ways of maize among the Fievie people	55
Tracing rice in the Ghanaian economy and in the Fievie traditional area.....	58
Food consumption and Class distinctions	62
The changing taste, the new generation and the social unit.....	64
Concluding Remarks	66
Chapter4.....	68
International and Local Conceptualization of Poverty and Development	68
Historical and Contemporary Perceptions of Poverty and Managing the Poor	69
Development, Investments and Save Battlefields.....	74
Concluding remarks.....	87
Chapter 5.....	88
The Fievie Partnership Model.....	88
Trends of participatory development projects	90
Maintaining partnership and the rice project	99
The Products of Partnership in Agricultural Production.....	103
The Fievie Copa Connect and a journey to attaining food self-sufficiency in Ghana	106
Concluding remarks.....	107
Concluding Thoughts	109
Recommendation for further research	113
References	114

Abstract

Poverty eradication and food security issues are central to most international development policies and developing countries including Ghana. International and national policies encourage investments in the agricultural sector, as a major means to reduce poverty and ensure food security. Lands in Sub-Saharan Africa have been declared empty and unutilized, which makes Africa the best corridor for such agricultural investments. However, large tracts of land acquisition through outright sale or long term lease with little or no compensation is in turn generating tension and conflicts at the local contexts where such agricultural projects take place.

The central focus of this study is to explore how partnership between foreign investors and community members affects agricultural productivity and its implications for food self-sufficiency at the national and local contexts in Ghana. The trajectory of most of the agricultural investment projects have ended in tragedy due to lack of a good working relationship between land owners and users on the one side, and investors on the other side. Some of these investments also have international market targets (biofuel production) and do not benefit the local people directly. Using the Fievie rice project as a case study, my fieldwork reveals that, the community used its land as a tool to enter into partnership with the investor company (Global Agric-Development Company). The community is entitled to 2.5% of the gross income of the project and reserves the right to take back the land within three months of non-production. An out-grower programme has been developed for some community members. However, there is a shift in attention from the main staple crop (maize) to rice production for the participants. Also, labourers of the rice project (with meagre wages) are abandoning their farmlands due to the time and energy demands of the project. The people are allowed to glean on the rice farm. There was enormous dietary transformation in Fievie from akple to rice.

Drawing on phenomenological and political ecology approaches as tools of analysis, I argue that, the Fievie rice participatory project, only works to an extent and to the advantage of people with power and the affluent in the global structure, at the detriment of the less advantaged. Also, local people's interests, meaning and values ascribed to food were not considered, prior to the commencement of the project. Although rice has become available to the people, it is transforming their culturally significant diet; akple. Additionally, the rice project might have boosted national food security, however, it is at the same time generating, maintaining and improving [existing] social, economic and political inequalities within the local structure. It further works to cripple existing self-reliance efforts of subsistence farmers. I argue that, the Fievie partnership is significant in controlling conflicts and land grabs, yet, it is a novel configuration of capitalism, and not a suitable tool for development.

CHAPTER 1

Food Self-Sufficiency; Partnership in Agricultural and Food Production

Introduction

When I made a visit to my field site to secure a host family, I was fortunate to meet two young men who took me round the community for the search. After a long walk, we secured a host family. Upon making my research plans known to my host mother, she readily confirmed the rice project in the Fievie community. She said, “...*that project was doing very well. It was a collaboration between the community and the foreign investors. It reduced poverty in this community. Some people used to glean on the rice field for personal use*”. “Do you mean it was doing well?” I asked. “Yes, but you see, because of poor management and lack of transparency on the part of our leaders, the project collapsed and new investors have taken over”. She responded.

The conversation I had with my host mother indicates that, the Fievie rice project is a participatory project between a foreign investor company (Global Agricultural Development Company) and the local community. The community used its land property as a tool to enter into partnership with the investors. Having first read about the project in the media prior to my fieldwork, I wondered why the project is on rice production and not maize, given the significance of maize in the diet of the Ewes. The Ewes are people from the Volta region of Ghana and are culturally and socially identified with “akple”. Also, the sale of customary land¹ by traditional authorities to investors, without any form of consultation with community members has become a topical issue in the media. Agricultural projects initiated through such land negotiations have been reported to generate conflicts and tension and usually failed to deliver the expected benefits to the communities (Acheampong & Campion, 2014). As food security and land grabs have become a growing local, national and international concerns, I became interested in understanding how the Fievie partnership project affects food security, access to and control of land and its use, as well as conflicts within the local and national contexts. I was also driven to find out how this project affects the diet of the local people, especially with

¹ Land holdings by a community, managed by traditional authorities but usually used by community members.

the significance attached to maize, because people have ascribed meaning, interests and value in what they consume. Thus to investigate how rice production in a maize consuming society affects the sociocultural and economic fabrics of the people.

This study presents analysis based on six months' fieldwork from August 2015 to January 2016 among the Fievie-Dugame people. The main focus of the study is to unravel how the agricultural partnership between the Fievie traditional area and investors affects the socio-economic life of the local peoples, through the lens of political ecology and phenomenological approaches as tools of analysis. Thus to investigate whether the rice project causes any destruction in or improves existing livelihood. While the need to promote social and economic development gained prominence in both academic and policy spheres, international institutions, national policies and local people pursue this goal through different and sometimes conflicting mediums.

Theoretical framework

In analyzing my research findings, I adopt two approaches as my tools of analysis; political ecology and phenomenological. Political ecology analyzes how politics work in my research field, while I use phenomenological approach to explore the social, political, economic and cultural world view of the people I have worked with.

The political ecology approach

"The land is ours and we decide what to use it for" (Fieldnote August, 2015).

The quote above suggests the power associated with land resource use in the Fievie community. It indicates what people choose to use their land possessions for and how they guard their property and the natural environment. But how does it work when it comes to distributing costs and benefits within their local context and ecology? It is necessary to analyze the politics and interests surrounding resource redistribution, access and use within local and global contexts (Bryant, 1998), as well as focusing on people's perceptions and conceptualization.

Over the years, political ecologists have attempted to explain Third World environmental change and conflicts in terms of key environmental issues such as soil erosion and land degradation, socio-economic characteristics (such as class), concepts (sustainable

development), actors (the state, multilateral institutions, poor farmers) and regions (Bryant & Bailey, 1997). The term political ecology was originally coined in English and used in its neo-Marxist sense by anthropologists Eric R. Wolf in 1972 due to radical development in cultural ecology, and the need to understand the role politics play in apolitical cultural ecology (Biersack, 2006b). Since the 1980s, other scholars have largely contributed to the field in addressing key issues such as; sustainable or green development by Redclift (1987) and Adams (1990); Blaikie and Brookfield (1987) provides accounts on soil erosion and land degradation; whereas Peet and Watts (1996a) link political ecology to discourse theory (cited in (Bryant & Bailey, 1997). In *Reimagining Political Ecology*, Biersack (2006b) made a shift from its framework of neo-Marxist sense, inspired by Dependency theory (Frank, 1969) and World system theory (Wallerstein, 1974) to address the challenges of constructivism. She also adopts “practice theory” (Bourdieu, 1977) to incorporate agency and events in human-environment relations. Knudsen (2009) posits political ecology as a field of study rather than a grand theory. Political ecology is an interdisciplinary field of studying complex interrelationships between environmental changes, ecological processes, access and management of natural resources, politics, socioeconomic exclusion and marginalization. According to Biersack (2006b), political ecology studies focus on the nuances of individual cases, while taking into consideration, the global social, economic and cultural context.

The growing diverse scope and interdisciplinary nature of the framework of political ecology provides different definitions and understanding of it. For the sake of analyzing this material, I ascribe to Biersack (2006b) position of political ecology that engages the constraints of structure, yet, attending to the indeterminacies of agency and events. Bryant and Bailey (1997) argued that, a useful way of understanding a research field is to analyze the political interests and actions of the various actors in an ecological conflict in the Third World. According to them, this helps to understand the political operations of the environment we study. Leach, Mearns, and Scoones (1999) also posit that, the connections between agency and structure accentuates how structures, norms and rules develop as products of intended or unintended actions and practices of people. They further argue that, people’s actions are actively perpetuated. Although individuals are

molded by societal and institutional values and norms, they also grow as skilled agents, whose lives are directed by their actions (Holt-Jensen, 2009, p. 162).

In light of this, I will focus on the three basic arguments made by Bryant and Bailey (1997) in "Third World Political Ecology". Firstly, they argued that, cost and benefits that come with environmental change are not distributed equally, as political, economic and social differences account for uneven distribution. More importantly, political powers mediate such inequalities. Secondly, the unequal distribution of costs and benefits in a society turn to reinforce or reduce such existing social and economic differences. Here, political ecology intermarries political economy as such changes in the environment affect the political and the economic life of the people. Finally, they posit the reinforcement or reduction in pre-existing inequalities produced by unequal costs and benefits distribution in a society provides political implications in terms of the altered power relationships that are produced.

I use political ecology as a tool of analysis because, as argued by Robbins (2004), the discipline provides an understanding that, there are less coercive, less exploitative, and better sustainable ways of doing things. Political ecology can therefore be used to understand the decisions communities make about the environment, within the context of their politicized environment, economic pressure and societal regulations. For instance, within the context of my research, traditional authorities and opinion leaders made the decision to enter into partnership with the investors because of their land ownership system. The customary landholding in this community made it flexible for easy transaction of business with the investors. Community leaders did not need to seek legal approval from all community members, since the land does not belong to an individual or a particular family, but the entire community. However, the prior notice given to land users and the entire process of entering into partnership, helped to ease tension and avoid conflict surrounding land access, use and distribution. Additionally, political ecology is relevant for informing international institutions, policymakers and investors of how complex human-environment interaction and development is, which can contribute to better environmental management and governance. Political ecology is also relevant for understanding how the unequal relations in and among societies affect the natural

environment. For instance, cattle farmers have to find new grazing fields, due to the rice project that has occupied their previous grazing field. This is so, because the decision makers (traditional authorities) in the community are more powerful than cattle farmers. This mount an extra pressure on the environment, as previously unused fields are being exploited.

My study uses Bryant and Bailey's (1997) understanding of political ecology as a tool of analysis to explain how various actors work within broader political and economic structures. Thus the relationship and influence that actors, (in this case, the state, foreign investors, traditional authorities, community members and neighboring communities) exert on each other in the operation of the rice project. I explain how power inequalities play out in local contexts and when there is a merge of the local and global worlds. I show how foreign investors make decisions in relation to their own benefits, benefit for the people they work with and the impacts of their presence on the human-environment interaction. For instance, how and why rice was selected for production in the project site. Also, taking into consideration pre-existing inequalities within the local context of the Fievie people in terms of politics, social, economic and culture, I analyze the role such differences play in the rice project. Additionally, I explain how such differences work to maintain or reduce pre-existing inequalities. For instance, most people report that, the chiefs and influential people, such as group leaders in the community only select people from their families to participate in the "Out grower programme". In effect, people with power, are expected to get more powerful and richer with their newly assumed economic status, at the expense of the rest. This study takes inspiration from Bryant and Bailey (1997) and advances on existing knowledge within the discipline of political ecology.

The Phenomenological Approach

My research is ethnographically grounded and takes a critical stance towards knowledge. I provide detailed accounts of field experiences in which I made explicit, patterns of cultural and social relations within the Fievie community. Ethnography overlaps with phenomenological perspective which focuses on "thick descriptions" (Geertz, 1973) of lived experiences through language. According to Davidsen (2013), phenomenological perspectives use philosophical concepts to interrogate research findings and to enable

greater theoretical analysis. In using this approach, I recognize that, thick descriptions are inevitably conditioned by cultural, social and interpersonal eventualities, therefore, methods and theories must be combined. I move from thin description to thick description of events and occurrences, and to interpretations of my fieldwork findings.

Husserl (1982) posits that, it is not possible to separate the experiencing subject from its world of experience. Thus understanding individual subjectivities gives insights into people's actions, and taken-for-granted assumptions. I engage phenomenological approach in describing my research methodology and fieldwork experiences, especially, as a female researcher.

I take inspiration from Lester (1999, p. 1), and use this approach to effectively bring to bear, the perceptions and experiences of individuals and the larger society from their own perspectives, thereby, challenging structural and normative assumptions. For instance, most people only know that, Ewes like akple but it is unknown to them that, they actually survive on it. Situating the phenomenological perspective within my research context, I use it to illustrate the life situations of the Fievie people and their conceptualization of cultural, social and economic phenomena. I focus on their routine activities, conversations and arguments. For instance, the conventional idea that, subsistence farmers only farm because of survival, is disputed in my research field. Most of the people I have worked with are motivated to farm, not only because it is a source of survival but also, the joy of producing and consuming what they ascribe meaning, interest and value to. I employ this perspective to understand and explore their world views of concepts such as food self-sufficiency, development, poverty, as well as the meaning of food and land. Specifically, I explore the sociocultural embeddedness of the ways of maize, in order to produce knowledge on how the rice project affects their diet.

Research questions

In this study, I will address the following questions;

- Why did the Fievie community enter into partnership with the foreign investors?
- How has the formation and organization of the partnership fared?
- How has the partnership impacted the community and the livelihood of the people I have worked with, as well as the project?

Background to the study

Global food concepts and Fievie people's food system

Seeing families and individuals move to and from their farms as they harvest their produce for the season was a pleasant view. While some convey the maize from the farm to the house, others remove the cornhusk and dry it for longer period preservation. They apply chemicals to the maize for storage in big white sacks and kept in storage rooms. The chemically applied maize can only be consumed usually after 3 months when the chemical wears off. The people therefore keep some of the maize for immediate consumption until the preserved one is safe for consumption. I was driven to find out how they are able to provide food for themselves through the year. Most people said they produce enough food to feed on throughout the year. This section sheds light on the intersection of global food concepts and the Fievie local food system.

According to the World Food Summit of 1996,

Food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life. (Bishwajit et al., 2013, p. 1)

Food availability, accessibility, stability and utilization are central to this definition. Every individual across the globe is entitled to have access to enough, safe and healthy food at all times, necessary to satisfy their dietary, preferences and health needs. A country's

food security is dependent on its population, household or individual's physical and economic access to enough quality food at all times, devoid of unwarranted risk of losing such access. Thus, food security is informed by stability through access and availability at any given time, hence access and availability must not be compromised. Fundamentally, regardless of sources, there must be constant means of supply of sufficient, safe and nutritious food necessary to satisfy the needs of a country's population. In contrast, Food self-sufficiency is the satisfaction of domestic consumption (*for staple food crops*) by means of domestic production (Matthew, 2014). This can be applied at the individual and country levels (FAO, 2015). A country's food self-sufficiency is dependent on its ability to make available, sufficient and safe food to all, solely through domestic production. Stability may not be guaranteed. The Fievie people's conceptualization of self-sufficiency in food is understood in terms of production of enough staple crops.

We always produce enough for ourselves, prior to and during the rice project to take us through the year. We harvest enough maize, cassava, pepper...that is the work in the community. So we do not buy food (Fievie community member, Fieldnotes September 23, 2015).

The quote above indicates the understanding of self-sufficiency in food in the Fievie community. For them, the ability to produce enough staple crops; maize and cassava means, they are self-sufficient in food. Food self-sufficiency is the state of being able to produce enough quality food at the individual, household, community and national levels. Thus, when a nation's demand does not exceed its domestic food production, it is said to be self-sufficient in food. The global concept of food self-sufficiency intertwines with the understanding of the concept by the people I have worked with. In both definition and understanding, domestic production should meet consumption demand at the individual, country or region levels. However, with the Fievie people understanding, food self-sufficiency is not only about producing enough for consumption, but also, not purchasing staple foodstuff. Everyone is encouraged to produce food by themselves. Their understanding of the concept is applied to sustainable living, where self-sufficient individuals do not consume outside of what they produce.

Although food self-sufficiency can facilitate food security, the two can actually conflict each other (Warr, 2011). This is due to prevailing international market regulations, access to suitable agricultural land, unpredictable climatic condition, land degradation, agricultural practices, labour. According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), “a narrow focus on self-sufficiency has high economic and social costs” (Gardner, 2013). He further points out that, food self-sufficiency is likely to cause severe global food insecurity, in the face of unpredictable conditions that may affect harvests. To an extent, I agree with Gardner (2013), however, economists and researchers often ignore the social and cultural factors that sometimes cripple agricultural productivity. Although food self-sufficiency may seem an unrealistic goal, from my fieldwork, I argue that, the concept of food self-sufficiency is a development tool which shows the need for self-reliance. People’s understanding of food self-sufficiency encourages them to produce enough food for themselves. They need not rely on the market or others for sustenance. In the Fievie community, the pursuit of self-sufficiency in food has not caused any food crisis as argued by OECD. No one has ever been reported of dying due to starvation. The concept of food self-sufficiency encourages people to be efficient and effective in agricultural production. Economists, international institutions and national policies often seem to address food security issues but seldom examine local concepts of food (Mzamu, 2012). What people consider as food and how they work to maintain or improve their ability to attain food security and self-sufficiency are rooted in their culture and societal values. For instance, in the Fievie community, a man is considered lazy and irresponsible, if he is not able to farm and produce enough maize and cassava, to sustain him and his family. This entrenched societal value encourages people to work hard towards achieving sufficiency in food.

From my fieldwork, people talked about food to mean a major staple crop, maize. Maize does not only form the backbone of the economic life of people but also, weaves through their sociocultural fabric. For them, a person’s typical day does not pass without akple².

² A local dish prepared of maize. It has high volume of carbohydrate. It is a special delicacy associated with the people of the Volta.

A day may be considered incomplete without akple, even if the person had consumed other food types. Indeed, I heard people say, they have not eaten the whole day, because they had not taken akple. In short, food is akple, anything else is a supplementary. Here, as elsewhere, food creates and maintains social relations (Douglas, 1972). In effect, the people are inclined to actively work to maintain or improve their food needs. It is important to recognize that, natural effects of climate change, on people's effort in agricultural practices are inevitable. This notwithstanding, the local people are not completely ignorant of these existences in their environments. In a contrasting view, OECD's argument that, food self-sufficiency is likely to cause severe global insecurity, the repercussions when the people cannot economically access food due to inadequate purchasing power mediated by international market prices must also not be underestimated.

Based on the Fievie people's understanding of food self-sufficiency, I therefore argue that, food self-sufficiency is attainable when people understand their food preference in this way and are inclined to meet their dietary needs. In a larger context, when international and national policies recognize and understand local people's conceptualization of food in their cultural and social domains, such policies will advocate, empower and promote local interests and values. I therefore agree with Warr (2011), when he posits, a better approach to increasing food self-sufficiency is to promote improved agricultural productivity, as this reduces imports while agricultural output rises. He further argued that, this is possible without necessarily raising the price of domestic produce and hence, without setting the two concepts of food security and food self-sufficiency at conflict. But how then can we improve agricultural productivity? Measures will have to be put in place for the right development projects in the right environments, which will attract the interests and undivided efforts of local people. This will in turn, promote their sociocultural preferences and economic interests.

Rice production in a maize consuming society: the paradox of global interest and local food security

In the Ghanaian society, different ethnic groups are located in different regions of the country. A person's region determines crop specialization in a largely agrarian Ghanaian society. People along the river Volta and the coast are known to be fishers, whereas those in the hinterland like Ashanti and the Northern regions are noted for farming (Nukunya, 2003). However, within these regions and among the various groups are varying degrees of what people do for a living. Among the people of Fievie for instance, you will hardly find someone who does solely fishing. Most people are subsistence farmers, where much focus is given to maize production, while others keep cattle. Maize is their main staple crop, and others such as cassava, pepper, sweet potatoes and beans supplement their diet.

I use the word paradox to highlight the reasons behind rice production instead of maize production and to also bring to bear, the differences that exist in the ideologies of development at the local, national and international levels. Using this as a point of entry into this thesis, I am tempted to ask few questions. If people of Fievie have for years focused on maize production, it means they must have arable land for its production. What are the reasons behind the selection of rice production for the project? Also, as we will soon see the various debates about food security and food self-sufficiency, I use food self-sufficiency as a development tool to argue that, in our international and national development aim to ensure food security, we may rather cripple local people's efforts in ensuring their own self-sufficiency in food.

Indeed, both maize and rice are staple crops in the country and remain central to national concern. However, Dzudzor (2015) pointed out that, rice has become a major staple food and the second largest cereal consumed after maize in the country. This notwithstanding, both crops remain under-produced to meet national demand. Given the fact that maize is the first staple food yet under-produced, why is an investment not made in maize but rather in rice? This question draws attention to the tendency for local interests to be ignored in development projects aimed at satisfying global needs. Some project managers pointed out that, people are developing taste for rice and national demand is higher than production, and it is an economically profitable venture hence, their motivation

to produce rice rather than any other crop. On the other hand, traditional authorities and community members also said, the investors who approached them for their land, came purposely for rice production. My fieldwork illustrates that, some investors who claim to improve existing economic lives of people, have interests that do not suit local people's interests, and often, they focus on national and international goals at the detriment of the very lives that work to make their dreams possible.

Why the need for agricultural development and investments in Ghana?

Poverty eradication and food security issues are central to many developing countries, including Ghana. Ghana is endowed with diverse natural resources including minerals, forest resources and oil. The country has also enjoyed political stability with peaceful elections and transition of power from one political party to the other since 1992 (Diao, 2010). Ghana's poverty is highly associated with the rural communities, and the rural economy is purely agrarian. Agriculture contributes about 40% to the Gross Domestic Product and about 55% of the population is employed in this sector, (Leturque & Wiggins, 2011). However, the World Food Programme (2009), indicates about 5% of Ghana's population is threatened by food insecurity and in a follow-up survey, the 2012 Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Analysis (CFSVA) revealed that, more than 680,000 people in the Northern, Brong Ahafo and Volta regions are prone to severe food insecurity (Biederlack & Rivers, 2009, 2013).

The challenges associated with food self-sufficiency in Ghana are not exclusive to difficulty in accessing suitable agricultural land by small-scale farmers and women, unfavourable climatic conditions, lack of improved agricultural techniques and practices as well as population growth. Also, inconsistencies in land title registration procedures, impedes economic development in Ghana. Most lands in Ghana are customary holdings. Due to local settlements around vast unregistered land, neighbouring communities turn to claim ownership of the same land area. In effect, different communities may end up selling same tracts of land to investors. This usually generates land litigation. Additionally, according to Boamah (2015), chiefs act as custodians of customary landholdings in most communities, and therefore negotiate land deals with investors on behalf of the community. He recounts, this often leads to dispossessions and erosion of livelihood of

people who do not have recognized relationships with chiefs. Thus people who are usually affected by such eventualities are those who have not worked out their relationships with chiefs, although they may be local citizens of the community. This notwithstanding, Antwi-Bediako (2013) contends that, large tracts of land acquired through Ghanaian middlemen and chiefs were used for biofuel production for international markets and the process of land acquisition was contested by stakeholders of the land which resulted in conflicts.

The trajectory of most of the agricultural investment projects have ended in tragedy due to lack of a good working relationship between land owners and users on the one side, and investors on the other side. Also, this is facilitated by improper terms of land negotiation, as chiefs do not consult with community members who are land users. Additionally, some of the investments do not benefit the local people directly, especially, those with international markets targets (biofuel production) (Acheampong & Campion, 2014; Antwi-Bediako, 2013). Little is known in research about what happens when investors enter into partnership with landowners in Ghana. This study sheds light on local partnership with investors which can inform state policies and guide investors and local people alike. Also, as a contribution to the ongoing academic debate on participatory development, I argue that, participatory only work to an extent and it is a novel configuration of capitalism due to hierarchized political boundaries observed within the global and local structures.

Agriculture is a very important industry for research, investment and development as this works towards food security and self-sufficiency, eradication of poverty, creation of jobs and a general increase in a country's GDP. Hence, particular attention has to be paid to the kind of investment being made and how it is being implemented. Agricultural investments can work to meet or transform local dietary needs, if particular attention is not paid to the local people's sociocultural and economic lives.

Development efforts in the country have rather failed to enact desired outcome. These efforts maintain or improve existing political, economic and social inequalities, as they have also done elsewhere (Caldeira & Holston, 2015; Green, 2003). It is commonly known that, community members are more knowledgeable in their environment (Posey,

1985) than any other person, irrespective of the person's profession or specialty, yet, Mzamu (2012, p. ix) asserts that,

standardised policy concepts such as 'food security', 'poverty' and 'the poor' are usually constructed at forums that are often dismissive of local people's interests, values and meanings, as well as of their potential (and ability) to contribute towards solving their own problems.

Most of the investments observed in Ghana are "top-down", where all decisions are made on forums that local people are dissociated from. "A general weakness of top-down development is provision of services by the state, bypassing resource-poor people and their organizations" (Ojha & Morin, 2001, p. 1). Lack of enthusiasm and low agricultural yields are the results of such actions. There is an urgent need to bring agents and agencies together via partnerships in agricultural production. Indeed, in Fievie, although the community is said to be in partnership with investors, it was only a few local elites and traditional authorities who made this decision. In effect, there is no grass-root participation, where community members are actively involved in decision making with regards to the rice project.

The emerging concept of partnership in agricultural investment

The Ghana Public-Private Partnership (PPP) policy guideline was developed in 2004, and was enhanced in 2011. The national policy for Ghana in 2011 defines the PPP as a legal agreement between the public entity and the private sector to provide certain infrastructure and services, otherwise provided by the state (MFEP, 2011)³. *The adoption of a PPP framework therefore reflects the Government's desire to improve the quality, cost-effectiveness and timely provision of public infrastructure and services in Ghana (MFEP, 2011, p. 1)*

As stated earlier, the agricultural sector forms the backbone of Ghana's socio-economic development as about 55 percent of the country's population is employed in this sector. Through the Food and Agriculture Sector Development Policy (FASDEP II), the Government of Ghana (GoG), in an attempt to develop the agricultural sector,

³ Government of Ghana, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning

emphasized the importance of inter-sectorial partnership among the public and private sectors and the civil society. This will increase agricultural production, through technical improvement and financial support. The GoG found it necessary and important to extend the PPP policy to agricultural mechanization. Since 1995, the country has experienced some partnership between the state and private sectors as well as external investors and donors (FAO, 2013)⁴. Nevertheless, the focus of these partnerships has been on cash crops including cocoa and rubber, until the West African sorghum partnership project was established in 2006.

Access to land is a major factor for agricultural production in Ghana and important for initiating and implementing agribusiness PPPs. FAO (2013), identifies problems of land litigation to have constrained the smooth implementation and operationalization of the PPP. They suggested a development of land banks to promote agribusiness PPPs. As mentioned earlier, the land ownership system in Ghana is predominantly customary landholdings, which either belong to families, clans, stools and skins, as well as state and private landholdings (Aryeetey, 2007; Kasanga & Kotey, 2001; Yaro, 2012a). Stool or skin lands belong to the chieftaincy of a particular society. Most customary landholdings are being used by community members but managed by traditional authorities such as chiefs. Land ownership gives a sense of belonging, identity and it is a source of wealth and livelihood for most people. Investors usually buy land outright from traditional authorities (who often do not consult community members who are the land users) and in effect, are challenged with resistance from the community (Acheampong & Campion, 2014; Zagema, 2011). Sometimes, the elites and middle class who identify with these investors, turn to block any useful relationship between the investors and the rest of the community members at their own self-centered interests. Also, the process of land acquisition is often contested by stakeholders of the land, sometimes resulting in conflicts. Dispossession and displacement from such land can actually lead to conflicts and unproductive relationships (Boamah, 2015). Often, global and national development policies and efforts that seek to ensure food security and poverty reduction seldom examine these power

⁴ Food and Agricultural Organization

relations, especially those associated with land acquisition and use, and subsequently end up marginalizing the less advantaged people who have been promised a better life.

PPPs in agriculture is a necessary mechanism to create transformational change, by promoting technology advancement, and to harness skills, expertise, resources and market access, to improve the lives of the resource-poor smallholders in Ghana. In this regard, certain partnerships are required particularly to control land litigation problems.

A number of agricultural partnerships have been observed in the country over the years. Of a particular attention is the role Wienco played in such initiatives. In 1979, Wienco, a Dutch-Ghanaian company was established. It is an agro-chemist company and its mission is to timely and efficiently provide excellent and affordable agricultural inputs and training through extensive distribution network. Wienco is committed to improving agricultural productivity of organized smallholder farmers by providing input packages such as agro-chemicals, seeds and fertilizers. The farmers in turn repay Wienco with their produce after harvest. So Wienco takes their cost of providing the necessary agro-chemicals to the farmers from the produce harvested. With their commitment to also improve the lives of its partner smallholders, they in turn buy the rest of their produce to control and prevent post-harvest loss. The remarkable effort of Wienco in increasing agricultural production in the country and improving the lives of farmers led to the establishment of partnerships with farmers' associations, including The Cocoa Abrabopa Association (for cocoa farmers) and Masara N'arziki (for maize farmers). But it must be emphasized that, these partnerships are only between institutions or companies and farmers' associations, not between investors and communities. As larger size of Ghana's land area is customary holding, PPPs in agriculture should not only be limited to public or the state and the private sectors, financial institutions supporting smallholder farmers by granting them loans. Partnerships that involve all-inclusive community participation, using customary land are required.

Although partnership between communities and investors may seem an "all-inclusive" project, it is only the voice of the more powerful, affluent and the "educated" that are heard and worked with. The authorities that act as mediators between the community members

and the investors often relegate community members' views to the background. Thus there may be clear regulations of operation in relation to community members, but such regulations are seldom practiced. For instance, we will soon learn that, although the social organization of the Fievie people into various social units is to promote grass root participation, only the views of chiefs are considered in decisions regarding the community. The power relations observed between the investors, who claim to be "all knowing" and the authorities, as well as between the authorities and their community members and even among members of the Fievie community calls for a discussion. The political and economic differences observed among interested parties only results in inefficient production and the failure of the project. Such inequalities work to maintain and exacerbate pre-existing political, economic and social differences.

This study provides empirical data to create the awareness among interested parties. It also outlines the process of forming and maintaining partnership and the products of entering partnership with local people. The knowledge produced can inform good and working partnership policies, in the quest for increasing agricultural production and improving livelihoods. The Fievie rice project is characterized by partnership between the community and the investors. In this partnership, every party has a motive but with a varying degree, and how these motives work towards the progress and/or failure of the project is calculable.

Is the land good for rice production or there is need for rice production?

Carney (2002), established that, rice cultivation was long perfected on the West African coast and contributed to the success of American rice production through the Atlantic slave trade. Paradoxically, Ghana lacks rice self-sufficiency and largely depends on importation. Rice is one of the main staple foods in the country and the largest cereal after maize (NDPC, 2013), due to increasing urbanization (Kwasi, 2015), rapid change in taste and easy method of preparation. The increasing consumption of rice and the rise on import tax of rice have attracted the attention of policy makers and stakeholders of Ghana's rice sector.

Although Asumeng-Brempong (1998) indicates that Ghana has good agronomic conditions for rice production (cited in Asuming-Brempong and Osei-Asare (2007), this staple's production in the country is rather insufficient due to low agrochemical usage, lack of homogenous seeds of demanded varieties and low farm mechanization. All these factors are controllable, to help rescue the situation. Lack of expertise and knowledge in the rice sub-sector is a major challenge. It is therefore prudent to have expertise, institutions and investors with means of providing the necessary support in terms of technical advice, equipment and quality seeds, to partner with communities and smallholder farmers with arable land and empowering societal value for rice production. Owing to the Fievie rice project, the most appealing means of effective rice production is having these institutions, experts and investors partner with the resource-poor farmers and communities. This way, everyone has a sense of responsibility in the production project. However, from my research findings, it will be more productive and less harmful to the alteration of sociocultural fabrics of the people investors enter into partnership with, if such investments are done in areas where rice farming is ongoing. Or where, the people largely consume rice, so that the presence of the project does not negatively transform their diet and affect their subsistence livelihood.

It must be noted that, people's choice of food is not only for physiological needs but also, for meanings and values grounded in their culture and orientation (Mzamu, 2012). There may be enough food, but people will still go hungry because, they do not attach value to them and may not even draw physiological satisfaction from them. As indicated by GSS (2010)⁵ about 96.1% of the Fievie population are Ewes⁶. Maize is the main staple food of Ewes. This draws attention to the political economy of rice production in this community. Of course, rice is one of the staple foods in Ghana, but until recently it was an occasional food, usually consumed at the end of the year. It was more of a Christmas dish. "Akple" which is made of maize is associated with the people of the Volta region which includes the Fievie people. It must be emphasized that, power relations are essential to people's selection of food types to produce, distribute and to consume. Mzamu (2012) argues that,

⁵ Ghana Statistical Services

⁶ They are people from the of Volta region of Ghana.

politics of meaning, values and interests are associated with particular crop production, thus, maize production in the case of the Chewa of Malawi. Although maize is of interest and value to the local people, it does not serve the political and economic interests of the investors. With a consistent and effective production of rice in this community, their diet is being transformed. The implication of the dietary transformation for food self-sufficiency and their socio-cultural activities is measurable.

Main Arguments

For the past centuries, anthropologists have studied food rules and taboos to explain cultural constructions of class, nature, gender, religion, morality, health and the social order (Counihan, 1992). Conducting studies on how food is conceptualized and evaluated in Ghana is important. This is because food security and poverty eradication in the Third World have become general concerns. Most development efforts such as agricultural investments to ensure food security are being encouraged in Africa, where there is the claim that empty, unutilized vast tracts of land abounds. I argue that, the success of such investments depends on their ability to fit into cultural patterns of the local people. I explain how international and national interests in food security and poverty eradication turn to generate internal conflicts and increase existing social, political and economic differences. As a contribution to academic debates on food security and food self-sufficiency, I argue that, the latter is a development tool entrenched in societal values, that empowers local people to produce enough staple crop to cater for themselves through the year. In contrast to OECD, a focus on food self-sufficiency does not result in food insecurity in the Fievie community.

I also maintain Robbins (2004) argument that, political ecology gives us the understanding that, there are less exploitative and coercive, as well as better sustainable ways of doing things. I argue, partnership between investors and a community is a necessary mechanism to control land litigation and smooth access to land in Ghana. It is also a good way to increase agricultural production and attain national food self-sufficiency. However, it only works to an extent, with implications for local people's values and interests, due to unequal power observed among actors, as well as unequal costs and benefits distributions. Partnership that is an all-inclusive that involves grass root

participation of the ordinary people, engaging them in managing their own resources is likely to thrive.

Additionally, I argue that, food self-sufficiency is a development tool for self-reliance. According to the NDPC (2014)⁷, the decline in staple crops production since 2011 to 2013 was attributable to unpredictable rainfall and a reduction in land area under cultivation. As an advance to this knowledge, my fieldwork reveals, some investment packages cripple existing local practices and self-reliance efforts. These factors are calculable and controllable. The Fievie people like to work for themselves, although they are also willing to work for money. But labourers complain bitterly about the wage as being meagre, not enough to support them and their families. They are also crippled by the high energy and time demand of the project, hence cannot work on their own farms. If this phenomenon persists, the people may eventually have to depend on neighbouring communities to meet their staple food demands. This is not a good sign of development of subsistence farmers who are turned into wage labourers and their taste for akple dismissed. Thus, I will show how the politico-economic selection of rice for production affects the diet of the people.

The Study Site and the Fievie People

This research is ethnographically grounded and based on fieldwork among the Fievie people from the period of August 2015 to middle of January 2016. According to the Ghana Statistical Services, (GSS, 2010), the Fievie traditional area is noted as a poverty stricken area with high illiteracy rate and unemployment. The South Tongu District of Volta region, of which Fievie is one of the five traditional areas, consists of 87,950 people and the population of Fievie traditional area is estimated around 10,000, (GSS, 2010). The area is made of a cluster of sub-communities with Sogakope as its commercial town.

The political organization of the area is characterized by chiefs and Assembly members; and the assembly unit is the highest government decision making body (GSS, 2010). There is a paramount chief and chiefs for the various communities. The sub-communities in turn have sub-divisional chiefs, all of whom are enstooled in Fievie Dugame, before

⁷ National Development Planning Commission

returning to their communities to act in that capacity. The people of the Fievie Dugame are organized in “*tokor*” (Gates)⁸. However, they are related due to intra-marriages. There is decentralization in administration but a concentration of power at the top, as the paramount chief exercises a “veto—power” of having a final say. His decisions are final. However, he is said to make selfless decisions for the community, having considered the views and interests of his people. But some members attest that, His decisions are not always favourable. As indicated by GSS (2010), 96.1% of the people are Ewes and majority of them are Christians, among other ethnic and religious groups respectively.

The ethnographic component of my research was carried in the Fievie Dugame. The reason being that, it is the traditional seat of the area to which all other communities pay allegiance. This notwithstanding, most of the traditional leaders hail from this community and the decisions concerning the traditional area concerns it most. I also made occasional visits to most of the other communities, such as Agorkpo, Kpodzi, Dendo, Sogakope, Adidokpe, Connerme etc. My main decision to live and to conduct this study among the people of Fievie Dugame and to visit the aforementioned communities is because, these people are most affected by the rice project.

There is lack of pre-colonial and even post-colonial data on the Fievie people. But from oral history, they migrated from Ana in Nigeria and were originally called the Anawo. They are said not to have gone through much socio-cultural transformations especially in their tradition. Although the district assembly is the highest decision making body in the district, assembly members need to liaise with their respective traditional authorities for effective administration. As the traditional authority, although act in relation to the laws of the state, exercises authoritarian control over their people. This is much indicative of the role and power of the paramount chief as he has a final say in every decision concerning the traditional area, irrespective of the voice of the people. However, from observation, he does not act of the ordinary, owing to the fact that, he lives, experiences and identifies with his people.

⁸ Gates are family lineages, in which people of a particular gate are considered as of one family. This is done to maintain ancestral lineage and for easy administration of the community.

Agriculture is the main occupation in the Fievie traditional area. Most people are into subsistence farming and cattle rearing. Although maize remains a central staple food in the country and its consumption is observed in all the regions, it is the main staple crop of the Fievie people, which is supplemented with cassava, beans, okro, groundnuts and sweet potatoes. Pepper is produced as a cash crop. Maize is processed in to different kinds of food; akple, banku, liha, kokonte-tasi, azikpeli, abolo, kenkey, etc. Although maize is their staple, most people sell part of their maize produce to financially support their nutritional requirements and other consumption. With the history of maize in this area, the integration of rice production is quite smooth, although people lack the expertise. It is necessary to emphasize the importance of partnership and its role in the life of resource-poor farmers.

Relating the theme of this thesis, food self-sufficiency is likely to be attained by the country but may end up transforming the socio-cultural dynamics of the people who are directly engaged in the production project. This is due to the fact that, it involves a food crop that they originally do not identify with. Although food is a candid issue in development discourse (Mzamu, 2012), it is the strongest ethnic marker in the lives of the Fievie people and there are complex and paradoxical issues that are necessary for their ways of life in relations to their food. Such attitudes are illustrated and observed in their local proverbs, such as “ema enye ame” (Akple, generally referred to as “ema” is human). This is more elaborated on in the subsequent chapters. This notwithstanding, people are open to explore other food crops made available to them.

In light of this, this thesis does not only provide ethnography on the people of Fievie but also, outlines the importance and contributions that partnership can make in realizing self-sufficiency in food in the country, yet, with the twist of transforming the diet of the Fievie people. It generally illuminates and advances on food studies, and partnership in agriculture in post-colonial states. It also provides empirical data on the politics of political economy and its roles in transforming the phenomenology and the concepts of target beneficiaries.

Research Methodology

During the research proposal stage of this study, I was unsure whether to use only qualitative research method or mixed methods. Research methodology is central to anthropological research and fieldwork, as a good research design saves time, resources and gives general idea of one's expectation. Research methodology is a plan or guide to a research, as fieldwork is a process by which evidence is generated (Watts, 2006). (LeCompte, 2010) argues that, the best research method is dependent on the research questions; researcher's abilities and interest of the knowledge he/she aims to produce about a group of people or an individual, under a particular condition; funds, funders' requirements, time and the target research audiences. Anthropologists are therefore confronted with enormous challenges prior to and during fieldwork and data analysis, making the authenticity and objectivity of the knowledge being produced questionable. Among such challenges are; selection of research methods, making sense of sociocultural variations and external forces, ethical issues and appropriate methods of analyzing data.

Qualitative research method is characterized by understanding an occurrence from a closer perspective and on which much knowledge may not exist. It is usually based on in-depth description and analysis of phenomena. LeCompte (2010) asserts that, surveys are challenged with the inability to elicit historical and contextual data and untouched findings, as the instruments are structured based on existing knowledge. It assumes one-fits-all with less flexibility. Simply put, a quantitative approach is deductive and limited in scope of the information or knowledge being produced about each unit of observation, although, it may be proven to be scientific and objective (Park, 2006). Park (2006) posits that, this may not be appropriate for nuanced research questions which seek to understand identity, subjective experiences and historical causation but rather, suited for people's political opinion and for social and economic decisions.

Anthropologists' quest for descriptive analysis, and for words instead of numbers for analysis may lead them to use qualitative approach which includes structured and semi-

structured interviews, informal conversation and ethnography. Participant observation which is central to ethnography is both humanistic and scientific methods and produces effective knowledge (Bernard, 2011, p. 256). However, LeCompte (2010) argues that, ethnography, although earmarked for discovery of people's behavior and meaning attached to them through hearing and discovery, is limited to small group of people and lacks generalizability to the entire population. This notwithstanding, I choose to use participant observation as the main framework of this ethnographic study. This afforded me the opportunity to observe the entire population of Fievie Dugame and generate theoretical generalizability, as knowledge gained from Fievie can be identified with and transferred to other contexts based on similar observations. I also conducted interviews to compliment my observation of socio-cultural occurrences and yields historical and contextual data.

Harrell (2006), argued that, anthropologists are confronted with the issue of objectivity of the knowledge being produced, as the social, cultural and historical processes being reported are said to be subjective. Researchers sometimes become embedded in events they were supposed to record. Also due to one's political, economic or racial standing, the researcher may impose his/her bias into the findings and during interpretation (Jackson, 2004). This is especially true for native anthropologists (Leslie & Storey, 2003). I therefore identified myself as "researcher" when necessary, yet, this did not assume a hierarchical order of researcher-informant. I mostly listened to my informants without questioning the authority and importance of their views. I listened, rather than talked. I avoided every form of argument in relation to my research and on issues that may make them think I knew it all. For instance, there was an instance when one of my male informants and some women were discussing about how women dress-their hairdo and polishing their nails. The women argued for the need for women to dress in nice clothes and with modern hairstyle. However, the man readily dismissed their argument, because, in doing so, the women become attractive to other men and this may generate divorce or adultery. As delicate as this issue was, I could not contribute, because, it may seem that, I was taking side with either parties. Besides, I was enjoying the discussion as it provided me with information about the gender relations in this community.

The conceptualization of culture suggests a world of human differences and diversified separate societies (Gupta & Ferguson, 1997) with inherently unique characteristics, typically associated with “a people”, “a tribe”, “a nation” (Stockings, 1982 cited in Gupta & Ferguson, 1997:1). The concept of culture forms the basis of cross-cultural comparison studies and the framework of ethnographic study, hence, fieldwork among the “Fievie people”. Although Gupta and Ferguson (1997) asserts that this makes it possible to bound the ethnographic object and to generalize from diverse separate cases, I argue that this rather presents the challenge of defining a community, an ethnic group, a traditional area of fieldwork, due to increasing migration, globalization, trans-cultural and transnational interconnectedness. This makes it difficult to separate the local from the global and the national from the regional, with the basic assumption that, there is no unique culture without permeation. Should we assume a geographically boundedness of these units (community, village, town, nation) or a boundedness and coherence of culture? How then do we make sense of internal sociocultural variations and external forces? I must clarify that, culture is no more fixed in places (Gupta & Ferguson, 1997), therefore sociocultural variation and external forces during fieldwork should be considered as historical processes or creations of diverse people to be explained rather than as accepted facts. Also, instead of opposing autonomous cultures, dominant ones should be selected and studied in the light of power relations that link localities to the wider world (Gupta & Ferguson, 1997).

Anthropologists should be mindful that, the sense of social and cultural occurrences as an order and a shared commonality is being transformed through processes and must therefore be seen as diversified and contested. Prior to my arrival at the fieldsite, I had the thought of conducting fieldwork among the Fievie people, about who little is known in the literature. Upon arrival and an encounter with one of the chiefs, I realized I was in Fievie-Dugame, which is usually called Fievie. To my dismay, communities I had thought of as independent were actually suburbs of the “Fievie traditional area”. An area defined to comprise other communities, with a commercial town and a traditional town. All other communities pay allegiance to the Fievie-Dugame, known to be the traditional and cultural seat of the Fievie traditional area. This was elaborated earlier in this chapter.

Anthropologists must therefore recognize cultural territories as complex and contingent results of historical, political, social, cultural and economic processes of different people, which require anthropological study.

Analysis of data is dependent on the research approach used in data collection. It is important but challenging to code a qualitative data, as this requires special and intellectual ability to categorize, analyze and theorize the content of the text, moving away from the mere description of events provided by informants and yet staying clear from personal prejudices. In phenomenological analysis, devising and working with codes, themes or categories (Gibbs, 2007) that reflect part of the data is very tedious. To avoid deductive criticisms, I used Grounded theory approach, thus a data driven and line-by-line coding to prevent the imposition of interpretation from existing literature or theory. Thus I read through my fieldnotes and transcribed interviews, and generated codes and themes based on them. I used this approach to code three major transcribed interviews into themes and categories. This served as the foundation for the rest of my analysis, although these first codes were reviewed and new ones generated as the data provide new insights.

Entering the Research Field

As indicated earlier, I conducted the main ethnographic fieldwork in the Fievie Dugame from August 2015 to January 2016. I made my first trip to the community in June, to inform the chief (Togbe Awaga) of my research project and indicated to him, the reasons for my choice to work among them. He gave me a pleasant welcome and confirmed the ongoing rice project with a brief history on how the project started and how it has fared over the years. I quickly asked for his assistance to secure a host family. Although he promised an immediate response to that effect, it rather delayed. He eventually secured a room for me in his house. However, considering the power relations that could be embedded in this community and associated with research, I politely rejected the offer. This action was a way of controlling the environment of politics and to create a shield of vital information, that could otherwise be communicated to me.

I became more acquainted with the informants in Fievie Dugame. The fieldwork period happened to be the period marking the end of the main farming season, and the beginning of the lean season. Most people were very busy with harvesting, weeding and sowing maize. I followed most of participants to their farms. I gathered my data as I assisted them on the farm. However, writing notes during such instances was a problem, because of the seriousness of working on the farm and the diet. I did not want them to feel I was taking too much of their time, so I avoided taking notes on the farm. I wrote down my notes immediately I got home.

Apart from being a part of and following everyday routine, I also, occasionally sat with the men at drinking spots and engaged in useful conversations. As a female researcher, I initially thought this will pose some challenges to me, as most of my informants are married men. I had about seven marriage proposals each day but there was no serious attachment to it. They were rather said jokingly by elderly men, *“Madam, I will marry you okay?”* I usually burst out laughing and they joined me to laugh over it. However, my host sister once told me that, whenever, I step out of the house, the young men come asking about me. Interestingly, these were people who shy away from me upon seeing me. Inasmuch as I was opened to everyone, I also maintained my position as a researcher, through my speech, dressing, and the manner in which I approached people. In effect, they accorded me the necessary respect. Also, because of high rate of illiteracy, school dropout and teenage pregnancy, most of the women I came in contact with, usually said to the men who asked to marry me, *“Do you think she is your class? Sister Gifty not interested”*. I only laughed. As a coping strategy, I used laughter to address such issues, and the people in turn know me as someone who likes laughing. I also played outdoor games such as “Ludu⁹” with some informants. Often, I initiated these activities by frying yam, as we ate alongside playing games and chatting. Such conversations had not always been about the rice project but other social, economic and political issues. In all these, I was quick to listen but slow to talk, and most especially, avoided any arguments.

⁹ It is a local game involving four players at time. One person throws a dice and moves his/her “plate”. This takes turns until there is a loser. It generates lots of arguments. This afforded me the opportunity to observe how some people resolve their misunderstandings.

I also visited the Saga market on several occasions with my host family, where I observed the foodstuff being traded.

Considering the research objectives, in addition to the ethnographic work, which was more of observation and participation, I also conducted interviews with some of the informants, chiefs, managers of the company (Global Agricultural Development Company), the manager of rice projects of Wienco, and the Fievie lands secretariat. The most crucial challenge in conducting an interview with my informants was the issue of recording their voices. But in the course of the interview, I prompted them of how important their views are and the fact that, recording allows for free flow of information without interruption of note taking. I was successful most often and was able to record. Due to my inability to work on the paddy farm as planned, I rather interacted with employees of the project in contexts other than the farm, such as in their houses and drinking spots. I used GPS remote device to take the location of Fievie and the paddy farm on the Ghana map. I also took some important sites on the farm, such as the irrigation and the rice mill machine, as well as some communities surrounding the farm, to indicate how the people and their animals co-exist on the project site. More light will be thrown on this in later chapters. Newspaper articles concerning the issues in question also contribute to the wide array of material studied.

In managing my fieldnotes, I wrote different information in different notepads. For instance, information provided by community members, traditional authorities; project managers, group or opinion leaders, employers were recorded in different notepads. Also, to make my analysis easier, while gathering data, I highlighted with different colours, texts that reflect same themes.

Challenges on the field

The issue of language was not much of a problem. Though I come from that region and speak the same dialect as my informants, there were traces of some differences and owing to the fact that, I have left the region for some years, I sometimes had to ask for explanations, especially, for their local proverbs.

Also, due to high illiteracy rate, teenage pregnancy and school dropout, my presence in this community was one of a pleasant stay, as men and women, adults and children accorded special respect to me. Irrespective of the fact that, I turned down some of their gestures, nothing stopped them. This was in an attempt to avoid power relations of researcher-informant hierarchy. Most people called me “madam” or “sister Gifty”. However, the twist to this respect and nice gestures was quite challenging at the beginning of the study. As most people were not forthcoming in our conversations, with the perception that, I am highly educated and hence, know more than them. To curb this challenge, I persistently informed them about my interest and curiosity to learn and know more about their way of life. Besides, I totally avoided any arguments. The people eventually became more opened in my third month of living among them, after they had become accustomed with me and due to my consistent request for explanation of the things they say and do.

Some people thought I was investigating for the Bureau of National Investigation (BNI) and just disguising myself. But with time, they came to appreciate the fact that, I was identifying with them, even as I learn from them. They had never before been exposed to the work of an anthropologist. In a nutshell, I developed trusted relationships, especially with my informants I accompanied to farm, drinking spots and pool sides in neighbouring communities. They have all immensely contributed to the insights I obtained from different aspects of their ways of living and in relation to the rice project.

Ethical consideration and a note on anonymity

Research ethics are professional codes of conduct with invariably different meanings of responsibility, rights and obligations that may be visible prior to and during fieldwork, and the writing stage of the thesis. The most important anthropological ethics include Informed consent, maintaining anonymity and confidentiality of informants and information provided as well as managing conflict of interest. It is important for anthropologists to obtain research permit from institutional review boards in accordance with human rights protection in research. It is also a requirement for some funders (Curran, 2006). Obtaining this approval can be very frustrating, time consuming, because, the processes are

bureaucratic but necessary to protect the rights and interests of the participants especially in sensitive studies. In observing this ethic, I subjected this study to the Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD) code of ethics, which protect the interests of informants. I obtained a research permit from NSD before my departure to Ghana.

I have maintained a complete anonymity in relation to interviews with informants according to their individual interests. Some informants do not mind to be acknowledged by their names, images, voices, and positions. But others would not even allow me to record their voices. In both cases, I restrained myself from using identifiable names. I put them in categories of chiefs, project managers and representatives, and community members. In this regard, I used pseudonyms and acronyms for my informants' first names. I have also handed a note of confidentiality and anonymity signed by me, to them and also assured them verbally that, information gathered will not be used against them but for my research purpose only.

Thesis Outline

The thesis comprises five chapters and a summary section. The first two chapters provide introduction to the study. As outlined above, chapter 1 introduces the thesis by outlining the basic subjects addressed. In chapter two, I discuss local socio-political organization and land resource distribution and use in the Fievie community. I further discuss how their system works to support the partnership project in terms of land use. It forms part of the background material to this research. In situating this research within food studies and development discourse, some theoretical and existing literatures are reviewed in chapter three to provide analytical perspectives on the subjects of interest especially on Food self-sufficiency in Ghana with empirical findings from my fieldwork. Chapter four provides insights into international and local conceptualization of poverty and development and how these views work to create, maintain or improve inequalities at local levels. Chapter five is the chapter where I present and analyze my main findings. It sheds light on the concept of partnership as an investments and development model, to control exploitation and land use, and for active participation of local people in the use of their resources.

Chapter 2

Local Social Organization and the Meaning of Land

“Our great grandfathers¹⁰ made ponds, from where we sometimes fish” (Fieldnote, October 2015).

This chapter provides background to the study. I will discuss how the people of Fievie are socially organized and how they affect each other's life. Also, the meaning ascribed to land in this community and its implication for access and use, will be discussed. The use of the word “our and we” in the excerpt above indicate a sense of collective identity, ownership and access to the fish pond resource. I spoke to the gentleman alone, where no one was present. He could not have been forced to use those words because of the presence of others. Other informants also use similar words often. This is an indication that, the people have a sense of collectiveness and are organized accordingly.

Local social organization is an important segment to land resource distribution in many communities in Ghana, especially in the Fievie traditional area. Just a recap from the introductory chapter, from their migration history from Oyo in Nigeria, they claim common ancestors with the Volo people. However, the people of Volo moved farther away to settle elsewhere. Being the first settlers in the area, the people of Fievie have ownership to a very vast area of fertile land. Many studies have shown that, land is a contested resource in Ghana (Acheampong & Campion, 2014; Antwi-Bediako, 2013; Boamah, 2015). But the question is, how do the people of Fievie work to avoid land litigation, ensure equal right to land, its use and benefits that ensue from it? Besides, does land mean anything at all to the people? This chapter also forms part of the background to the study and will address the concerns mentioned above. Due to non-existence of knowledge about the Fievie people, much of the information provided here are based on observations, and oral history.

¹⁰ One's father's father's father, using Nukunya's (2013) definition of grandfather,

Suburbs, Gates and Houses

The social system of the Fievie traditional area is imbedded in its subdivisions of suburbs, gates and houses of a group of people who share a common history, origin, heritage and characteristics. In many Ewe communities in Ghana, sub-villages of a larger traditional area are common. The Fievie traditional area is of no exception. The Fievie history has it that, when their ancestors first settled at their present location, and with the vast land available to them, they considered it wise to settle on different areas of the land. This was an attempt to secure the land. These initial settlements with a social unit of a husband, wife and children eventually evolved into villages and towns. They are usually referred to as “*kope*”. They usually use this term to mean village. However, irrespective of how changed the villages may become, they still possess their original names. For instance, Sogakope, although the commercial town of the traditional area, still has the word “*kope*” attached to it. Thus, although these settlements usually consist of more than 200 habitats and may qualify to be small towns, they need to be examined in their own regional and context peculiarities and understanding (Andersson, 2002; Owusu, 2005). Currently, these settlements have their own chiefs but are not autonomous to the paramount chief and the “the custodian of the stool”. The custodian of the stool possesses the power to enstool and destool any chief.

These chiefs seek the traditional, social and economic welfare of their people and act as representatives of the people on the traditional council. They are also responsible for the protection of their people, physically and spiritually (Amoatia (2010). I recall one of the nights whiles in the field. I heard several gun shots and I was filled with fear and could not make meaning of it. In a conversation with my host sister, she explained;

What you heard was indeed gunshot, but just warning shot. Our chiefs and elders guard this community as they guard their own houses. As we go to bed, they keep wake to protect and drive especially thieves away. You see, thieves come here now and then, but our chiefs are always alert. I don't even know how they are alerted of the plans of these criminals. They mostly catch them. ...the chiefs really do well in that regard (Fieldnote, 16th November, 2015).

The efforts of the various chiefs especially of Fievie Dugame, where I resided during my fieldwork, to protect the interests of their people cannot be underestimated. The extract above is a typical illustration of how the people feel protected by their chiefs and traditional leaders. They regard themselves as one people since they are interrelated through marriages and with common ancestors. However, the traditional leaders lack efficiency and commitment in delivering their duties as the people I have worked with express dissatisfaction with the duty of the leader to protect their interests.

Centralization and decentralization of power to sub chiefs within the various villages do not only make administration easy and the people controllable, but it is also an attempt for grassroots participation (Scott, 1998). The people of the Fievie Dugame are divided into four “Gates”. Unlike the Ashanti people, who are identified by clans (Nukunya, 2003), the Fievie people have gates which are considered to be entrances to the whole community. These gates have their own chiefs, enstooled by the “stool custodian”. They own allegiance to their immediate chief, thus the chief of the suburb, in this case, the chief of the Fievie Dugame, “Togbe Awaga”. They provide him with all the necessary information pertaining to the social, political and economic welfare of their gate members. Most people within a particular gate bear the same family/surname. This illustrates a common great-grandfather, as people are usually named after their grandfathers. People maintain their family names for a number of reasons. Perhaps the person being named after was a hero, for identifiable relatedness, a sense of belonging and to claim inheritance (Nukunya, 2003). However, this is changing in this community and even in the larger society of Ghana. Most people now prefer to name their children after themselves. One important reason is the notion of “household” being created within these various gates.

Households are small social units of husband, wife (wives), children, brothers and sister, brothers’ wife and children and grandchildren. Houses are usually headed by the elderly man of the house not only by age but, the surviving man of the oldest generation (see also Nukunya (2003). In rare cases, you may find women holding this position as heads, especially, when the house consist of only a widow and her children. Unlike the chief of

a gate who has a bigger responsibility to seek the welfare of his people, of which lapses are often observed in delivering his duties, the head of the house has a neatly defined and intense tasks, to seek for the social, economic and spiritual growth of the household members. House heads are closely tied to these responsibilities and it becomes very clear if one is unable to fulfil the task. This is due to the fact, the house is a smaller unit and easily observable. People can easily tell when a child of a particular house is being starved. Such a house head maybe considered lazy and irresponsible. On the other hand, the chief of a particular gate is not particularly responsible for the provision of food for its members but to make economic opportunities available for them and so that they can feed themselves. This is made possible by providing land to those who demand it. As will be discussed in chapter three, the Fievie people believe in farming as the best means to overcome hunger and starvation, taking advantage of the huge fertile land they possess. They consider hunger in a household as a sign of the refusal of household members to till the land and eat its fruit thereof The role of a member of a house is to help the head in farming and to undertake any other duties assigned to him or her by the head (Nukunya, 2003). Children and women assist in weeding the farm and harvesting the produce. Thus, there is division of labour.

Gate chiefs are the overseers of funerals, marriage ceremonies, and other issues pertaining to the gate. The gate is a larger unit and is likened to a family. Due to their interrelatedness, they grace occasions and ceremonies of each other within and out of the gates. During my field-work, there were four funeral rites performed on the same day. My host family took me to all of them and people were moving to and fro of the various funerals. *“We pay funeral rate for each other. If you do it for others, they’ll same for you”*, (Personal conversation with my host mother, October 2015). They believe in oneness and the need to be each other’s keepers.

Intermarriages are essential ingredients in the neat connectedness and interrelatedness of the Fievie traditional area. There are no transitional rites from adolescence to adulthood for both males and females, but marriage for men marks their transition and aids the adolescent girl to be recognized as a woman. One often hears the statement, “you are

now a man”, when a young male gets married. Unlike women, men make the decision to marry a woman, and the woman accepts or declines the offer. However, a woman may have a child with a man without any form of marital rite, by means of customary but this is not culturally acceptable. This is often observed among adolescents. Intra and intermarriages are allowed in the Fievie traditional area. They marry from other tribes and regions of the country. But intra-marriages are encouraged more often. In attempt to continually keep family wealth within the family, marriages within the same gate, family and house are allowed. First-cousins (a male and female, who share the same grandparents) are allowed to marry. As mentioned earlier, the land in the Fievie traditional area is customary landholdings. However, with long history of cultivating and dwelling on the land, some people had claimed ownership of it and had been handed down to succeeding generations. Family wealth is best defined in terms of the size of the family land.

From the above discussions, various actors are at play and have different roles to play in the collectiveness of the Fievie society. According to Holt-Jensen (2009), although these actors are shaped by the society, they also possess personal skills that they use to govern themselves and the people they serve. The manner in which costs and benefits are shared within the environment is calculable. Although gate chiefs maintain their responsibility to protect their people, they hardly share benefits among them equally. For instance, some informants expressed dissatisfaction with the people selected to participate in the out-grower programme of the rice project. I argue that, although chiefs and traditional leaders are shaped by their societal norms and values, and are known to protect their people, they also have personal needs that they are inclined to satisfy. The chiefs and their immediate families are the first to benefit from any opportunity for the community, yet, everyone in the community has a shared responsibility to clean the community and to maintain peace. Thus, my research findings are consistent with Bryant and Bailey (1997)’s argument that, costs and benefits of an environment is not equally distributed among its people. And this strengthens existing inequalities, as chiefs and their immediate families become economically and politically more powerful.

Communal labour and fines

The social organization and the subdivision of the area makes it easy for effective administration and control. Although the community is not a structure of cemented houses and shops, the people work around to keep their surrounding clean and to manage waste and sanitation. This is done on household basis and also commonly organized around “Communal labour” where, every member of the community is expected to participate. Refusal to partake in communal labour, attracts fines or imprisonment of a 2-month term (GhanaNews, 2008)¹¹. This activity is usually organized by the Assemblyman and unit committee members, who serve as government representatives in the community. They are usually supported by traditional leaders especially the chiefs of the various gates to mobilize their people for effective cleaning exercise. The chiefs are considered to be closer to their people and know them much better than government representatives (Amoatia, 2010). The irony is that, Assemblymen and Unit Committee members are elected by the people, while chiefs are appointed and enstooled by the “Stool Custodian”. However, the people pay more respect to the chiefs than the government representatives. Amoatia (2010, p. 1) argues that the constitution of Ghana alone could not have organized the people around a collective nationality, but a sense of unity has been made possible due to the endless efforts of traditional authorities through deep-rooted traditional norms and values. They are, therefore, largely depended on effective communal labour organized almost every month to clean up specific communal places like the school premises and gutters.

With the cosmological ideology and the fear of the land running infertile, people readily pay fines for not observing the taboos of the land. This fear is transferred to other areas of the Fievie people’s life. And one such example is the communal labour fine. As it is believed that, the gods of the land require clean environment, in order to bring rain, maintain peace and drive away sicknesses. The people work effectively to keep their part of the agreement; therefore, most people participate in such activities, mainly to avoid the wrath of the gods and any monetary cost.

¹¹ Ghana News Agency

Marriage is a significant mechanism for social inclusion and organization. The subdivision of the area into villages, gates and houses with heads and various responsibilities from being a member of a household to the paramount chief is a demonstration of decentralization of power and division of labour that enforce individual participation in decision making. According to traditional authorities, every individual has a role to play in this decision making chain, and this encourages grass-root participation. However, community members expressed dissatisfaction that, their views are hardly considered by chiefs in making decisions regarding the community.

The Political chair/Chieftaincy

Chief is defined as

a person who, hailing from the appropriate family and lineage, has been validly nominated, elected or selected and enstooled, enskinned or enstooled as a chief or queen mother in accordance with the relevant customary law and usage (Article 277 of the 1992 Constitution of Ghana, cited in Mwalimu (2009, p. 209).

The 1992 constitution of Ghana permits the chieftaincy institution and its traditional councils to preserve their role as national symbol of unity, but are not expected to actively participate in party politics. The chiefs' active involvement in partisan politics may lead to the division of their people. The Member of Parliament, District Chief Executive, the Assemblyman and Unit committee members are government representatives in the district in which Fievie traditional area is located. Although there are government representatives in the community, the people pay more allegiance to the chiefs (Amoatia, 2010). In light of this, government officials usually depend on the assistance of the chiefs to carry out some official duties such as communal labour and organization of community members for meeting with district officers.

Unlike most communities in Ghana, the Fievie traditional area has no such thing as royal family (Nukunya, 2003). They are all considered royals as the name "Fievie" suggests; "children of the chief". The people are therefore considered as royals. So in effect, everyone is royal. There is no one particular family designated as a royal family. Everyone

stands the chance to emerge as a chief, but subject to appointment by the stool custodian. However, the “stool custodian” can only be selected from one family. He is charged with the duty of appointing and enstooling the chiefs and queen mothers. Fievie Dugame is the traditional seat of the traditional area, where all the various chiefs are enstooled.

Although power is decentralized to the chiefs of the suburbs and to the gates, the paramount chief exercises an absolute power to over-rule the views of all others but in a diplomatic way. It is believed that, the paramount chief is blessed with wisdom to make the best decision for the community. He is also surrounded by a council of elders who act as his main advisors. The chiefs are entrusted with the customary land for the interest of their people and for national development. The authority and decision of traditional leaders are not questioned. The inability of community members to question the decision of traditional authorities makes the power hierarchy in this community obvious. Due to the important position of the chiefs as traditional leaders and custodians of social and cultural values and norms, the people in the Fievie community do not rebel against them, even if there are misunderstandings. Thus the traditional power of chiefs keeps their subjects in check from any riots. From the outline of the social organization given above, the Fievie traditional area is highly hierarchized. Within the traditional system, the paramount chief, although appointed by the stool custodian is the top most head of the area. After him on the rank is the commander in chief (who is designated to lead the people in times of war). Followed by the various gates' chiefs, then the family and household's heads. Lastly are the ordinary men, women and children. Consistent with this power rank, requests and enquiries are channeled through the chain from the lowest to the top most. But not every issue gets to the paramount chief as they are resolved at lower levels. The power of the chiefs transcends social and cultural boundaries to economic life of their people. This is made possible, largely due to entrusted land resources in their jurisdiction (Boamah, 2015).

Local Actors and Land Resource Management and Distribution

The 1992 constitution of Ghana recognizes and acknowledges the importance of land tenure and the need to entrust land management in the hands of people capable of managing the land to the best interest of a “whole”. The colonial administration of land is not well established in the governing Land Acts of the country. However, the Independence and the Post Independence’s constitutions of 1962, 1969 and 1992 outlines the processes of land acquisition and management in the country for the interests of the nation, community and the family. The land ownership system in Ghana is predominantly customary landholdings (families, clans, stools, skins, etc.) as well as state and private landholdings (Aryeetey, 2007; Yaro, 2012b).

“the state shall recognize that ownership and possession of land carry a social obligation to serve the larger community and, in particular, the state shall recognize that the managers of public, stool, skin and family lands are fiduciaries charged with the obligation to discharge their functions for the benefit respectively of the people of Ghana of the stool, skin or family concerned, and are accountable as fiduciaries in this regard” (Article 36(8) of the 1992 constitution)

The above excerpt shows the country’s concern and its recognition of the importance of proper management of land resource. However, the land management system is poorly articulated under certain conditions. Taking the historical perspective of the land ownership system in Ghana, the “Public land” is categorized into two types; the compulsorily acquired land for the interest of the public under the State Lands Act, 1962 (Act 125), or other relevant statutes; and the land which has been vested in the President, in trust for a landholding community under the Administration of Lands Act, 1962 (Act 123). The state, under the law, is obligated to compensate the victims of expropriation because both the legal and the beneficial titles are now vested in the President, and all previous interests relinquished. With the “vested land”, a dual ownership is generated, where the legal title is transferred to the state whiles the beneficial interests lie with the community. As a result, the government does not pay any compensation, but any income proceeding from such land is paid to the stool/skin land account and dispersed accordingly (Section 1.8). The excessive abuse of the compulsory acquisition of land by

the state necessitated the creation of the Lands Commission under the 1969 constitution of Lands Commission Act 1971 (Act 362). For instance;

Large tracts of land were acquired for state farms and factories without compensation paid to farmers who were cultivating in the respective areas. Although protests were often made by farmers to the District Commissioner, political pressure was used to let farmers abandon the fight to regain their land. In a number of instances they were employed to work on the state farms as compensation (Ofori 1973, cited in Kasanga and Kotey (2001, p. 3).

The laws of the country were made to protect the interest of its people. It entrusted into capable hands to manage and use land resources to interests of their people. These are social actors, acting in economic capacities. As indicated by Political ecologists Bryant and Bailey (1997), these social actors are inclined to execute their own plans. From the quote above, the state, represented by the president is vested with the power to confiscate any land for the benefit of the public. However, working with agents and agencies, this right is often abused under most circumstances. People were therefore displaced off their farmland and property, yet could not fight the powerful state for their rights to land. The very state, entrusted to protect the people, turn to abuse their rights. The post structural political ecologists argue that, the state make laws that protect and empower the powerful in society at the expense of the less advantaged. This study sheds some insight to that effect.

The Land commission was then under the ministry of Land and Natural Resources but the 1979 constitution placed the commission directly under the President, although with a greater autonomy. The Lands Commission Act, 1980 (Act 401) created the office of the Administrator of Stools Lands, to act as trustee for the stools, opened a stool land account for the various stools where rents, dues, royalties, revenues and other payments were made into and to also ensure the disbursement of such funds to respective beneficiaries. This notwithstanding, the office of the Administrator of Stool Lands was under the supervision of Lands Commission. Although, the state made provision for stools or communities to benefit from their land resources, its management was distanced from them. It was entrusted into the supervision of land commission. The implication is that,

societies and traditional leaders were incapable of managing their own affair or the state took the measures to avoid chaos that can ensue between traditional authorities and their people. Some chiefs have vehemently argued that, they are capable of handling their own affairs (Amoatia, 2010).

Also, the 1992 constitution reformed the “compulsory land acquisition” to guarantee right to private property and reduce compulsory land acquisition. Lands can only be compulsorily acquired under the interest of public safety, with adequate and fair compensation.

The Lands Commission Act 1994 (Act 483) under the 1992 constitution, created the National Lands Commission, with ten Regional Land Commissions, effectively supported by a Lands Commission Secretariat. The Article 258 (1) of the constitution outlines the functions of the national and regional land commission as follows;

- To manage public lands and any lands vested in the president or the Commission on behalf of the government.
- To advise the government, local and traditional authorities on the policy framework for the development of particular areas to ensure that the development of individual pieces of land is coordinated with the relevant development plan for the area concerned.
- To formulate and submit to government recommendations on national policy with respect to land use and capability.
- To advise on, and assist in, the execution of a comprehensive programme for the registration of title to land throughout Ghana.

With the decentralization of some management roles to regional and communities level actors including chiefs, opinion leaders, educated elites and community members alike, work to perpetuate their own interests. Several unpleasant experiences have been reported across the country, pertaining to land resource distribution, access and use (Acheampong & Campion, 2014). Traditional authorities were reported to sell large tracts of land without land users’ consent as these lands are customary holdings, which are vested in and managed by the chiefs. However, in contrast to Acheampong and Campion

(2014), my research finds that, the traditional authorities of the Fievie traditional area act in the interest of their people, in terms of land redistribution, access and use. Although there are misunderstandings pertaining to the land given out in the rice project, they did not sell the land. Below is a conversation with a community member;

Our land is a clan land. We don't have family land. So everybody has an interest in the land. ...it's just how your community can develop. Because if they sell that land, then it goes out of the authority of the community and we will not benefit from it. But since they leased it, it is still ours. So if they end the project, or aren't able to continue, the land will be for the community. But if they sell it and the work doesn't continue, whatever they like, they can do with it and that means the land is no more for the community, which is not fair. The land is ours and we decide what to use it for (Fieldnote, conversation with a community member, November 2015)

The excerpt above indicates a sense of collective identity and entitlement to the land resource. However, unlike other regions of the country, the people value a continued access to or control over their land. Although chiefs as actors in the environment may not distribute land resource equally, they are mindful of losing total control over their land. This is to maintain their legitimacy to the land for their benefits. Also, it is way to guarantee a continued respect and power of the traditional authority from the people, as land gives them access to control and manage the economic life of the people. People who need new farmlands accord chiefs due respect, as they approach them for the stated purpose.

In accordance with the Lands Commission Act 1994, the Fievie Land Secretariat (FLS) was established to provide administrative support to the regional and national lands commissions in land title registration and the management of clan lands for the benefit of its people. The Fievie traditional clan land is managed by the FLS. The secretariat is made of a five-member executive and other administrative officers. Three of the executive members are chiefs and the rest are community members. There are three professional lawyers who serve on the executive board of which two are chiefs. I call it "the three characteristics" of the executive members of the FLS. The intellectual background; the power vested in them as traditional leaders and lastly, the power entrusted in them by the

state to manage the land resource of their people, innovative decisions pertaining to the redistribution of land within this community was made. But the question is, does the decisions and policies made represent views and interest of the people as directed by the constitution? Chapter five of this study will discuss this topic.

Given the genesis of established law governing land management and distribution since the country attained independence from colonial rule, reforms were made to preceding constitutions, in amendment of disordered laws and restructuring of the land resource, to control state wealth and avoid litigation. However, the country consistently suffers quandaries of land redistribution, as concerned parties seldom observe the necessary laws governing land. Besides, most of the reforms only reinstated and maintained the original administration of land resource. For instance, until the office of the Administrator of Stool Lands was established as an independent body, since, 1962, the President of the country has a continued power vested in him by the various constitutions, to oversee land acquisition and management in the country.

Notwithstanding the amendments for compulsory land acquisition in the 1992 constitution, anomalies are still prevalent in Land management and redistribution in the country. Narh, Lambini, Sabbi, Pham, and Nguyen (2016) argue that, land reforms rather affect the poor and the marginalized groups of our societies, although they are intended to improve the lives of these people. Not to dispute Narh et al. (2016) and Acheampong and Campion (2014), my fieldwork reveals that, local actors such as traditional authorities are inclined to maintain control over their land resources, although, they may not distribute costs and benefits equally among community members. More light will be thrown on this in chapter five. However, Bryant and Bailey (1997) overlooked the role actors can play in the interest of a whole, yet, they capitalize on such opportunities to perpetuate their interests as well. In this case, the Fievie community maintains the right to discontinue the partnership and retrieve their land. However, the benefits that accrue from the project are managed and used by few. Also, a guaranteed access to land means a continued control of the economic life of the people by their chiefs.

The meaning of land in Fievie

One evening during my fieldwork, I heard my host mother shouting and I was startled. So I inquired what got her very angry. It was about a small piece of land behind her house. She wanted to make use of it. But it does not belong to her. The owner heard about her plans and asked someone to stop her from using it. However, my host mother could not comprehend why the land owner could not give out that small piece of land to use as a bathhouse. She continued to say, *“we came to meet the land and will soon die and leave it. ...all you need is a six-feet area for your graveyard”* (Fieldnote, 15th December 2015). My host mother’s meaning of land may differ from others. For her, land is a gift to humans. And considering the lifespan of humans, this gift is to be used for our benefits while we are still alive. So, to her, we are to make use of the land while you can.

While Franco, Twomey, Ju, Vervest, and Kramer (2015) have argued, land is a source of life, from the excerpt above, land is also a home for the dead. People usually find befitting piece of land for their dead relatives’ body. Although dead, relatives may want to keep proximity with the departed person, therefore they bury the corpse at lawful, yet honouring places. Some are buried at specific places based on order given prior to their death (Mwesigire, 2014). Those in the cities may transport the corpse to their hometown for burial. In Fievie, sometimes considering the status of the dead, (such as family head, breadwinner, children) they are buried in their homes. They believe the spirit of the dead is safer at home and feels closer to them than, it being in the cemetery. Land presents us

life, yet when we die, it takes us back (See also The Chimurenga Chronic April, 2013, cited in Mwesigire (2014)). argued that, if you are landless while alive, you may not have your wish granted on your death of being buried at a specific place. However, my host mother did not observe the rules pertaining to land in Fievie. The land belongs to someone. In this community, it is necessary for her to obtain the landowner's permission before making use of it. This shows respect and mutual understanding that, there is an owner and a user.

The United Nations' Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) defines land

as a delineable area of the earth's terrestrial surface, encompassing all attributes of the biosphere immediately above or below this surface including those of the near-surface climate, the soil and terrain forms, the surface hydrology (including shallow lakes, rivers, marshes, and swamps), the near-surface sedimentary layers and associated groundwater reserve, the plant and animal populations, the human settlement pattern and physical results of past and present human activity [terracing, water storage or drainage structures, roads, buildings, etc] (Franco et al., 2015, p. 4)

From the definition above, land is very important for human livelihood and their history. Different people ascribe different meanings to land. For some, it is an empty ground not occupied by water. For others, it is earth surface for farming to feed themselves and their households. Pastoralists consider its greens good for their livestock. It is dignity and identity for most people, that is why we have such terms as "hometown", place of birth, country. We usually refer to Ghana as "our beloved motherland". The land that provides, succor, care, love, peace and everything good for "her" people. We get attached to some places more than others, due to the experiences lived there (see also Basso, 1996), and this marks the history that we are identified with. How humans relate to land may vary from place to place, which reflects the significance of diverse landscapes (Franco et al., 2015, p. 4).

The historical concerns granted to land resource demonstrates the important role it plays in the Ghanaian economy and the chaos it stands to create if care is not taken. It is therefore in line to argue that, land in Ghana has been commodified. According to Berry (2009), in order to increase productivity through land markets and encourage private investments in land-based development, neoliberal policy makers entreat governments to privatize land ownership. Land is significant for development. Although has been commodified with varying degrees of interested parties such as land agents, chiefs, educated elites, heads of family, community members, it remains a great asset to many. As people across the country ascribe different meanings to it, determined by their history and territorial preferences. I therefore argue that, meanings, values and interests ascribed to land by different groups of people determines how their land is distributed and what it is use.

Although, we are the current owners of the land, we are only custodians of it. The land is for generations unborn. Our forefathers left it as legacy for us. We also have to keep it and transfer it unto our children. ...we do not want the situation where people will just come, exploit everything and take it away. ...and the country will be left with nothing. That's why we entered into partnership with them and for the technological transfer of rice farming (Fieldnotes, Conversation with the "stool custodian", December, 2015).

Land is a property from heaven to human land. If you misuse your land God will not make any new one. Right now, if this land goes bad, God will not create a new one for Fievie. The best plan should been put in place. If you sign an agreement with somebody & he fails, you should raise a case against the person (Fieldnotes, Queen Mother, 21th August, 2015).

The extracts above demonstrate a characteristic of generational thinkers. People who understand the importance and meaning of land and have foresight of the significance land can be to the generations after them. They therefore take measures to avoid loss of right to their land property. According to one of the chiefs I spoke to, the community's

benefit that ensues from the rice project is used to resolve land litigations between them and neighbouring communities as these communities are trying to encroach on their land. To him, it is better for them to secure the land for future generations, than to lavish it on themselves. Additionally, with regards to generational use, they are cautious of the land running infertile for crop production, therefore, they avoid fallowing the land. They practice more of mixed cropping, to make available unused fertile land for the unborn generations. The World Bank's (2009) report argues that, much of Africa's land is under-utilized. My research reveals that, the Fievie people consider such unused lands as gift from God and the present generation to the future ones (Morris, Binswanger-Mikhize, & Byerlee, 2009).

According to Franco et al. (2015), land is safety and security for the Myanmar people. Land does not only provide safety and security for the Fievie people but also, for their livestock. They find it safe to feed their livestock within their land area, rather than to take them elsewhere for grazing, for the fear of poisoning of livestock. Also, most people fear for their economic security elsewhere. They prefer to stay in their own community, where they can provide food for themselves. According to them, they have lived there since birth and know where and how to feed themselves. *"The land never finishes, neither does it disappear, once they have the strength to till it, they are food secured"* (Fieldnote, 11th September, 2015). Additionally, they find healing in the land. Most people hardly visit the hospital when they are sick. Some consult the gods of the land for healing, while others depend largely on the herbs that the land provides. Based on my fieldwork, I argue that, people do not only feel safe and secured with advancement in science and technology, but also, with the very materials their land provides them.

Besides, people in the area largely depend on the land to earn a living. For them, working for a living is about farming. Land does not only sustain the lives of these people but keep them together. It is a heritage that needs to be protected as it binds them together in social units, such as family, gate and a community. For instance, from my fieldwork, land gives a sense of belonging and authority. I recall when I first made a visit to the paddy farm. In a confrontation, a security man held the shirt of a manager and altered the following words *"the land is for us. Why are you using us anyhow on the farm?"* Further

enquiries show that, the security man did not want to carry out the instructions of the manager who had already worked him out earlier that day. Had it not been that the community has entered into partnership with the investors, this man could not have the audacity to alter those words. Because, he would only be considered as a mere wage labourer. However, although he is a labourer, he also belongs to the community which has a share in the project, hence, he felt empowered to make his feelings known.

Although Yaro (2012b) and Zagemma (2011) contend that, chiefs and earth priests sell off farmland for residential purposes and private agricultural investments in the country, the Fievie people based took a different approach. Based on their history of dealing with land, cosmology, and the fact that, it is a source of living for many, as well as their intellectual ability, took the initiative to control land grabs and to ensure a continued access to their land. To a larger extent, they entered into partnership with the investors to maintain their authority over it. Although the motive is clear, the power relations to such decisions are consistent with conventional traditional authority, which reserves the power to make such decisions. Their interests in such initiatives are calculable within the “moral economy” (Polanyi, 1944).

Land is the main tool for managing the economic life of people by their traditional authorities (Nukunya, 2003). Although they possess cosmological powers and has the history to have won the allegiance of their people, with the introduction of Christianity and advancement in technology, land has become a very important tool upon which traditional authorities operate and control the lives of their people (Amoatia, 2010). When customary lands are taken away or become useless to the people, the traditional leaders are likely to lose power in control of their people. Community members may not have to ask chiefs for a piece of land to farm on any longer, because, they do not have it in their possessions, to be given out.

Concluding Remarks

Local social organization is very important in understanding societies and the kind of decisions its members make. The social organization of the Fievie traditional area shows

how land is being redistributed, accessed and used. They are organized in suburbs, gates and households. The land in this area is largely customary holdings. The people I have worked with access land through their gate's chiefs.

Chiefs are entrusted with customary lands to manage, in the interest of their people. Land is a critical tool with which the chiefs control the economic and social life of their people. For instance, people do not readily access land upon demand from their chiefs. The social status of the person and his/her community membership is queried before land is given out. This in turn keep people's behaviour in check. As land is a source of livelihood for many of the people I have worked with, it is only distributed to people who are responsible and can manage it effectively to their own benefits and that of their families. Land being a generational gift and the importance attached to it, chiefs take critical measures to ensure their continued authority over it. The need to continually have control over their land, necessitated the community's decision to enter into partnership with the investors.

Chapter 3

The meaning of Food; following the ways of maize and rice in Fievie

During my fieldwork, I realized food has an inscribed relationship and meaning to our identity, culture, class, kinship and history (see also Almerico (2014). In 2012, Kittler, Sucher, and Nelms, lay claim to the term “Food habit” (also known as food ways) to explain the manner in which humans produce, distribute, acquire food and how it is used (Kittler; Sucher; & Nelms, 2012). From what we choose to eat, how and who prepares it, how it is produced or acquired, to the people who eat with us, illustrate the kind of people we portray ourselves to be or the stories that can be told about us (Adema, 2007; Harris, 1987; Mzamu, 2012). Fievie women have the adage, “*the way to a man’s heart is through the stomach*”. This implies that, food is necessary to win a man’s heart. Food symbolizes love and paves the way to be loved. Food is a medium of communication (Hauck-Lawson, 2004), and an in-depth knowledge of what people consider as food and satisfying is important for understanding our basic practices and beliefs of our societies and the world. Examining and understanding people’s choice of food within food studies can help researchers, readers, government, investors, to demystify food stereotypes and integrate and appreciate people’s choice of food and the values ascribed to them. This in turn can inform state policies and the right investments and development through space and time. It is in line to argue that, people’s choice of food is not only for physiological needs but also, for meanings and values grounded in their culture and orientation. Of paramount importance to the discussion in this chapter, is the meaning of food in relation to the culture, identity and history of the Fievie people. Also, how the understanding of the meaning and value of food can influence agricultural investment projects, as well as development projects that seek to address issues within food system.

Also, following Appadurai (1986) argument of the importance of following the ways of objects in order to understand the meaning embodied and not only ascribed to them, this chapter explores how different perceptions about the meaning and value of food are dealt with locally and during hunger alleviation policy making and forums that are delineated

from the intended beneficiaries. How meaning, interest and value of food affect agricultural investments and how these projects work to maintain or transform the beneficiaries' diet.

Food ways, culture, identity and symbols

E.B. Tylor defines culture in its widest sense, as "that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society" (Tylor, 1974, p. 1). Although there is no universally agreed definition for culture within the field of anthropology, Tylor's definition indicates a transfer of qualities, acquired by others through the process of learning. Values, beliefs, knowledge and characteristics exhibited and practiced by a society or group of people are uniquely identified with them. Culture is not genetically inherited but rather learned (Almerico, 2014). As will be elaborated later in this chapter, in the Ghanaian society, the food preferences of different cultural groups are linked to ethnic behaviours and religious beliefs. Mention "kenkey", then the Ga's of Greater Accra region will readily come to mind; "fufu" to the Ashanti people of the Asante region; "tuozafi" of the people of the northern regions; "akple" identified with Ewes, and the list continues. In different cultures, meaning is ascribed to food types based on texture, taste, color, method of preparation, who prepares it, how it is served and the effort that goes into preparing it (Counihan, 1992). Akple is a cultural diet with defined taste and texture. It is usually prepared very soft and served hot, preferably with grinded pepper. Inspired by Kittler; Sucher; & Nelms (2012), argument that, "Eating is a daily reaffirmation of [one's] cultural identity" (cited in Almerico (2014, p. 5), the Fievie people eat "akple", because one's day is incomplete without it, not only for its physiological value but also, an attempt to maintain their cultural identity. The people have and make fond memories of this "*delicacy*"¹² and express good feelings about it.

Food from our childhood, culture and family often provide soothing relief from stress. For instance, in an informal conversation with a community member, he passionately made the following statement; "*if you want to see me happy all the time, just prepare akple for me...* Those who are sick, will say, "Get me some akple to eat, I should be fine afterwards"

¹² I italicized this word to indicate it as a term used for particular kinds of food in the Ghanaian society.

(*Fieldnote, December, 2015*). Besides, in the Christian religion, bread is a symbol of the body of Christ in the sacrament of communion and as such, Christians have been instructed to partake in this event in remembrance of Christ (Luke 22:19 cited in Kurz (1985)). As much as this is metaphorical, it is also an indication of food symbolism. Food symbolizes joy, happiness, holiness and a sign of continuous relationship. Thus, a simple saying exist among people that if you want to be my friend, just prepare this particular dish for me. Since friends often want to see each other happy, they will do the needful, in order to maintain their relationship. It is worth arguing that, food does not only tell of us, our culture and identity but, it provides the platform for social interaction as well. As blatantly put by Almerico, "*it ties us to our families and holds a special worth to a person*" (2014; 5). Thus, food gives meaning to the lives we live and the people we relate with in a social unit and the broader world. It is in point to argue that, food has an important symbolic meaning, and with relations to other life experiences.

I agree with Douglas's (1972), argument that, categorization of food is embedded with codes of social events and it illustrates intimacy and distance, when she talks about the preferences for food her family made at any point in time. Also, that, food does not only have a biological component but also, a social one. Food has social embedded relations. Of course, as argued by (Almerico, 2014), groups' or individual's personality, history, beliefs and preferences are revealed through their choice of food at any time in point. However, Douglas (1972) is quick to argue that, "Those we know at meals we also know at drinks. The meal expresses close friendship. Those we only know at drinks we know less intimately" (Douglas, 1972, p. 66). She made a generalizing statement that does not apply to all societies. In the Fievie community, this is not the case. Taking inspiration from Price (1975), in the Ghanaian society, visitors are welcome, honoured and accepted depending on the kind of food offered to them and they in turn accept or reject the offer based on trust. In spite of the fact that, he fails to show the kinds of food that are tied to these preferences, there is a changing trend or that, his assumption is not universal to all Ghanaian societies. In Fievie, People are generally invited to meals and drinks at all time. The choice is left with the person being invited to accept or decline.

I argue that, exchange of food reduces social distance and strengthen relationships in the Fievie community (see also Mauss (1967). Conversely, in capitalist societies, food is a commodity which when exchanged, creates distance and differentiation (Counihan, 1992, p. 54). Sahlins (1972) labels it as “negative reciprocity” where individuals are separated from and positioned antagonistically, because some have control over access to food and other’s do not. The Fievie people eat together from one bowl, only with families and close associates. It is courteous that, you are invited to eat with them, if you coincidentally meet anyone eating. But this does not necessarily mean you should compulsorily join them to eat. If you accept the offer to eat, they may either dish out your food separately or allow you to eat with them, depending on your relationship with them. So it is not the case that, people would not share their meal with even a stranger, as outlined by Douglas (1972) but that, they may not share the same bowl with you. During my fieldwork in the community, my host mother is a very generous woman, from whom a lot of people ate. However, I observed some differences and preferences. Some people were never invited to eat with them, but once they appear while dinner is ongoing, they readily joined hands to eat with the family. It looked strange to me though. Others were invited to eat before they joined them to eat, while others never ate at all. So I was driven by this observation and approached one of my host sisters to inquire about this phenomenon. I was told the people who readily joined hands with them to eat were people of the extended family and very close friends, while the others who waited to be invited were friends and strangers alike. This implies that, food is an important symbolic factor in distinguishing kinship. It signifies how people are closely related within a social unit, but Douglas (1972) failed to notice the openness of this social unit to others who are willing to join, and of course, this phenomenon is society specific. This may be due to differences that exist between England (where Douglas made her observation) and my field site in Ghana.

The National Statistics English housing survey report of 2008, outlined that, of the dwellings built since 1919 in England are flats, detached or semi-detached houses, terraced houses and bungalows (NSEHS, 2010)¹³. The idea of flat, detached or semi-detached, terraced houses and bungalows create the images of enclosed apartments.

¹³ National Statistics English Housing Survey

People live in enclosed areas where everything is done within, of which others are not privy to. Thus, the house settings do not expose people within a household and their activities to the public. One may visit another, upon prior notice and of course, the gate or door has to be opened for the visitor. In contrast, most rural Ghanaian communities are not gated or enclosed, and Fievie is of no exception. The people have dwellings opened to every passing being. You may sometimes have to pass through people's houses to reach your destination. This makes social integration, including through food easy, as people easily make acquaintances.

I argue that, food creates relationships among people everywhere, and the people of Fievie are of no exception. But does unavailability of food or insufficient food initiate distance between people? In the Fievie community, no matter how little the food may be, the same observation is made. It is not binding on the people to invite a visitor to eat with them but it is a norm almost everybody observes. People even make fun of it. There was an instant when a woman and her three-year-old son were passing through our house, from farm, and my host family invited them to eat. The woman readily said, "*No, thank you*" but her son spoke the following words, "*please, eat and leave mine, I will be back to eat*". (Fieldnote, 13th September, 2015). Everyone busted out laughing but, he never returned to eat. As food is considered to be human (*ema nye ame*) in the popular saying of the people I have worked with, so are the social relations and events it creates that live with people. These are live long relations and meanings that transcends generations.

In the following sections of this chapter, the discussion will focus on both maize and rice production and consumption in Ghana and in the Fievie community and the meaning people ascribe to them. Although the title of this study is "Political economy of rice production", it is prudent to consider maize production and consumption in the country and the study community since "akple" prepared of maize is significantly associated with the people of Volta region, and the largest cereal staple crop consumed in the country.

The conceptual and discursive ways of maize among the Fievie people

According to Ragasa, Chapoto, and Kolavalli (2014), maize is one of the important food crops in Ghana, which forms more than 50 percent of the country's cereal production. I must be quick to add that, maize is not only an important food, but also, livestock feed and the most important staple crop, of which about 70 percent is produced by smallholder farmers (Food and Agricultural Organization FAO (2012)). Maize is largely consumed across the country and as such, receives special attention for production. Therefore, the Government of Ghana (GoG) has made and is making several efforts not only to encourage investments in the agricultural industry but especially in maize production. In the 2012 "Analysis of incentives and disincentives for maize in Ghana", FAO outlines the GoG's effort in this direction, the maize sector attracts fertilizer subsidy of about 50 percent. Also, through the Agricultural Mechanization Services Enterprises Centers (AMSEC), tractors were provided for mechanized farming in 2008. This notwithstanding, the National Food Buffer Stock Company (NAFCO), a state owned enterprise was set up in 2010 to purchase, preserve, and distribute excess grains in an attempt to control post-harvest losses and price instability. This illustrates the government's acknowledgement of the widespread use of maize and its efforts to increase production and control prices. It is important to argue that, although there are regional and tribal food preferences, maize is a core staple in virtually all the regions due to its numerous functions, cultural associations, identity, values, meaning and interests.

...we have cassava and maize. Those are the staples. And it does akple. Yes, so the staple food is akple. You can't wake up without eating akple, I'm telling you. Now we grow pepper as cash crop. But normally, it's cassava and maize. You can't farm without those two. And you know...we process it into so many food products. We have our own way of processing the cassava and the maize and you know, a combination of cornflour and cassava flour...no other group does this ooo, it's only us. It is called "kokontekple tasi". If you have the right mix, you will enjoy that dish. And then, when it comes to the dough too, we don't have "banku". We have our own thing, "akple". And we also prepare maize itself. The raw maize, "eworkple".

And we use the maize dough itself to prepare “eblimokple” (Fieldnote, chief, 2nd December, 2015).

As mentioned in the introductory chapter of this study, “*akple*”, a locally made food from corn flour is traditionally identified with the people of the Volta region. According to (Spieth, 2011), maize has never been mentioned in the early history of the Ewe people during their migration from Ketu and Notsie to their present day locations in Ghana. However, Strickrodt (2015) argues that, it was possible that, maize was introduced to the country by Gold Coast immigrants who settled at Little Popo from the mid 17thC or, that, they just established the term; “*maize*” for the already introduced crop by the Europeans. Whichever way, we can assume that, since the Ewes made contact with the Europeans, they also came into contact with maize and have since been associated with it, especially, when it comes to *akple* and “*aliha*”, a locally brewed drink from maize.

The Fievie people ascribe values, meaning and interest to cultivating and consuming maize, and when they say, “*food crop*”, they mean “*maize or cassava*”; by “*food*”, they mean to say “*akple*”. During my fieldwork, I observed how families adore and adorn farming, especially on Saturdays. Agriculture is the most important occupation in most Ewe communities, where husbands, wives and children pay particular attention to (Nukunya, 2003). In Fievie, men are usually expected to do the hard or extraneous work by clearing the land for cultivation, while women and children help in the sowing and weeding of the farm. In spite of this, some women, especially single mothers are observed to engage in similar work on the farm as men. It must be emphasized that, both men and women extensively, work as subsistence farmers towards ensuring self-sufficiency in food (Nukunya, 2003). They mostly cultivate maize, supplemented with cassava, beans, okro, tomatoes, and pepper as cash crop. It is important to note that, maize is cultivated in two seasons annually; the major and lean seasons, thus the first and second seasons respectively. Post-harvest loss is usually experienced during the first season, as farmers have problems with drying their produce to enable them store for the future. This is largely due to continued rain immediately after the first season in July. Paradoxically, although the people of the Volta region produce and use maize, more than any other crop. FAO (2012) indicates that, over the period of 2006-2010, they only produce 5 percent of the

nationally produced maize, 84 percent is grown by Brong Ahafo, Eastern and Asante regions. However, due to its widespread production and use, this staple is not as politicized as observed in Malawi (Mzamu, 2012). Tremendous efforts are made to produce more and always make available to consumers by the state but often, greater concern is given to cash crops.

In Fievie, maize is not only central to their celebrations, rituals and funerals but also it expresses their cosmological understanding of the world and what makes them uniquely identifiable as rain can be evoked when traditional authorities deem it necessary. Other crops can be cultivated throughout the year but maize needs consistent rain to grow well. Food is centred on maize and it is believed that, anything that has to do with maize should be prosperous, owing to its relation to the ancestral world. Many people believe that, maize is an ancestral crop, in that their ancestors fed on maize. And it was a crop that was used to feed them since infancy. During their festival, they offer different types of food prepared from maize to their ancestors, in order to pay homage and show appreciation of the blessings of the ancestors upon them. Traditional leaders sometimes perform rituals to invoke rain for maize production. However, some people express worries with the growing advancement in technology and introduction of new religions in the community, as these affect their rituals and cosmological practices in relation to maize production.

“We take care of ourselves by farming. We farm and still send some to the market. We farm to take care of us throughout the year. When tradition was at its peak, it used to rain 3 times (seasons) in a year. If you farm, you will be okay in terms of food. ... is it not Christianity? Now when something happens and they say we should do some tradition, you wouldn't see anyone. You see that forest, (pointing to the bush), you see how we have a lot of mosquitoes now, we get a lot more when someone cut firewood from that forest. According to tradition, the person must return it, then we make sacrifices to it. You wouldn't see a single mosquito within two days. That's why, it is called “avageve” [mosquitos forest]. But now, it is all lost to Christianity and technology. Our elders do not evoke rain anymore...”
(Fieldnote, community member, January 2016)

The voice of the informant above indicates threats posed to agricultural practices, although, much attention is still given to maize production every year. There is no farmer in the community who does not cultivate maize. It is a constant crop production and a development tool for self-sustenance or self-sufficiency in food. The people are self-motivated to produce every year, not only for its physiological need but also, their long standing historical association and how they have been exposed to it since infancy. Some city dwellers move to the village to farm for maize and take part of their crop with them as they return to their various places of residence. Some of these city dwellers take inspiration from the fact that, their parents in the village can depend on the maize harvested, even if they do not make enough money in the city to support them, because, that is “food”.

Tracing rice in the Ghanaian economy and in the Fievie traditional area.

There has been a dietary shift to rice by post-independence (1957), in the urban centres (Oteng, 1997). Nyanteng (1998) attributes this increase to increased income, favourable government pricing policies, good storability of rice and ease of cooking. Amanor-Boadu (2012) records an increment in per capita rice consumption per annum from 17.5kg between 1999 and 2001 to 22.66kg between 2002 and 2004 and had increased to 38kg per annum by 2011. It is estimated at 63kg per annum by 2018 (GNRDS-MoFA, 2009)¹⁴. Rice has become a major staple food in Ghana and the second largest cereal food consumed after maize (Dzudzor, 2015). According to SRID-MoFA, 2010, about 70 percent of the country's total rice consumption is observed in the urban areas and the government predicts a continuous increase in consumption due to increasing urbanization and population growth (GNRDS-MoFA, 2009).

Although rice attracted a huge interest and increase in consumption in the urban centres since Ghana's independence from colonial rule, rice remained an occasional food in the Fievie traditional area and is not a locally dominant diet. It was a diet usually consumed once a year, during Christmas.

¹⁴ Ministry of Food and Agriculture

Everybody has started eating rice, I'm telling you. Everybody had changed into rice. Because, formally, we were eating rice once in a year, during Christmas. Now, they were eating rice every day. So yes, there was a change (with some confidence) ... (Fieldnote, chief, 2nd December, 2015)

Though rice was not common to the people prior to the start of the rice project, it was available on the market. However, most people did not enjoy this diet for various reasons. Rice was not considered to be satisfying enough, compared to their locally identified food (akple). It was considered as a delicacy for the affluent or people of high class since it was very costly. These two reasons are intertwined. The average people with low purchasing power did not consider it worthy and economically wise to spend money on food that does not attract physiological and traditional satisfaction and value.

Given the preamble for per capita rice consumption per annum in Ghana from 1999 to 2018, the rate of rice production is rather the minimal. Although rice is not traditionally identified with any region or tribe in Ghana, it has however, remained a nationally important food. The production rate between 1996 and 2005 ranged from 130,000 to 182,000 tons of milled rice, with large annual fluctuations. Paddy production increased from 300,000 tons in 2005 to about 500,000 tons in 2010 (FAO, 2013). However, this did not meet the consumer demand rate. Rice is cultivated in the country as food crop and cash crop, yet, rice remains an import food. Rice imports attract 37 percent in taxes and levies (import tax-20%) (Dzudzor, 2015, p. 5).

Carney (2002) established that, rice cultivation was long perfected on the West African coast and contributed to the success of American rice production through the Atlantic slave trade, paradoxically, Ghana still lacks rice self-sufficiency and largely depends on importation. Sharma et al. (2011) records rice self-sufficiency rate at 33 percent as at 2011. GoG aims to increase self-sufficiency in rice by 2018 to meet the nation's demand. Government's efforts in increasing production resulted in policies, initiatives and establishment of buffer houses. The Global food crisis and the IV Tokyo International Conference on African Development (TICAD IV) in May 2008, followed by the launching

of the Coalition for Africa Rice Development (CARD) largely contributed to Ghana's vision to double rice production by 2018, through the initiative of the National Rice Development Standard (NRDS) (GNRDS-MoFA, 2009).

The strategy proposes to double rice production taking into consideration the comparative production capacities of the three major ecologies (rain fed upland, rain fed lowland and irrigated). The major constraints especially land development and land tenure arrangements, seed, fertilizer, inadequate human resource capacity, inadequate harvesting and post-harvest management technology, weak local rice marketing system and the role of Government and related agencies have been considered. A governance structure with many of the major/key actors in the rice sector have been considered and may be modified as the project unfolds (GNRDS-MoFA, 2009, p. 1)

As the above quote illustrates, government policies and strategies often consider all but the human actors, their belief systems and practices when implementing such policies that are aimed at generating national benefits. Government may consider improving smallholder farming practices but do not concern themselves with the interest, values and meaning ascribed to a particular food rather than the other. According to Assuming-Brempong (1998), Ghana has the right agronomic conditions to produce rice throughout the year (Dzudzor, 2015). However, government and private investors' efforts to ensure food security, alleviate poverty and the need to meet national demand and international policy standards, dissociate and displace the need, interest and value of the ordinary person. I mean to establish that, certain government and international policies, as well as foreign investments do not consider the interest and values of the local people they work directly with.

Those were the only investors who came to us. People who came to invest into rice. They were the people who approached us. It was their idea, not our idea. They approached us and made the offer and we accepted it (Fieldnote, Chief, 2nd December, 2015).

As stated by Assuming-Brempong (1998), Ghana is blessed with the right agronomic conditions to cultivate rice throughout the year and for that matter, any type of crop. The first investor company, Global Agricultural Development Company (GADCO), thrived well in rice production but cultivated for only four years. Much of its production story was attributed to the suitability of the land and the community members' cooperation. Although this project brought rice to the doorstep of the people, especially through gleaning by women, it did not meet the dietary needs of the people. It might have increased national production rate and met consumption demand in the urban centres, but how about the people whose labour went into producing it?

It was owned by India & Nigerian. Currently it's been handed over to Wienco. ...when they came we realized that rice importation to Ghana was very high. As at the time the project started, they were importing close to USD 700million per annum. Meanwhile, the local production was less than 30%. So approximately, we have been importing close to 70% of our rice need, which is definitely not the best. So there is the need for us to actually work at it as a nation. ... as one of the lucrative areas, they partner with Finatrade which buys the rice from us for marketing (Fieldnote, Project Manager, 21st August, 2015

People in the area are predominantly smallholder maize farmers, who attribute much interest, value and meaning to what they produce and eat. Ghana has not yet attained self-sufficiency in maize, so why not maize but rice production? Mzamu (2012), asserts, the Chewa people of Malawi interest, value and meaning for food are displaced and dissociated at forums and policies that are alien to them. Some investors boast to improve a country's economy through their investments. However, such projects hardly improve the lives of those who labour for them. They focus on the global which can generate much profit, to the detriment of the poor local lives. How then can food security be fostered at the local level, not to mention food self-sufficiency? This is much elaborated in the next chapter. Also, the transformation of the dietary of the people will be expatiated in chapter five of this study.

Food consumption and Class distinctions

The kind of food and how the food is prepared exemplifies one's class. My experience in the field in this regard, actually posed a challenge to me. Although I ate their culturally and historically important food "*akple*", I had my food prepared differently especially, the soup with which it's accompanied. I shared my food with them, all the time and everyone wants to have a taste not because they are hungry, but the "*different taste*". People from my host family and others that I had contact with, will ordinarily ask me to prepare food for them, even ordinary tea. So I ask one gentleman who is married, why he prefers my food to his wife's. He said; "*Madam, yours is different, it is from the city and I am sure you have secret spices, it is of a certain class*" (Fieldnote, 4th December, 2015). However, except for my host family, people were hesitant to share their food with me. One lady passionately said, "*Sister Gifty will not eat this food because, she would not like it. It is different from what she prepares and eats*", (fieldnote 17th October, 2015). Although it might have been my fault not to initially rely on them for food (which was mainly for health issues), there is a clear distinction between who eats what food. This is observed among people who were once city dwellers, or who had some formal education, or live in brick houses. It is important to note that, class differentiations are being illustrated by what people eat and the process of cooking.

Maize does not only weave through the sociocultural body but also, the socio-economic aspect of the people of Fievie. Although not a cash crop, it highly distinguishes who is wealthy from who is poor; hardworking from who is lazy. As discussed earlier in chapter one, most people believe that, if one is not lazy to farm, he/she can produce enough food to take him/her throughout the year. People who buy food (maize) are considered lazy. Also, the rich are those who harvest a lot during the year's seasons. However, the people do not associate this with class, as everyone is considered capable of feeding themselves and their households, through whichever means it is done. That is to say, no one feels incapable of or inferior to the other, perhaps because, the person harvested more farm produce. This has an implication for self-reliance and resilience. As the ability to attain self-sufficiency in food become a development tool and a basic practice for every individual. It is only when one is not able to attain this ideal that, it becomes obvious to

society as to who is poor and lazy. Thus, the ability to work hard is directly connected to one's class, and this has an entrenched societal value that people are inclined to fulfill. However, "global actors" such as international institutions and investors who are ignorant of these values are likely to violate and cripple it, and undermine the ability of the people.

Class differences are shown by the amount of money person possesses, demonstrated through house structures, cars, level of education and the number of cattle one possesses. So if you want to show off your class and the only occupation you engage in is maize farming, then, you must as well sell off your produce to build a house or buy a car or what is considered wealthy. Food is a basic necessity and the only sure way to fulfill that is through farming. Thus, although maize is not directly linked to class, it has an indirect connection to how the people are classified from one group to the other.

I choose Bourdieu (1984)'s approach to analyze food consumption and class because, he provides systematic conceptualization of social class and how it connects through habitus to behaviour. According to Bourdieu, people of different class status exhibit different lifestyles reflecting their class position in a society. Thus, habitus connects one's position in a social structure to the person's actual behaviour. In essence, people's everyday decisions reflect their social class status. Social class status influences the quantity and type of resources available to a person, which forms part of the embodied pattern of perceptions. In relating this to food consumption, it is understood in terms of tastes for specific objects or food types.

In his practice theory, Bourdieu (2005) explains taste of luxury and taste of necessity. According to him, people turn to associate rise in income to what people eat and the kind of work people do. Such that, the bourgeois spend less on fatty and heavy food; and more on leaner and less fatty, fresh fruits and vegetables. The sharp opposition of taste of luxury as a total freedom of choice of food due to economic power and taste of necessity, where one has to fill up the hungry stomach due to energy demand is quite contentious. It is true that, akple contains lot of carbohydrate component and most people in this community are farmers. But as mentioned earlier, not everyone has farming as main

occupation or require lots of energy to do extraneous work. Some are lawyers, teachers, hairdressers, administrators and traders, yet, they all consume akple, just as the occupational farmers. I therefore disagree with Korsmeyer (2002)'s argument that, people only eat based on their physiological need to quench hunger.

(Bourdieu, 2005) argued that, the idea of taste is typical of the bourgeois, which is totally freedom of choice. In essence, it is not ideal to associate taste to economic power. To an extent, this is true based on my research findings. As stated earlier, most people consume akple, irrespective of class. Although the people lacked purchasing power at the time when interest was developed for rice consumption, "akple" was and is a constant meal and could never be forfeited for any other meal. I agree with Bourdieu's (2005) argument that, *"Necessity can only be fulfilled, most of the time, because the agents are inclined to fulfill it, since they have a taste for what they are anyway condemned to"* (74). This way, irrespective of one's economic status, the person is motivated to consume the food he is culturally and socially 'condemned' to. This is in line with the argument that, food is a "cultural signifier" (Almerico, 2014, p. 3). However, it is too generalizing to argue that, taste is merely "a freedom of choice" (Bourdieu, 2005, p. 73). I therefore argue that, economic or purchasing power, influences the realization of the full potential of one's choice of food, especially when a new taste is developed. This is so, because, prior to the commencement of the rice project in the Fievie community, the people had developed interest in rice consumption, but this was less observed in their menu, due to lack of purchasing power. They could not afford rice every day. However, they consume akple not because they could not afford other foodstuff, but it is a taste they are condemned to.

The changing taste, the new generation and the social unit

Although rice is not traditionally associated with any region or tribe in Ghana, both maize and rice remain central to all the regions in Ghana and as such, are central to food security and food policy formulation in the country.

Social, cultural and psychological factors influence people's choice of food. In examining the influence such factors exert on individual's preferences for food, Larson and Story

(2009), discovered that, children select food consumed by admired adults, such as teachers, favorite fictional characters, peers and siblings but not parents. A. Brown (2011) asserts, social conscience and pressure from friends, impact the food choices people make. Thus, he learned that, when a group disapproves of a particular choice of food, the individual in question relinquishes the choice. And the opposite is true, when an approval is made for a particular food, individuals' in the group turn to subscribe and enjoy it. However, anthropologists of senses and food theorists have not established who is capable of initiating a change in a family's or group's menu or diet when a new taste is developed for another diet. This study advances on the existing knowledge within food studies by providing data on how a change in taste and preference for particular food over the other, occurs within a social unit.

From my fieldwork, there is an observed changing taste and preference for rice, owing to the sprout of a new generation. Change does occur in individual's taste for a particular food and the need arises for a change in diet. Although, change in taste may occur on the individual level, due to the social coherence and interaction and family relations in the study area, that change in taste for just one person can affect the dietary of others in a defined social unit or relationship. This finding does not entirely oppose A. Brown (2011) study, but to recognize that, individuals do not always give up on their preferences due to peer pressure. They are however, capable of effecting change within a unit.

The intensity or severity or rapidness with which a change in diet occurs is largely dependent on the social status of the person who first experienced the change (Wills, Backett-Milburn, Roberts, & Lawton, 2011). The status of a person within a social unit, be it, household, family or a group defines the person's ability of causing a change within that unit. In this case, the head of a house or the breadwinner of the house can, to a large extent, decide on what a family consumes. As outlined by Nukunya (2003), the man is the head of the house and makes major decisions concerning the family. Children are considered "*the stars of the future*" and are given special consideration and preference when it comes to what the family can have as food, among the Fievie people. Some informants said "*we labour for our children, because, they will one day take care of us,*

when we are weak” (Informal conversation with informants, fieldnote, November 2015). Children in this community are the major orchestrators of the change in diet due to their persistent demand to eat rice, supported by the advent of the rice project. Although children are often influenced by their peers, as argued by Larson and Story (2009), children in this community discovered their preference for rice due to their exposure to the food they consume at school through “school feeding programme”¹⁵. In my opinion, this programme is not value free, as preference is not given to the kind of food given to children in particular societies. This has implications for a cultural shift as the needs of children in this society is well attended to. This is however not to assert that children are most influential.

It is important to note that, although taste for rice was developed before commencement of the rice project, it was not fully realized, or did not materialize until the project begun. According to Rozin (2005), humans biologically adapt to their ancestral food environment, where food is produced and consumed. It is in line to argue that, humans’ biological adaptation to their ancestral food environment also affect their social lives. Indeed, people maintain tradition, not only because of their biological needs and to keep history but also, due to lack of purchasing power to explore other types of foods available on the market. Societal or individual economic needs can highly be suppressed by less or no purchasing power and this can as well limit the role or the social status each individual plays and holds within a particular social unit, and the influence or change they can cause. Thus, economic power is necessary for social change in the Fievie society.

Concluding Remarks

I agree with A. Brown (2011), when he argued that, psychological needs intertwine with social factors when foods are used more for the meaning they represent more than the nourishment they offer or provide. Food creates social relations and distinguishes the closeness of people in the Fievie society. Families are easily differentiated from friends, and friends from strangers, through how food is served and consumed.

¹⁵ This is a free feeding programme initiated by the government of Ghana to reduce hunger among school going children.

The people I have worked with have ascribed meaning and a defined taste for akple, of which nothing can substitute for. It is not a matter of consuming fatty and heavy food, because of hard or tedious work, but an inclination to fulfill a desire for a particular taste, and not a matter of income. Of course, some people may not be able to afford variety in their dishes due to lack of money but, regardless of a person's class in this society, he/she reserves a preferred taste for akple. It was not that, the people did not like rice but they lacked purchasing power at the time and could not make provision for anything outside of what is considered "food", physiologically and culturally. This study provides a confirmation for Bourdieu's (2005), argument of food as people's attempt to fulfill their cultural inclination and for Almerico's (2014), food as a "cultural signifier". However, the investor company did not consider the Fievie people's interests and value associated with maize. Thus, development intervention in this community is rather crippling existing subsistence farming efforts.

Chapter4

International and Local Conceptualization of Poverty and Development

When I first met my host mother and I told her about myself and my research plan to study the rice project in the Fievie community, her response gave me an idea about how the project was performing and their perception of poverty. I immediately asked her if I could write down notes. She did not hesitate.

...that project was doing very well. It was a collaboration between the community and the foreign investors. It reduced poverty in this community. Some people used to glean on the rice field for personal use. I don't go but my sister went once, and I know a lot of people go to the field. We ate some and sold a greater part to outsiders. It puts money in our pockets. They make money through gleaning to take their children to school, and buy other kinds of food stuff. But you see, because of poor management and lack of transparency on the part of our leaders, the project collapsed. Some of our men were employed. They were very active at the beginning, because, we were told the project is for the community as well. But our chiefs hardly communicate to us about the community's benefit, and the workers were also not paid well. Some of them were also dismissed from their job, and most of them lost interest in working on the rice farm. The company promised to farm for some community members, especially for those whose land was taken by the project. But, the chiefs and leaders selected their family members. Now, I heard, a new company has taken over the project, but our leaders haven't told us anything yet, meanwhile, they say this is a collaboration project between the investors and our community. But we don't know much about the project. (Fieldnote, July 2015).

From the above excerpt, this woman expressed a lot of concerns about the rice project and its impact on their lives. She readily admits how effective the project was, until its collapse. At this point, I am more concerned with her perception about poverty in this community. Having had conversations with several people in this community, for them,

poverty is about lack of money. They believe money can do a lot of things. With money, they can educate their children, buy new clothes, and afford other kinds of food on the market. They hope to work for money. However, most of them prefer to work for themselves, because they believe that, if you work hard, you can harvest more and sell some of the produce to cater for other needs. From my fieldwork, it is evident that, people are willing to work and gain money, but by working for themselves and seeing themselves of being in charge of their jobs. “...the young men in this community don’t like to be under people, they like to be in-charge of what they do. Most of us prefer to work for ourselves” (Personal conversation with an informant, October 2015). In short, most people in this community prefer to be self-employed, rather than wage labourers. In the following, we will see how poverty has been perceived elsewhere across the world over time by different agents and agencies, as well as how the course to eradicate poverty has been.

Historical and Contemporary Perceptions of Poverty and Managing the Poor

The word ‘poverty’ is, no doubt, a key word of our times, extensively used and abused by everyone. Huge amounts of money are spent in the name of the poor. Thousands of books and expert advice continue to offer solutions to their problems. Strangely enough, however, nobody, including the proposed ‘beneficiaries’ of these activities, seems to have a clear, and commonly shared, view of poverty. For one reason, almost all the definitions given to the word are woven around the concept of ‘lack’ or ‘deficiency’. This notion reflects only the basic relativity of the concept. What is necessary and to whom? And who is qualified to define all that” (Majid Rahnema, *Global Poverty: A pauperizing Myth*, 1991, cited in Escobar (1995, p. 21)

...in both rural and urban Ghana, men associate poverty with a lack of material assets, whereas for women, poverty is defined as food insecurity. Generational differences emerged as well. Younger men in Ghana consider the ability to generate an income as the most important asset, whereas older men cite as

most important, the status connected to a traditional agricultural lifestyle (Ghana 1995a, cited in Narayan-Parker and Patel (2000, p. 27).

The excerpts above illustrate that, the classification and definition of poverty is highly contested across the continents, and the development discourse (an attempt to manage poverty), is historically perpetuated over time and space, since the medieval times. For some, it is lack of means, insufficiency, ideology and inability. Before the 20th century, poverty was not stigmatized, as resources were finite and life was harsh (Katz, 1990). Several attempts were made to provide for the poor but under varying conditions in different regions of the world. Katz (1990), noted that, by this period, there were several attempts to distinguish who deserves help and who does not. Concepts such as the deserving and undeserving poor with various classification as neighbours and strangers; impotent poor and able-poor; the poor and the paupers; the worthy and unworthy poor are used in an attempt to make these distinctions. According to Katz (1990), the redefinition of poverty in the early 19th century as a moral condition, followed the transition to capitalism and democracy in America. Poor relief expenses were carefully checked and the moral condition and the market provided strong incentive to work, providing cheap wage labour in the market economy. By mid-20th century, the concept of “culture of poverty” was introduced by anthropologist Oscar Lewis in his study of Mexicans and Puerto Ricans (Katz, 1990). The idea had developed, where people’s values and behaviour were categorized and converted into poverty with the notion that, poverty is self-perpetuating transmissible to children (O’Connor, 2001). In short, poverty was seen to be caused by certain cultural traits and transferrable from generation to generation. Here, the poor were blamed for their condition, in the light of market economy where everyone is presented with the opportunity to amass wealth.

It must be noted that, issues of poverty and managing the poor, did not only exist at local and national levels but was also discussed in international forums. According Escobar (1995, p. 21), by the early post world-war II, people became aware of mass poverty in the continents of Africa, Asia and Latin American, with the historical segregation of the “North and the South; The First and Third Worlds” and the “Developed and Developing Worlds”.

These labels are historically perpetuated within the global economic and political structure to indicate economic and power inequalities among countries. This discovery provided the stage for the First World to tackle poverty on the international level, hence the need for a global culture and political economy and the “war on poverty” in the Third World began (Escobar, 1995, p. 21). The advent of capitalism in Europe and subsequent development in the Third World, marked the 19th century break in conceptualizing and managing poverty (Rahnema, 1991). Broch-Due and Schroeder (2000) assert that, the notion and conceptualization of poverty and the Western domestic poor were exported and planted all over the world to reshape indigenous societies (See also Thorne (1997). In “Producing nature and poverty in Africa”, Broch-Due and Schroeder (2000) explain how colonial authorities forced the Turkuna people to move from Turkuna Isiolo town in central Kenya to Turkuna District where they (colonial authorities) deemed appropriate. The concept they termed “repatriation”, a return to the root, origin, “a wholly positive restoration of natural order of things” (Broch-Due & Schroeder, 2000, p. 54). Thus, early anthropological ethnographies of the 19th century of the European poor were likened to the exotic primitive of the colonial world, which appeared as though they were versions of another and registered forms of “lack”, such as disease, dependency, food insecurity, domesticity of women and illiteracy (see also C. Hall (1993).

It is necessary to note that, the definition of poverty and the poor is of varying degree across space. However, the context specific concept of poverty is displaced for a universal ideology of who the poor is, when tackling global poverty. These ideas are generated, worked and supported by crude generalizing “standard statistics”, with thin description of “simplified imagery of the needy”, people without food security, misery and diseases, produced by economists who neither consider the social context nor the region of analysis (Broch-Due, 1995, p. 1; Escobar, 1995). The dislocation of the Turkuna Isiolo people was carved under the notion of civilization, which created labour market and rather produced poverty, lack and hunger among the people (Broch-Due and Schroeder, 2000). A civilization that promised better life for the people rather splashed poverty in their faces. The Turkuna Isiolo people were dedicated to cattle rearing, and the number of cattle one possesses determines a person’s level of wealth. In contrast to this view and perception

of wealth and the world at large, the colonial authorities considered their pastoralism as barbaric and primitive, as this is likened to “costermongers” (Mayhew cited in Gallagher (1986, p. 11) and the urban poor of Europe. Hence, there was the need to tame the wild and to sedentarize them. The authors note that, during their migration, most people lost the cattle as they were challenged with water shortage and diseases. Also, others cattle were raided by neighbouring communities. I therefore argue that, local concepts and perceptions of their world are usually displaced for the so-called erudite explication of Western ideas, that which promises a better life for people who are claimed to incapable of managing their own lives. Policy makers and political economists make policies that work to maintain what they claim to alleviate, due to the dissociation of the policy making process and implementation from the target beneficiaries and inconsideration of local concepts (Gallagher & Greenblatt, 2000).

Poverty became a social problem, with the need for careful examination and attention. According to Polanyi, *“Pauperism, political ecology, the discovery of society was closely interwoven”* (1957a, p. 84). The attempt to manage poverty as a social problem involved interventions in education, health, morality, employment and instilment of good habits, (Escobar, 1995, p. 23). The poor became object of knowledge and management as more resources were invested into producing knowledge about the poor (O'Connor, 2001). Thus, it became necessary that, the poor be investigated, and knowledge be produced about them, to channel development.

The idea to curb poverty and to create a better life for people otherwise, dependent, culminated in globalization of the world to create international market for free movements of goods and services between the First and the Third Worlds and among all. What is the need for globalization? Is it the continuation of colonialism or development in poor countries? Thus, within the First World, the poor were described as lacking the wealth of the affluent in terms of material possessions. On a global scale, the third-worlds were described to be insufficient in what the First Worlds possess economically, and the only solution was economic growth and development (Broch-Due & Schroeder, 2000; Escobar, 1995), hence the need to attempt global management of poverty through market

economy. Within the context of my fieldwork, the perception about poverty may be as those shared by international development agencies, however, they differ in ideology about the processes to reduce or eradicate it. For international bodies, the only sure way for the poor to overcome their adversaries is through the market economy where they can offer their labour for money.

The World Bank effort to epitomize Colombia as the light for the rest of the underdeveloped countries in 1949, illustrates that, possession of natural resources are not enough for economic growth of a country (Escobar, 1995). As such, science, technology, international organization and planning were put in place to address any lapses, as these tools had their successful stories in the Western world, and had assumed a universal status of its applicability. Development then, became promising, the only sure way to eradicate poverty, through science and technology. However, according (Escobar, 1995), when development is promoted based on the ideas of the Western affluent, then, development becomes a normal course of evolution and progress. Development therefore becomes a tool of normalizing the world. The question is, linguistically, “do we have the word development in our local languages?” If so, then the concept long existed even before the attempt of the developed to develop the underdeveloped. But how were such issues of “developmental ideas” perceived and addressed within their local contexts? Has/is the local context ideology of the concept been/being considered at all? This forms the basis of my argument that, development for target beneficiaries will only be 100% successful when local knowledge and target beneficiaries’ interests and values are considered in such processes. Thus, a careful attention to grass root participation is necessary for successful development interventions.

Development, Investments and Save Battlefields

Development is an ambiguous adventure born of tensions between what goods are sought and how these are obtained (Goulet, 1997, p. 1161).

As complex as it is, I will personally not attempt to define the concept of development here, but will consider how it has been perceived by others over the decades across space and time. As indicated by (Bartelson, 2000, p. 182), "Practices of definition and usage are never innocent. They invariably reflect underlying presuppositions about the sociopolitical world and the conditions of its intelligibility". Also, in light of the Western ideas of development, I will bring to light some of the investments it attracts, especially in the global South.

I want us to understand that, economy and development is not only about money and natural resources, but also about people's lives. It is often said in Ghana; *"the economy is bad and people are suffering"*. It is easier to distinguish one country from the other as richer but how do you determine one that is developed from the developing? Every government has its own development policies that it works to seek or maintain the economic growth of its people, and these varies from country to country. In every *"state of the nation's address"* by most presidents across the world, in one way or the other, outlines their development goal(s) for the year. I argue that, development is a continuous process of economic growth for members of a particular group, society, state, or region. Let us bear in mind that, the development of a country is evident in the lives of its people, hence, human development is of critical issue. It is not a matter of abundance of natural resources, but the equitable redistribution and use of these resources and its effects on the lives of the ordinary people, with regards to health, education, employment opportunities, infrastructure, clean water, available safe food (Soubbotina, 2004).

As indicated earlier, following World War II and mass discovery of poverty in the world with the division of the North from the South, it became prudent to establish institutions necessary to control and manage the world poverty. During the Bretton Woods

Agreements in 1944, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) was established Oberdabernig (2013). As specified, the institution was tasked to regulate the international monetary and financial systems and to promote its stability. Also, it should inspire economic cooperation and help to promote the world economic stability, prevent economic crisis and of great importance, to promote growth and foster processes necessary for alleviating world poverty (IMF, 2008). In 2001, the Managing Director of IMF and the President of the World Bank, issued a joint statement proclaiming poverty as, “the greatest challenge facing the international community” and an issue concerning which “the Bank and Fund have an important role to play” (W. B. IMF, 2001, p. 2). This is an indication of how eager these leaders were, to implement international policies necessary to channel the poverty eradication course.

The question is, how do these prominent institutions, international organizations, governments and developers, work out their responsibilities in poverty eradication? The obvious response to this question is through the “Structural Adjustment Programs” (SAPs) and “blueprints”. With its principles, the SAPs pave the way for countries to obtain loan from IMF and World Bank, in aid of development projects. (Abugre, 2000), asserts that, these loans are tied to conditions that need to be fulfilled before they are granted. Being the first institution to manage the world economic affairs, World Bank was the main agency providing structural adjustment lending, until 1986, when IMF started providing adjustment loans (Oberdabernig, 2010). The structural adjustment loans’ conditions work to inform and change state policies, to meet its demands. In short, the IMF through the SAPs, turn to influence receiving countries policies that, the institution deems necessary for a positive economic change.

Although, the SAPs is not the main focus of this discussion, it is relevant to argue that, these international organizations’ policy demands, that transform the so-called developing countries policies are constructed on forums dissociated from the ordinary lives that these very programmes sought to improve. Oberdabernig (2010), argues “...one can say that *Structural Adjustment Programs of the IMF seem to have negative impacts on poverty and income distribution*” (20). Thus, according to (Oberdabernig, 2010) using

the Heckman method of analysis, poverty levels in participating countries in the SAPs increased and income distribution in those countries is worse than in non-participation countries.

As stated earlier, the predominant ideas about development contribute to creating the conditions for certain kinds of investments. I am tempted to make some connections here. Why did the need arise for the establishment of World Bank and IMF? As stated earlier, this was related to the Cold War and the desire of capitalist block to contain communism in poor countries. Therefore, there was the need to create institutions to fight world poverty through SAPs. But the question is, "why do we need these programmes?" Because, some countries were classified as developed, while others, underdeveloped and developing based on economic growth. Hence, development becomes a channel to eradicate poverty. However, through programmes that are deemed necessary by international bodies, which have little or no interaction with the local contexts that, the programmes seek to improve. According to Escobar (1995), structural adjustments is a neoliberal intervention the focused on creating favourable conditions for multinational companies and foreign investors, rather than local populations, the intended beneficiaries. For instance, the government of Ghana has laid embargo on public servant employment, because it has to fulfil the condition of a loan granted by IMF. Meanwhile, the country produces university graduates every year, who need to apply the knowledge gained in the corporate world. This has not only increased unemployment rate in the country but also, provides the means for capitalists or private investors, most of whom are foreigners to pay low wages. Most private institutions also keep employees under as contract workers for many years in order to avoid good remuneration. Structural adjustment no longer has the prominent role it used to have.

As indicated in the first section of this chapter, the discovery of mass poverty and the capitalists' market economy made it necessary for countries to open up their borders for free movement of goods and services, as well as investments. Cooper (2001, p. 189) posed the question, "*What is the concept of globalization good for?*". Globalization became homogenizing and popular ideas in the 1980s, due to the rising global connection

through communication, made possible by the internet, where people feel more strongly and speedily connected across the world (Martell, 2010). However, Martell (2010) is uncertain whether the disorganized world after the Cold War, became unified through the spread of capitalism or cultural homogenization. But it was a period of a “collective thinking” especially, of global problems like climate change, economic interdependency and instability, market economy as well as poverty. Ferguson (1992) argued that, the concept of globalization is just a little more than an expression of capitalist ideology. The concept of globalization possesses the “effect, if not the function, of submerging the effects of imperialism in cultural ecumenism or economic fatalism and of making transnational relationships of power appear as a neutral necessity” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1999, p. 42). It is important to note that, the concept of globalization presents us with a double relation to our world of international relations. To the sociologists, globalization is seen as a “more positive, equalizing, democratic and benign process bringing an intermingling of cultures in a new cosmopolitanism, and the generalization of positive values such as universal human rights” (Martell, 2010, p. 5). However, on the other side, it is considered a problematic process, which either imposes neoliberalism by the West, or American imperialism through the media, exploitative multinational corporations or military power on the rest of the world, especially in the South.

The aim of globalization to solve world problems through global politics may be well-meant but unrealistic, as the concept has assumed different meanings and people across the world use it to their own advantage. The question at this juncture is, whether the neoliberal globalization will be able to solve global inequality and poverty issues at all? Of course, the advantages of globalization cannot be underestimated. Not only do we live in an “imagined community” (Anderson, 1983) of a global entity, through science and technology but, also, it has made it possible for easy flow of goods, services and people from one country to other, although with restrictions. Tackling the world’s problem of economic instability, globalization encourages free trade and aids, international investments by international organizations and individuals.



Photo 1: cattle grazing on the rice project site.

Investment is good but humans' relations with the environment is very necessary to foster its success. The picture above shows Fievie people's cattle grazing at the rice farm. The rice mill machine is just about a mile away from the cattle and the rice farm is about 5 metres across the street. This is to say that, the land taken by the rice project has affected cattle farmers' livelihood. In rebuilding Europe after the World War II, the American Marshall Plan introduced economic aid (Bräutigam & Knack, 2004, p. 256) with the assumption that, development can be achieved through huge money injections. However, I agree with Kristof, (2000) when he argued that, the relationship that exist between economic growth and the environment is highly controversial (cited in Moe (2007, p. 2). The people complain bitterly about their grazing field being seized by their chiefs for the project. Apparently, the rice farm was spread with chemicals that were harmful to the cattle, and most farmers lost their animals. The very chemicals meant for the growth of the rice, polluted neighbouring communities source of drinking water. The people could not access the water but to walk for long miles to fetch drinking water. People count their wealth based on the number of cow they possess. In fact, cattle are considered property.

Some work to acquire money, to purchase cow. Others send their male children to work for cattle farmers as cowboys, to acquire cow after a number of years. It is a major source of living and a long-term investment for them. The company promised to prepare a field for their cattle to feed but they failed to deliver on their promise. Currently, the cattle feed around the rice farm and often, feed on the growing rice. This generates conflicts and maltreatment from the managers and workers alike to cattle farmers. Cattle feed on green leaves. How can they co-exist in an environment with green rice sprouts? Although, there is always someone to control the cattle, they express concerns about how difficult it becomes to prevent the animals from entering the rice farm. It is quite interesting to know that, cattle barns are even closer to the rice farm. What if they go rogue at night?

Although the particular land may be fertile for rice production, the activities existing in the environment should have been considered and well dealt with, prior to or at the start of the project. Now the people feel their livelihood is being destroyed, as their cattle and the rice fight for space. Can cattle farmers be blamed for loss of produce due to grazing? It is worth pointing out that, economic growth through investments is not only about money injections, but also, close attention must be paid to the existing human interaction with the environment. Because, prior to the project, the cattle farmers and the cattle lived in a somewhat, peaceful habitat. Cattle graze as they manure the land with their dung, and when it rains, the field grows green. This expresses the peaceful co-existence among them in an ecosystem. Or should humans stop consuming meat, because rice has to be produced and it is a national concern?

Current development ethics enforce the need to acknowledge that, “political, economic and social factors affect environmental issues” (Øyhus 2011 cited in Jayathilaka (2015, p. 1). He continues to assert that international development strategies are not value free. “A consensus exists that development institutions, projects and aid givers should seek strategies in which both human well-being and a healthy environment jointly exist and are mutually reinforcing” (Crocker 2004, in Jayathilaka (2015, p. 1). In light of human-environment relations, political ecology becomes a tool of analysis to understand how environmental politics affect people (Jayathilaka, 2015, p. 1).

It is important at this point to consider how economic growth and development, through investments and trade in the global world, affect humans' economic, social and political relations through the lens of political ecology. The "world system theory" (Frank, 1969) specifies workers at the periphery, providing labour and producing surplus, whereas the capitalists, people with means of production, reside at the core of the world. It was a system structure, as much as geographically stratified, as the capitalists and workers reside in the developed and undeveloped worlds respectively (Biersack, 2006b). The theory posits, while studying the environmental and development concerns, politics, power, cultural and social factors at the local and international levels has to be considered, as such domains are not devoid of the latter ones. It is important to consider politics in development of target beneficiaries, especially, in the usage of resources. Politics can work to produce wealth for those who possess it, and poverty for others.

...demand for food and other agricultural commodities will continue to increase while the ability of traditional producers and traditional regions to meet that demand will decrease. It is self-evident therefore that i) the resulting gap cannot be filled by smallholder farming and hence ii) that there is a pressing need for new production models and new producing areas. Simple demographics suggest that such new production models will include commercial enterprises, while its vast underutilized natural resource base and large underemployed populations suggest that sub-Saharan Africa will be one of the new producing areas. In fact, with the right mix of enabling policy and appropriate investment models, there is no reason why the region could not become the most important food producing region in the world (Riddell, 2009, p. 8).

Over the years, many development projects and investments in the developing world have proved futile, due to inconsideration of politics, social, historical and cultural factors pre-existing in the local contexts. The above extract suggests enabling policies and appropriate investments, but how? In Biersack (2006a), study of the people along the Porgera valleys in Papua New Guinea, it was discovered that, segregation and conflict

emanated from the gold mining. According Biersack (2006a), since the 1930s, alluvial gold ore was mined by the native people, until the period 1982 to 1984, when high grade ore was discovered and attracted national and international attentions. In 1989, the Porgera Joint Venture owned by transnational corporations, state of the Papua New Guinea, Government of the Enga Provincial Government and the descent lines, who were recognized by their land owning within the context of the mining area, obtained a special mining lease (Biersack, 2006a, p. 233). In 1992, the Porgera gold mine was pronounced the third most productive gold mine in the world. However, Biersack (2006a), recounts its environmental impacts not only on the people recognized as descent lines, with land title holdings and who benefit from the project, but also, on their neighbouring communities. The Porgera River turned red and run into other river streams that connect to it. This was caused by the waste rock that was not properly disposed. This did not only invade the economic livelihood of the beneficiaries and their neighbors with whom they had economic ties, but also, the social relations between them. The red river destroyed the land from which the people earn their living and the waste rock and tailings have covered the previous area where natives mine alluvial gold ore. On the local level, social ties are broken, as this development generated wealth for some, and produced poverty for the rest. The NGO monitoring the project did not consider how the beneficiaries and neighbouring communities redistribute and use resources within their social system. Hence they only considered the people who are directly tied the land in use. Although the project produced national income, it paradoxically produced poverty and inequality among the very lives the national income is to be used to improve. In a similar vein, my fieldwork reveals that, the rice project faired very well, in relation to the size of land cultivated and the yield harvested. Also, the traditional authorities attest to the fact that, the community gained huge income through its percentage share from the project. However, neighbouring community members express dissatisfaction about the project, in that, they have lost their livestock and they continually struggle over grazing field with project managers. Most community members also express growing concern about the community's benefit from the project. According to them, they have not seen any economic change in the community. Inasmuch as people have lost their sources of earning other income (from the common use land taken by the project), apart from

farming, the community's benefit is not being used to develop the its people. For instance, the only basic school in the community gets flooded any time it rains, and nothing is being done about it.

Thus, there is a huge argument and tension between cattle farmers and the rest of the community members who are not in to cattle rearing. The various actors within the economic, social and political scenes, work to promote their interests. The tension is mainly about which benefit is more important. Investors argue for national food security and the profitability of rice production to them. Traditional authorities advocate for community growth through a constant flow of funds through the project. Some community members also hope for employment that will make their lives better. However, cattle farmers do not understand why their grazing field should be given out for rice farming. According to informants, a consensus was reached based on the promise that, a new grazing field will be prepared for them. However, failure to deliver on this promise has culminated in conflict between cattle farmers and the project managers. Also, the irrigation system constructed to provide water for the rice farm, causes flood at neighbouring communities whenever it rains. This prevents many economic activity and even destroys their crops. School children are not able to go to school, because of fear of passing through the flooded water. Thus, the flood isolates communities. The political hierarchy and the tradition that exist among the people, make it difficult for community members to question their traditional authorities' decision concerning the community. The people's views are hardly considered, and the non-ruling class suffer the consequences.

It is important to encourage investments particularly in the agricultural sector for food security and poverty reduction, especially in the developing world. For many decades, development efforts in Ghana rather proved ineffective as such development investments either work to produce or maintain political, economic and social inequality, dispossession and displacement (Caldeira & Holston, 2015; Green, 2003).

You see...that place used to be where our women earned their living, thus, apart from farming. They gathered firewood and mart weeds. All those things have been destroyed. That's where they also get their daily bread. But now, it has become a farm. So if you see everyone, they don't even know which work to do. You see

how they all go when it is harvesting at the fishpond, it is the same when the mart weed is due for harvest. They all go and everyone's effort shows how much they have gathered. But the rice farm, even if they take some people for training, they will dismiss them. Is that good? Meanwhile, when there is firewood or tach, and I want to gather or weed and sell, I can do that. That's where we the men go for fishing. But they said fishing canal. The canal is very weedy now and we are not able to fish there anymore. Meanwhile, first, every family had a pond created by our forefathers at where the rice project is, and people survive on that for months. ...what pains me about Fievie's land contract is that, when the people come for the land, they should have had a very good and outstanding agreement with the people. So that, the community members can benefit from it. By the time you realize, some people will just be using it for free, at their own advantage. Then the community members will just be there and be suffering (Fieldwork conversation with a community member, October, 2015).

In the extract above, the informant expressed his grievances towards the rice project held in high esteem, which has proven effective and boosted the national production rate of rice. Often, those reports rendered by our national and international news and the social media, seldom examine the local lives that are in direct contact with the project. As recounted by Bertelsen (2014), most of his interlocutors who participated in the strike action in Mozambique believe that, their source of poverty and hunger are rooted in the operations of the powerful and affluent members of the Frelimo party and more especially, their connections with foreigners. They believe such affinities are used to immorally accumulate wealth for their self-centered interests at the expense of the ordinary people. Indeed, political ecologists argue that, the state tends to protect the interest of the powerful, people associated with private accumulation and with means of production (investors and land owners), the middle class and the elites at the expense of the less advantaged people in the society. The ordinary lives are left to an unjust fate. And often, their voices are less heard, as the powerful and affluent overpower and overshadow them. They grow weaker, poorer, and less powerful each day, as the reverse is true for the powerful and the capitalists.

Additionally, some development projects do not only dispossess its target beneficiaries but, capitalists in agricultural investments exploit the very lives they seek to improve. What happens when people's sources of livelihood are taken away? These people are left to work as wage labourers on the very projects that dispossessed them. The people feel exploited, as they work tiredly, yet are paid meagre wage (Acheampong & Campion, 2014). I do not think foreign or even local investors can be blamed entirely. Governments of developing countries advocate for foreign investors, and/or international organizations to invest in their economies. They list out interesting and attractive investment opportunities in their respective countries; vast suitable agricultural land, cheap labour, political stability and the likes. For instance, let us consider the excerpt below.

Ghana has attractive attributes for commercial farming, with large tracts of land available with excellent soil and climate suitable for the production of many crops. Lake Volta, the world's largest man-made lake, is fed by an extensive system of rivers. Labor is inexpensive with typical farm labor costing between GH¢3-5 per day (\$2.22-\$3.57). Together, Ghana's vast resources of agricultural land with plentiful water for irrigation and available labor make it ideal for commercial farming of key staple crops such as maize, soya, and rice (MCC, 2014, p. 2)¹⁶.

The amount of money they are supposed to pay the workers on the farm, are not being paid. So, the project is not progressing as supposed to be. Some of us even work outside formal working hours, to make sure that, no one steals anything from the farm. But we are not being treated well at all. We are not even treated like the land owners. We use our personal motor bikes to patrol at night, which is difficult to move through the mud. We petitioned the company to provide us with more advanced bikes to enable us perform our watch over the farm. But they never responded to that effect. They only give 5kg bag of rice during Christmas, that's once every year, and we are paid GHS 440.00 per month. How can you take care of your wife and children as well as other family members? I am the breadwinner

¹⁶ Millennium Challenge Corporation

of my family, since my father died. I go to work at 7am and close at 4pm. And I go again at night to patrol. I partly blame our elders for not having a good agreement with the investors. They only toss us around when we approach them. You see, because of these attitudes, some employees steal from the farm. Although we still farm, we employ the services of others, to weed our farms at a cost, since we don't have time to work on our own farms. That notwithstanding, when you personally do not monitor your farm, the crops don't grow well (Fieldnote, conversation with a labourer, November 2015).

It is a good initiative for governments to appeal for foreign investments in their countries, projecting their countries as safe fields for investments, to unmake the long history of Third worlds as battlefields. But the kind of advocates you make, tell the story expected by these foreign investments. I will not say, the above excerpts contradict each other, rather, the first might have fueled the latter. Citizens of a nation cannot really blame foreign investors for exploiting them, because, this is how their leaders market them on international forums, and the internet. Even if labour costs \$4 per day, it costs more to afford a three square meal a day, in order to regain energy to work. Many of the so called development projects in developing countries, are aimed at poverty reduction. These efforts however result in counterproductive outcomes, thus exacerbating poverty and increasing inequality.

Much of the emphasis by governments and international institutions is placed on macro-economic growth at the expense of the minute section (local people) of the larger economic system, who make the success of a development project. Thus, in attempt to address world problems, macroeconomics attracts more attention than micro-economics, if at all they receive some attention. They then support their economic growth based on crude generalizing statistics (Broch-Due, 1995).

Riddell (2009) asserts that, *"Until recently, most of the world's food has been eaten by those that produce it" (7)*. The fate of traditional producers is recently undetermined. If their land has not been taken, then, they are probably producing for consumers other than themselves (See also (Acheampong & Champion, 2014; Boamah, 2015; Zagema, 2011).

Of what good is this when the labourer is distanced from what he produces? The alienation of the workers from the produce is experienced all over the world. Comaroff and Comaroff (1987) in their "Madman and the Migrant" unearth a similar situation in South African mines;

Here I struggle, but I work for myself (iterela; the reflexive of direla, "work [do] for"). The soil is stony and there is no rain. I struggle, but I call no one "boss". Out there. Where we labour (bereka) for the whites. They pay us money. But the mine like the grave, has use only for your body. When it has done with you, it spits you out, and you are finished! Useless! (Migrant's message in Comaroff and Comaroff (1987, p. 192).

Who are the poor? What essence is it when the very lives that are hoped to be improved, are rather impoverished and treated under harsh conditions, because, the previously unemployed, have now been given jobs as wage labourers (who cannot even fend for themselves)? Investors work under the notion of impacting a country's economy, they amass wealth at the expense of the less advantaged. People lose the joy that comes with working for themselves, to fighting for a global change, yet, their efforts are hardly recognized. Most labourers on the rice farm are unable to cultivate their own farmland due to exhaustion of energy and time on the rice farm. Ironically, although non-workers are able to glean after harvest, the workers are incapacitated to do so, because of time and their obligation to work on the farm. They are unable to glean; neither are they paid well. So the labourers turn to work for other's food security and well-being.

Concluding remarks

In this chapter, we have seen how poverty has been perceived over the years at international, national and local forums. I argued that, local people's perception of poverty may be similar to international and national agencies, however, the approach of eradicating or reducing it vary greatly. Although the people of Fievie believe in the ability of money to avert poverty, they prefer self-employed ventures, rather than wage labour as perceived by capitalists, international organizations and governments. Thus, they preferred to be empowered through their subsistence activities, rather than being employed as wage labourers, of which they cannot afford their basic needs. According to them, to be developed is to possess money to educate their children, build modern houses, purchase variety of foods, have connecting roads to neighbouring communities, and have access to drinking water and electricity. Also, we have seen how local politics, social relations and the fabric of the ecosystem existing in local contexts are often dismissed from development initiatives. I argue that, investments in such a community should empower, monitor and improve existing local economic activities. I therefore suggest that such investment initiative should be merged with local interests and perspectives.

Of a growing concern among political ecologists, development practitioners and anthropologists alike, is how to intermarry global concerns and local social, economic and cultural relations. In attempt to address such concerns, to harmonize investors driven goals, human well-being in a peaceful ecosystem, Riddell (2009, p. 7) argued that, fortunes have been made in the sub-Saharan agricultural sector through investment models such as joint venture partnerships, leases, new build, contract farming and public private partnerships. In the next chapter, I analyze how the Fievie joint-venture partnership was formed and being maintained, as well as its effects on the lives of local people, who are also, stakeholders. The focus will be on my fieldwork.

Chapter 5

The Fievie Partnership Model



Figure 1, Source: Mwesigire (2014)

Different terminologies and ideologies are being conceived and used to characterize acquisition of large tracts of land in Africa. For instance, “Africa is for sale ...land grabs... while the World Bank notes euphemistically the ‘rising global interest in farmland’ (R. Hall, 2011, p. 1) are but a few. The increasing concerns for food security, poverty eradication, fuel price fluctuations, the need for development and foreign investments in poor African countries are being used to legitimize the process of land grabbing. However, these concerns sometimes turn to dismiss the very life it seeks to improve. From the image above, multinational interests and benefits are being prioritized and promoted over local livelihoods. Local people are saddened by these actions, but as argued by political ecologists, the power structure they find themselves in, incapacitate them to fight and win their rights to land resource. Local lives are being deconstructed, rendering them loss of history and identity. Although the land being used for the rice project is customary holding, it was also a “common use” for community members. Most of the people I have worked with, had fish ponds there, that were handed down by their forefathers. Women gathered firewood to sell in order to earn a living. There were community and personal shrines.

History is made at places lived and used and identities written off. The closure of the “common use” did not only erode source of livelihood but also, people’s history and identity. Land marks demarcating fish ponds and other personal activities have been cleared off. People in the area can no more make out what was once theirs and the lived experiences. Land grabs are exacerbating the conditions of the “already claimed poor”, as smallholder farmlands are being taken for corporate farming and are being termed as “poor victims of global processes” (Flikke, 2014, p. 178). It is also disorganizing local social organization, as we have seen in chapter two that, land provides traditional authorities with power to control the economic, social and political lives of their people. Land grabs has in itself, become a growing social unrest in most African countries. In the previous chapters, I argue that, local people’s world views of culture, social, economic and political existence are necessary for development programme planning and implementations. This is important to foster both local and global interests. More specifically, I have argued in chapters two and three that, the meaning, interests and values, the Fievie people ascribe to food and land resources are very significant for the kind of food they produce and eat, as well as what they use their land resource for. I have also shown how their local social organization with regards to land access and use has aided their partnership process.

As an empirical example grounded in ethnography, I present this chapter on partnership between foreign investors and community members to confirm Robbins (2004)’s claim that, there are less coercive, less exploitative and more approachable ways of doing things. Situating it within my research context, I argue that, partnership with clear business terms and negotiation between investors and a community can serve to control land grabs and its associated inconveniences, and as well generate income for community development. This kind of partnership can also foster national food self-sufficiency, yet, likely to cripple existing local self-reliance efforts, if local people’s interests are not considered. I will also show that, partnership only work to an extent. I will outline the processes involved in forming and maintaining partnership, as well as the reasons behind its formation. According to Benjaminsen and Svarstad (2010), in the new concept of “conservation as development”, it is recognized that, humans are embedded in nature, hence a successful conservation depends on local participation (cited in Flikke

(2014, p. 174). However, in analysing Turner's article on biosphere, Flikke (2014) argued that, the cooperation that spelt a win-win scenario, created a sense of insecurity, marginalization and alienation, instead of empowering local participation. Taking inspiration from Flikke (2014), partnership, is not entirely an ideal solution to conflicts in development projects, as social actors in their various capacities work to maintain and intensify existing inequalities within the local and global structure.

Trends of participatory development projects

First, it should be understood that there is nothing new about commercial investment in sub-Saharan agriculture. Fortunes have been made and continue to be made in the sector by local and foreign investors alike in various combinations of production, supply and/or market chain activities and with a variety of investment models including joint venture partnerships, leases, new build, contract farming and public private partnerships (Riddell, 2009, p. 7).

The assertion that local people need assistance in creating sustainable living has initiated a lot of destructive, yet, profitable activities in development, as this works to limit the role of intended beneficiaries (Slater, 1996 cited in Ystanes (2014)). From the epigraph above, different approaches have been adopted by development professionals as well as investors in maximizing profits and controlling conflicts. Of particular interest for this discussion is the joint venture model of investment. International institutions, investors, development experts as well as some local people are convinced that, participatory projects, where local people are involved in programme planning are sure to thrive amidst other factors. Thus, in attempt to harness local people and global interests and control resistance, participatory projects have been introduced to create a sustainable living. Partnership projects have become the new trend of legitimizing yet, exploitative projects (see also Caldeira (1988)). In *Saving Guatemala environmental crisis* which deals with participatory development, Ystanes (2014), recounts that, the local population was politically and socially marginalized due to their position as lower class ladino forest dwellers. Caldeira and Holston (2015) also indicates that, although success was recorded in the mobilization of local participation in formulating a new urban planning model, its very success created conflicts coupled with unintended results, as only the voices of the affluent were heard at the expense of the poor. Additionally, Green (2003) posits that, in

spite of unequal power relations between development agencies and beneficiaries, recipients do have the ability to impact programmes and sometimes reject it. From the above research findings, partnership, although provides a collaborative forum for various participants, is not devoid of power hierarchies. The hierarchized structure of partnership limits the extent to which social actors influence a decision. At this point, let us consider how the Fievie partnership project started with negotiations, and how it has fared, taking into consideration the power relations in this community.

In 2010, a company known as Global Agricultural Development Company (GADCO), approached the Fievie community for a piece of land for the rice project, and we contracted with them. So it was an idea from them to produce rice. We entered into Memorandum of Understanding with them. We gave them the lease of 50 years. But we didn't sell the land to them. To at least 5 years, we take a percentage of their Gross production. That's 2.5% of the Gross for the first five years, then to 5% after five years (Fieldnote, a community member, December 2015).

The Agricultural Development Company (Gadco), in 2010 surveyed and tested the Fievie traditional area's land and found it suitable for rice production. They then approached the community to acquire the land. Their initial plan was to purchase the land outright from the community. However, with the community's history of outright sale and dealing with land, coupled with their knowledge of capitalism and exploitation, the traditional leaders through the operation of the Fievie Lands Secretariat (FLS), thus, the local land administration found it necessary to enter into partnership with the investors. As discussed in chapter two, due to land litigation issues, and families and individuals fighting over land, the 1992 constitution and leaders of the Fievie traditional area deemed it necessary to establish the FLS. This is to encourage and promote land registration within the area. Under the auspices of the FLS, all communal land holdings have been registered. This institution, made it quite flexible for the partnership contract to be established.

Although the idea of rice production was developed by the investors, the idea to partner with these investors was generated by the traditional leaders of the area, for various reasons. Among such are, a continued and guaranteed access to their land, constant and consistent flow of funds; a mechanism to control exploitation by people of the North and with means of capital; to actively contribute to the project by having a voice in the project and providing the necessary support from the community to investors; and to open doors for employment in the community. This community possesses a spirit of domineering over their land, due to the history they have with neighbouring communities and outright sale of land which they did not find beneficial to the community. Hence, they capitalized on their arable land for rice production as a critical tool, to enter into partnership with the investors. In fact, it was a colossal discovery for the community of how suitable their land is for paddy farming.

Being the managers of the community, the chiefs and opinion leaders had series of meetings with the investors to negotiate the terms and conditions of the contract. With the commitment of the traditional authorities to their people, members of the community were not left out of the decision making process.

Our land is a clan land. So everybody has an interest in the land. When it comes to matters of this nature, we call on the whole community, to partake... as we deliver the information to them. Ours is an effectively packaged community. We don't impose ideas on them. Everybody takes part in the decision we make. ...Even the investors used to come and speak to them. They meet them face to face. (Fieldnote, December 2015, chief).

In contrast to Acheampong and Campion (2014)'s findings that, traditional authorities did not consult with land users before leasing out customary land to *Jatropha* investors, from the above excerpt, there were a number of meetings between the community members and their leaders concerning the rice production project. However, there are discrepancies as to how these meetings were organized and the interaction that ensued among them. From observation at community meetings, only few members of the community speak their views during these meetings. You will find most people especially,

the youth idly standing around as though the meeting concerned them not. My interaction with them reveals that:

Whenever, they are coming to do anything, they have a communal meeting. For me, I attended all the first meetings but I haven't been to any of the new ones. Because, if you are doing something and you get benefit, that's when you continue. ... some of us, our speech is hurtful. Because the truth will not be there and we will ignore it. But then, you are a child, and they will tag you. If they tag you, they will soon kill you and leave your children and wife. If you are rather alive and struggling is better. The community property is for the community. So if you are smart, you will know how to do avoid problems. So because of that, I don't go for the meetings anymore. Because when I go, I wouldn't keep quiet on the issue and even if I do, I will come back home and be angry about it. So it's better I don't go. (Fieldnote, November, 2015, a community member).

The chief's statement illustrates how well organized the Fievie traditional area is, but this is contrasted with a community members view of how members can only fight for their personal rightful benefit and not that of the community's. These presents us with contradictory views on the oneness of an effectively packaged community and how communal cake is shared and approached by the people it sets to benefit. Also, it illustrates how people can easily dissociate themselves from a communal benefit, because fighting for it is just an endless fight for a share of a "whole", which is not worth fighting for.

Traditional authorities and project managers expressed difficulty in organizing meetings to include all the suburbs of the Fievie traditional area. Therefore, a "Rice Project Committee" was formed. It comprises of representatives of all the suburbs, opinion leaders, the executives of the FLS and the management of the company. The main purpose of this committee is to address issues such as, the progress and challenges of the project, as well as the concerns of community members. The representatives of the various suburbs were to mediate between the community members, the FLS and the management of the project, by keeping them informed of updates on the project and

presenting their concerns during discussions. community and to seek for the welfare of the project.

I argue that, although the rice project committee was set up to ensure “participation”, it is a political tool to legitimize and enforce decisions from above, due to unequal power relations among participants. Thus, the committee set up to indicate a bottom up approach is a political tool, disguising the conventional exploitative top-down approach. In *Saving Guatemala’s forest*, Ystanes (2014, p. 127), argues, “although participation is a buzzword in contemporary development efforts, the legacy of local and global hierarchies established during the colonial era often works to limit the roles of intended beneficiaries”. Ystanes (2011, pp. 129-131) recounts that in an attempt to address conflicts arising from the existing conservation regime and the promotion of the Mirador Basin Project (which is an attempt to abandon the concession system, which is favorable to the communities, yet considered unsustainable by those who seek to gain profit from tourism in the area), a roundtable discussion forum called La mesa Multisectorial was set up. The archaeological project and their donors, civil society organizations, the presidency, state bodies on cultural and natural heritage, tourism and the environment, and the concession holding forest communities were represented on the roundtable discussion. The forum was to turn conflicts into collaboration based on consensus, where in theory, every participant possess equal say in any subject matter. However, in practice, the different sectorial representative due to the background and experience, had unequal access to contacts and networks within and outside the forum. The hierarchical boundaries among the participants on the La Mesa, made the decision making process complicated. People were not open to each other and could not trust the truth in what others said during such discussions. Also, the position of concession holders (most of them Ladinos), as lower-class forest labourers further marginalized them politically and socially. Thus, the people have different power positions, and as such could not trust each other’s views. Many Westerners and developers could not conceive that; the concession holders possess the capacity to address environmental problems within their surroundings. On the other hand, the Peten forest dwellers also feel they play a vital role in protecting their community.

The rice project committee, unlike (Ystanes, 2011) roundtable discussion in “Precarious trust”, where people are not able to speak out their actual intentions because of lack of trust and closure, is more of who possess the power of knowledge. As discussed in chapter three, rice farming is new to the Fievie people, therefore they possess little knowledge about it. On the other hand, the educated investors and project managers who claim to have in-depth knowledge about how rice production works, seems to direct the affairs of the project. Community-based knowledge was dismissed for rice production practices. The presence of suburb representatives was only used to legitimize top-down approach of decision making. The total dismissal of local knowledge of the environment posed a huge challenge to the project, which eventually led to its collapse. As observed among the forest dwellers in Guatemala by Ystanes (2011), who were considered incapable of solving their environmental problems and were taken for granted, the Fievie people’s knowledge of the annual flood and advice to the project managers were underestimated. The investors ordered for increase in land size for cultivation. While the produce was ready for harvest, there were not enough harvesting machines to harvest the produce on time, and the annual flood sets in. Greater part of the rice could not be harvested. GADCO run into bankruptcy, and Wienco has taken over the project in the last quarter of 2014.

Green (2003) argued that development planning involves representatives of donor agencies, recipient government, local people representatives as well as professionals recruited to make sure the programmes work effectively. She also acknowledges power relations observed between development agencies and recipients. However, she argues that, recipients possess the capacity to influence the programme, as well as to reject it. According to her, participatory project management makes project process a social one. However, Green misses the link between planning and implementation. Recipient representatives may be included at the planning stage, but are usually cut off during implementation. Her experiences of careful examination from planning stage to the end of the project can only be limited to her area of jurisdiction. Most of the things documented as working documents are seldom implemented. For instance, my fieldwork reveals that, investors planned and agreed to carry out the project for 50 years. But they only worked

for four years and the project collapsed. They also agreed with cattle farmers to prepare a new grazing field for their animals, since the previous field has been taken by the project. To the disappointment of the local people, this part of the agreement was not fulfilled. The people could not have known that the investors will not honour this part of the contract, which has eroded their source of livelihood. What if after the four years of production, the land becomes infertile for any use? Taking inspiration from Blaikie (1985)'s "The political economy of soil erosion in developing countries", it would then become a novel capitalism that forced the people to take from the soil, what they could not put back. I disagree with Maia's argument, and argue that, representatives of recipients can only influence or reject development programmes or investments based on what they know and the limit of their power position. On the one hand, often, development programmes or investors have hidden agenda that is not made explicit during the planning process.

Sawyer (2003) argued that, technological advancement is being used to normalize political, social and economic differences in the Ecuadorian forest, to legitimize oil exploration and environmental conservation, negating the social lives. Meanwhile, people have played a great role in maintaining what seems like untouched forest by planting trees over the decades, yet, their lives have been dissociated from it. According Sawyer, ARCO made every effort to erase the presence of people in the forest, by using invisible pipelines to demonstrate the absence of human lives. Looking at the photographs of ARCO's book alone, never shows traces of humans in the forest. In a similar vein, not only are investors using the partnership package to legitimize exploitation but also, to neutralize environmentalists concerns of destroying the ecosystem. They come with the news of advanced irrigation system, yet they seldom consider the indigenous social lives and their lived landscapes. The irrigation is constructed, yet when it rains, it floods surrounding communities.

The Technical Environmental Committee was established to address the plights of indigenous people, thus, to enable local leaders to insist that, ARCO built invisible pipeline through their territory without a road. However, the committee turned out to be a forum for discussing issues pertaining to ARCO's environmental concerns (Sawyer, 2003, p.

90). Comparatively, the Fievie rice project committee formed to address social concerns and of the project, has become a platform to enforce decisions and make them appropriate and acceptable by all. This is so because, speaking to some of these committee members reveal that, first of all, these people are not well informed with ongoing issues on the rice farm. Secondly, when native employees update them on such issues, they are hardly communicated during committee meetings, due to power ranks. Thirdly, in cases where concerns of community members are raised, they are walked on by project managers, who relegate such concerns to the background. Fourthly, these representatives could not query the decisions made at such meetings, because most of them benefit from the project directly, through the out grower programme, knowing that people's conscience are bought with gift giving Mauss (2002) there's less to argue about. The result of such unscrupulous acts is reproduction of poverty and marginalization of indigenous people, the "target beneficiaries" (see also Sawyer (2003). Irrespectively of how brilliant the investors and traditional authorities might have taken the initiative to establish a partnership and subsequently a "committee", this should not blind us of the hidden exploitative agenda, and perpetuating and exacerbating inequalities in land resource use. As an advance to existing knowledge on political ecology of which Robbins (2004) argues that, there are less exploitative and less coercive and more sustainable of doing things. I argue that, mitigating social as well as ecological impacts of the rice project should inculcate the views of all representatives. It should also move beyond just selected few as representatives on a "committee", to sometimes include community members who can boldly voice out their concerns at open forums.

As discussed earlier, the people accord special respect to their chiefs and traditional authorities. As such, decisions or the views of traditional authorities are hardly questioned by their people. Hence, the understanding of the hierarchized world of Fievie should take into account how politics is conceived and worked in this community. Unlike avoiding conflict in the political world of Brazilians as outlined by Caldeira (1988, p. 446), where "the expression of political opinion has to be disguised and dissimulated, since it involves the possibility of conflict and the exposure of difference" in the Fievie community, due to position of chiefs, community members negotiate their views rather than confront

authorities. Paradoxically, the chiefs claim not to impose on their people, instead, they allow them to take part in the decision making process by organizing series of meetings. However, in these meetings, people turn to compromise, since it is considered impolite to talk back at traditional authorities. Thus, the respect accorded to chiefs due to their traditional position, has been politicized into every aspect of their world. In fact, people generally negotiate and compromise to preserve their cultural and societal values and norms. For instance, the youth group in the community was alleged to have planned to assassinate the paramount chief, because they had a meeting about what the community's benefit from the rice project was being used for. Having heard about the allegation, the youth decided never to meet again to discuss any other matters. They were filled with fear of disregarding the position of the paramount chief. I argue that, such societal values can either keep bad people in check, but to a large extent, cripple people's views about ongoing issues. Also, this partnership project represents the views of the few people with traditional power, since such meetings organized with communities were only used to legitimize decisions otherwise taken by traditional authorities.

In one of such occasional community meetings I sat in, to discuss issues arising from the rice project, the hierarchical position of chiefs and community members makes it a presentation section, more than a forum for discussions and collaboration. It is a communal meeting which required the presence of all community members. During such meetings, women sit separately from men and the young men stand. Only few people are allowed to ask questions and give suggestions, and these people are usually selected by the chiefs. In such meetings, even when allowed to talk, the people use "positive politeness" (P. Brown & Levinson, 1978), such as "our fathers" to emphasize the position and authority of the chiefs and elders, and to delimit themselves. The use of such words indicates inequality and domination. Besides, others queried the politeness of other community members, who might have addressed the chiefs in a confronting manner. For instance, they asked "who taught you to talk to the elderly like that"? Thus, there are no clear boundaries as to when the chiefs deserve this special respect and when they can be queried. Chiefs never cease to be chiefs and as custom demands, they are worth this respect all the time. Relating to chiefs in this manner has been ritualized and weaves

through the socio-political body of the people, and indicates how people speak in a typical world of traditional society. According to community members, the chiefs are supposed to be a true reflection of them, because, they know their values and interests. However, as argued by Leach et al. (1999), that, social actors although are shaped by their societal values, have also grown to be skilled agents. The chiefs although are the custodians of societal values, have their personal interests to be pursued, which may not reflect the interest of their people. Unlike in Brazil where the power inequality is observed among the upper class and working class people (Caldeira, 1988), in Fievie, the tension is rather between traditional authorities and the commoners at the community level. Subsequently, as chiefs always promise to represent the views of their people, the people on the other hand are beginning to know that, this is not always true. The people think “the intention behind the speaker’s word should be investigated” (Caldeira, 1988, p. 452). A gentleman told me, *“you see, just as you’re investigating, I am also investigating our elders”*.

In the Fievie community, it is an indication that, meanings and power are negotiated and reproduced in hierarchized ways.

Maintaining partnership and the rice project

It is one thing to establish a partnership and yet, another to maintain that partnership. Maintaining the partnership may be quite challenging but very necessary for the purpose of the partnership to be achieved. Although the terms and conditions for the contract of partnership were still active during Gadco’s administration, there were arising issues of compensation for affected people; mismanagement and poor investor-managers’ relationship and low salaries for lower rank employees. The discussion here will be focused on Gadco and its production failure by relating it to how this partnership could not be maintained and its consequences for the rice project.

“They initially said, they would not take those lands but they later, they took those portion of land. We said everything humanly possible, but there was no understanding. It was our leaders who gave out the land to them and they gave out the entire portion, so we just let go. They said they will give us GHS 4000 but

they never delivered on that promise. They just deceived us on several occasions. ...only some people benefited from it. They said they will farm for us but they were selective. ...when they dug the irrigation canal, it affected where we earn a living...our animals and fish...you can rear fish in the fish pond there to support you. But since they sprayed the rice farm and could not control the spraying well, they also sprayed the pond from which the animals drink. We lost out cattle. So that is our bitterness” (Fieldwork interview with a community member, 8th October, 2015)

Most community members expressed dissatisfaction with the whole project with regards to the fact that, they were not compensated as their place of earning a living and history has been taken away from them. Issues of compensation has been a major challenge for most investors after displacing local people. No or inadequate compensation has generated conflicts, local resistance and demonstration against to investors in Ghana (Acheampong & Campion, 2014). From the above excerpt, some people have lost their livestock and place of earning a living. While they have been promised compensation for all, only selected few received it. The plan was to cultivate rice farm for such people at the project site. However, since Gadco could not continue with production, this plan seemed shattered until the new company, Wienco took over. Although Wienco has started and continued from where Gadco left off, the process is slow and the selection of beneficiaries is political. The criteria for selecting people for the Fievie Coppa Connect¹⁷ is claimed to be based on individual enthusiasm towards the paddy farm. The twist to this approach is that, prior to the rice project, nobody measured any one’s interest level for cultivating their own staple crops and rearing livestock. Besides, from observation, most people in this programme are either chiefs or members of a particular family. As discussed in chapter two, the Fievie Dugame is divided into four gates and people from all these gates were affected by the project. However, some gates benefit at the expense of others. Although there are gates and suburbs, due to intermarriages, the people possess a sense of unity and are do not take to the street to start war against each other. This

¹⁷ Fievie Coppa Connect is an out grower programme for the Fievie community. It was initiated partly as a form of compensation for those who lost their farmlands, as well as a benefit for those whose farmlands were unaffected by the project.

demonstrates their calmness to the situation and hope for the future. When people express dissatisfaction, they lose interest in such issues. Though the people may not take to war or demonstration due to their relationship with one another and respect for traditional authorities, they are adamant about the progress and welfare of the rice product. They are less concerned with issues pertaining to the project as compared to the initial stage of the project. Although these people's action may not have a direct impact on the project as outlined by Acheampong and Campion (2014) in other parts of the country, the little contribution of reporting theft cases to the project managers are being terminated because they care less now. This has a great implication for the new company. If measures are not put in place, Wienco may not have full assistance and cooperation of the people.

This partnership was strictly business but the kind of relationship that developed is important for the progress or vision of the project. Though the community reserves a voice in the issues affecting the project, its voice is limited, as the company has its own operating regulations and laws guarding the project, which remain unknown to the community (see also Sawyer (2003)). The community can only advise the investors. The company has enjoyed an informal and unpaid services of the people including unofficial security patrol by some youth from the community. The self-appointed individuals took on this task to control theft and pilfering from other community and neighbouring community members. In the course of their duty, any observation that does not conform or may be disastrous for the project if reported to the chiefs and community representatives on the project committee. However, as discussed above, this kind of information and community based knowledge advice are filtered and only few if any, are worked with.

As mentioned earlier, some natural disasters like floods are controllable in non-seasonal crop farming like rice, or plantations that are supported with irrigation. The community though is not well vested in rice farming; it has an in-depth knowledge about the annual occurrence of flood in the area. On the other hand, the people with means of capital and the knowledge and technical know-how of rice farming were in conflict about how this expertise may work to the best of the project. The biggest challenge, leading to the fall of Gadco was mismanagement by managers in relation to poor communication and

coordination by both the local project managers and the investors (who are all based in the United State of America and United Kingdom). Gadco at the time cultivated about 800 hectares under the instruction of the investors who were residing abroad. Although this was a good effort towards increasing production, there were less human resources and equipment to work with. The local managers having received orders from employers ploughed and planted on a large range of the land.

The problem was that, the paddy was ready for harvest but there were not enough harvester machines to harvest the produce, and in no time, flood took over greater part of the land. This flood could have been to the advantage of the project if the land was cultivated in reasonable sizes and in turns, such that, while one part is ready for harvest, the others are in a different growth stage. This advice was offered by the community members and the local managers also informed the investors about their predicament of few harvesters, but they were downplayed. This is an indication of investors who consider themselves to be experts, hence, underestimate local knowledge and eventually exploit and ruin the lives of the poor resource owners. In effect, the community had a low income since the gross income of the project was itself low. Community members who participated in the out-grower programme for the community, (in which rice is cultivated for participants) did not also harvest.

It is important to emphasize that, although these investors are Nigerians and Indians who reside in the developed world and might have been influenced by the Western culture, the notion of exploitation in capitalism is taking a new direction. It is in place to state that, exploitation is taking place within and among people of the global South. Since colonialism, researchers have argued that, exploitation of the South has always been by the people of the North. However, my fieldwork reveals that, the investors are people of the South. I gathered that, they have gained a lot from the rice project and because there was no financial commitment in terms of the land, they really had nothing to lose, although at end, they were met with financial challenges due to their own calculated mismanagement. The local managers were also described to be self-centred individuals. Most of these local managers of which some are foreigners, have acquired personal land elsewhere and cultivating rice. Taking inspiration from Bryant and Bailey (1997), I argue,

social actors at different levels of the project structure; from the investors, local project managers, traditional authorities, community representatives on the rice committee, to community members, have their self-centred interests to satisfy. Although with varying degrees, they all work to maintain and intensify the existing social, economic and political inequalities. In essence, these inequalities and hierarchical boundaries work to limit the progress of the rice project.

The Products of Partnership in Agricultural Production

Participation is a process through which stakeholders influence and share control of development initiatives and of decisions and resources that affect them. The process enhances stakeholder ownership and commitment, and helps give a voice to the poor and disadvantaged (ADB, 2001, p. II).

... as part of the Memorandum of Understanding, there is going to be a technological transfer. We also want to participate in the project. We want to be rice farmers as well. So we have this idea of Smallholder Scheme. That's the local people also owning part of the project, in which case, when we do it that way, everybody benefits. We don't want the situation where people will just come, exploit everything and take it away. Yes...and the country will be left with nothing. That's why we entered into partnership with them... (Fieldnote, a chief, 16th December 2016)

The introduction of the PPP policy to the agricultural sector, and adoption of Joint Venture model for investments, are a good mechanism to encourage investments in agriculture; empower poor resource owners; control land litigation and a medium of attaining self-sufficiency in food. From the epigraphs above, participatory projects give voice and a sense of ownership to stakeholders, especially, poor smallholder farmers. However, as I have argued in the above sections of this chapters, the power of the voice of the less advantaged stakeholders in this participatory project is limited and does not go far, and may therefore not contribute to the progress of the projects and their own sustainable living. This notwithstanding, there are enormous benefits that stakeholders stand to gain.

My fieldwork in the Fievie traditional area reveals that, when investors who are interested in agricultural production, enter into partnership with landowners, their capital becomes more useful in developing and cultivating the land. In effect, less capital resource is needed to start production as compared to outright acquisition of land. Rather than putting part of their resources in land purchase, they invested in equipment and chemicals. This made it possible for them to cultivate large size of land even at the very beginning of the project. Simply put, partnership in agricultural production enables capital accumulation for cultivation and easy expansion.

Also, the land does not go unused when a particular company or investor is unable to stay in business, the landowners possess the right to take over the land and reuse it. Unlike land grabs where there is outright purchase of land or confiscation of land, and the eventual loss of land rights by the poor resource owners, the Fievie land secretariat reserves the right to re-enter in to the contract and reuse the as it pleases, after three months of non-production. This is an innovation consistent with post colonialist states educated traditional authorities. According to them, they are playing defence in an attempt to avoid further exploitation of both human and natural resources as experienced during colonialism. Consistent with the terms and conditions of the contract of partnership with the investors, the community will never lose right to their land, rather, they are assured of a guaranteed access to their land.

Most communities suffer loss from development projects that are meant to benefit them (Acheampong & Campion, 2014). However, the Fievie Partnership model demonstrates a channel through which a constant income to the community can flow. The community is entitled to 2.5% of the Gross Income irrespective of whether the company is in production or not. Apart from the constant and consistent income to the community, it keeps the investors in check by encouraging them to be effective and efficient in operation. It is also a strategy to curb exploitation as the community takes from the Gross Income and not the Net Income. Because, the investors can declare no profit after harvest, and this implies that, the community will not have any share at the share at the end. Thus, the community decisions to take from the gross income was not to share in the ineffectiveness of the investors.

Low salaries for lower rank employees usually referred to as labourers and majority of the community members employed on the farm fall under this category but we cannot entirely rule out the fact that, this project opened employment avenue for the people it is intended to benefit. As part of the reasons Gadco failed production, there were few hands to work with and poor remuneration. The labourers felt underpaid and some took to pilfering of diesel and backbiting each other. Some are very active and hardworking, although they were not being paid well but they take consolation the fact that, the project is theirs since the community has a share in it. So they make the sacrifices. But the other group of the labourers capitalize on the fact that, the land is theirs and they deserve to be treated better. Once they did not get that treatment, they misbehaved and were dismissed from working on the paddy farm. It must be emphasized that, the community's right to have a voice in the project got some people to be employed but could not keep the job for them, since the company also has its code of conduct that it regulates with. However, both the disappointed and dismissed as well as those who sacrifice themselves for the welfare of the project complain bitterly about the treatment meted to them by the local managers who are self-centred and the inability of their leaders to speak and ask for an increment in salaries. Taking inspiration from Mauss (2002), the conscience of chiefs, project representatives and local project managers who can petition the investors to give better remuneration to these category of employees have been bought, as they have their own benefits and interests to protect. This notwithstanding, the company has tremendous support from most employees basically because, the larger community has a share in it. Although it may be difficult to have a “win, win negotiation”, partnership provides a sense of ownership and commitment by stakeholders, with varying degrees of benefits.

The Fievie Copa Connect and a journey to attaining food self-sufficiency in Ghana

The current company feels it is Corporate Social Responsibility but the community thinks it is an obligation as outlined by the contract. In either ways, there is an out grower programme for some community members that are labelled to be enthusiastic about the rice project. This programme is called the Fievie Copa Connect which is designed to promote community participation in the project, thus apart from employment for the people. For the community, it is a quick way to learn rice farming for any eventualities and also to compensate the loss of the affected people. Although this programme is developing slowly, as people are being farmed for in batches of 40, it is likely to sail. As I have argued in chapter four, development efforts that do not consider the interest of the local people, may cripple the existing efforts by the people for self-sustenance. I have also mentioned that, the people prefer to work for themselves, a process that put them in-charge of what they do. The Fievie Coppa Connect is an approach to empower the interests of the people. Here, everything in relation to rice farming is done by the company, with assistance from the beneficiaries. For instance, they help in to regulate water flow in their respective fields. When the produce is ready for harvest, the company harvests. It takes out its production cost and give the rest to the beneficiaries. This worked quite well under GADCO's administrations, although with challenges. However, with Wienco's long standing history in partnership with smallholder farmers' associations, the programme may do better. Wienco expressed interest in making greater part of the project under the out grower programme.

The out grower programme provides a source of income for participants and their families. As discussed in chapter four, the people prefer to work for themselves but are also willing to work for wages. For them, poverty means lack of money. The participants of the Fievie Coppa Connect expressed satisfaction with the programme for various reasons. It empowers them as though they are working on their own field. Secondly, it generates money for them to pay their children's school fees and to put up modern houses. Also, although it is prohibited for them to harvest rice from their field to feed themselves, they are allowed to glean after harvest. So it is a source of earning a living.

However, people's attention is being shifted from staple crop cultivation to rice production, particularly due to the fact that it readily makes money available to them. Thus after the company retrieves its cost of production, it returns the rest of the money gained to the beneficiaries as income. The twist and turn of this is that, while the out grower programme gives them monetary satisfaction, they lack the power and control over what they produce, as they could not take directly from what they produce, but to glean. Inasmuch as they lack control in this programme, they are also being less effective in maize production. The attention of most participants in the programme is shifting from maize production. I observed reduction in farmland size, as I accompanied them to their farms. Eventually, although, they may gain money from the out grower programme, they may have to depend on the market for their staple foods. This poses a threat to the people's existing subsistence and self-sustenance efforts. They may become incapacitated to provide for themselves, should they not earn enough from the rice production, and should the price of maize rise up beyond what they can afford.

The concept of agricultural partnership has a lot to offer food self-sufficiency in Ghana if only the views of interested parties are considered reasonable and important. That way, issues of natural disasters destroying crops leading to low yields can be avoided. Partnership is a development strategy to empower communities, to control exploitation and land litigations in the country.

Concluding remarks

The concept of agricultural partnership has a lot to offer food self-sufficiency in Ghana if only the views of interested parties are considered reasonable and important. That way, issues of natural disasters destroying crops leading to low yields can be avoided. Partnership is a development strategy to empower communities, to control exploitation and land litigations in the country.

The persisting inequalities being reproduced may not result in riots in this community, because of the entrenched custom demands of respect for traditional authorities. However, these may be possible factors that can cripple the progress of the project, since

the people are now reluctant to do anything useful intrinsically to aid the process of progress.

Concluding Thoughts

This study has explored how partnership in agricultural production affects national food self-sufficiency positively and control land litigations, yet, creating internal conflicts and crippling existing self-reliance efforts of subsistence farming. I have presented findings based on a fieldwork carried on the Fievie rice project among the people of Fievie-Dugame. Most of the agricultural investments in the country were, public-private partnership; institutions assisting farmers' associations through provision of agrochemicals, and loans; as well as investors buying large tracts of customary lands outright from chiefs. In the latter, the chiefs usually do not consult with land users before embarking on such ventures. The trajectory of such investments have resulted in dispossession and displacement of smallholder farmers, loss of history and identity, conflicts, as well as erosion of livelihood (Acheampong & Campion, 2014; Antwi-Bediako, 2013; Boamah, 2015). I was motivated by the Fievie rice project's characteristic of partnership between the investors and the community, where the community used its land as a tool to enter into partnership with the investors. In this section of the thesis, I pull together the discussions above to remind the reader and to show how my study contributes to existing knowledge and to propose further research possibilities.

From the phenomenological approach, the sociocultural world views of the people concerning land was explored in chapter two. Land in the Fievie community is predominantly customary landholdings. I have shown how local social organization affect land access and use. The people are organized around household, family, gates and suburbs. Each social unit has a head that regulates the affairs of his people. Members in turn access land by approaching and negotiating with their immediate chiefs. I argued in chapter two, the meaning, interests and values ascribed to land influences how and what people use their land for. The people of Fievie think of land as a generational gift, which need to be guarded and used reasonably, in order to be handed down to unborn generations. It is also a source of livelihood for them, as the people are predominantly subsistence farmers. Land is both a source of life and death for them. They cultivate the land as they are alive to aid their survival, yet when they die, land is still need to bury the dead. Land lives with them and provides them with comfort, even as they die. In order not to lose total control over their land, they refused to sell it outright as proposed by the

investors, instead, they entered into partnership with them. The memorandum of understanding, guarantees their continuous access and control over the land.

In chapter three, I discussed the meaning, values and interests attached to food and how the people conceptualize food self-sufficiency as well as how they work towards achieving it. The people are socio-culturally condemned to akple. As argued by Bourdieu (2005), people eat certain kinds of food because of the taste developed for it, and irrespective of a person's economic status, he is inclined to fulfill the desire. My fieldwork reveals that, the people of Fievie, irrespective of their occupation, consume akple. I disagreed with researchers who posit that, people who eat fatty and heavy food are people with low income and those who do extraneous work. Akple which is a local dish prepared from maize, has high concentration of carbohydrate, yet, for the sake of taste, interest and value ascribed to it, the people satisfy their desire accordingly. A good day does not end without akple. I argued that, akple is a cultural signifier of which the people are condemned and inclined to fulfill. However, my point of departure from Bourdieu (2005) is that, sometimes, people's choices are limited by lack of purchasing power. This is revealed in the tremendous change in diet of the people at the commencement of the rice project. Akple does not only weave through the economic fabric of the people, but also, through their sociocultural world. My study confirms Douglas (1972) argument that, food signifies social relations and shows how people are closely related. However, I disagreed with her position that, people we know only at drink, we know less at meal. Although, she used this idea to illustrate the intimacy expressed in offering meal to others and how closed a social unit can be, I find it too generalizing. Although sharing food indicates close relations in a social unit, this unit is opened to others who are willing to join in the Fievie community. The people I have worked with generally invite others, even strangers passing through their houses to join them eat. However, the relationship is marked by whether this person can eat with them from the same bowl. I have clarified that, this may be possible due to open house structures in my study area, which is unlike the detached and semi-detached apartments and bungalows at Douglas' research setting. I therefore argued, food in this community does not only show social relations but also, creates it. I have also shown that, due to the meaning and interest attached to akple, the people are poised to farm in order to provide for themselves. In their understanding of food self-

sufficiency, they said, they are able to produce enough staple food (maize and cassava) to take them throughout the year, and that, they only access the market for the sake of variety in what they consume.

Poverty eradication and food security issues are growing general concerns. However, as I argued in chapter four, most of the international and national policies, as well as investment strategies that sought to address these issues usually do not consider the social, cultural and political relations existing within the local contexts where, such programmes are initiated. I have established based on my findings that, the rice project works to maintain and exacerbate existing socio-economic and political inequalities in the Fievie traditional area. This is because, as argued by Bryant and Bailey (1997), social actors including investors, chiefs, project managers and representatives as well as community members, all work to influence the project by protecting and projecting their self-centered interests within the structure. Firstly, investors found it more profitable to produce rice in a maize consuming society. They also cultivated very large size of land (800 hectares) in order to harvest and make more profit, yet, paid less attention to local knowledge. Local project managers also accumulated personal wealth by selling out some of the project equipment and produce. Traditional authorities make decisions and inform their people. The people consider this as a way of imposition since their views are usually not considered and the decisions of the chiefs could not be questioned due their custom of not questioning the wisdom and authority of traditional authorities. In selecting people to participate in the out grower program, chiefs and members of their families were chosen. Hence, some gates have brick structures whereas, others are more of mud-houses. Also, the first company, Global Agricultural Development Company collapsed largely due to poor management; affected cattle farmers are at huddle with chiefs and project managers, and some community members are at loggerhead with each other. Beneficiaries of the out grower programme make money to send their children to school and put up new house structures. As argued by political ecologists, this is producing and maintaining a clear economic, social and political differences among the people and neighbouring communities who are partially affected by the project through flood caused by the irrigation system (see also Biersack (2006a).

As argued by Robbins (2004), political ecology posits that, there are less exploitative and coercive ways of doing things. Adding to existing knowledge in this regard, my study shows that partnership between the Fievie traditional area and foreign investors is one of such mechanisms that can control to an extent, exploitation and manage conflict amicably. Regarding exploitation, both community members and chiefs believe that, partnership was the best means to assure a constant inflow of cash to the community. For if they had sold the land, the money would have been small as compared to what they earn now. Their decision was an attempt to share in the benefits of the project. Partnership is also a means to control conflict and resistance to investors by community members. As noted above, although community members do not think to impact the project with their views, they feel satisfied to be informed about it, hence they sensitized themselves. Unlike observed in other parts of the country where smallholder farmers were dispossessed and displaced off their land without prior notice (Acheampong & Campion, 2014; Antwi-Bediako, 2013), this project is contrary. My research sheds light on the first investor-community agriculture partnership experienced in Ghana.

Notwithstanding the above stated benefits of partnership, I argue that, it is a novel configuration of capitalism. Firstly, the interest of the investors to produce rice was pursued over the local people concern, value and efforts to produce their staple crops. Secondly, although a rice project committee was set up to address issues pertaining to the project, it was a forum to legitimize decisions made by investors and traditional authorities, due to inequalities that exist among investors, chiefs, project managers and community representatives. Investors and managers possess knowledge of rice farming and means of production, while traditional authorities and representatives own the land. However, the power of the people who claim to represent the rest of the community on such platform is furthered limited by the unquestionable character and decision of their chiefs. Additionally, I argued that, the conscience of the representatives is bought, as most of them are beneficiaries of the out grower programme of rice production and are less effective in enforcing their views. Thirdly, partnership may address the issue of exploitation at the national and community levels. However, exploitation of wage labourers is prevalent. Labourers claim to be underpaid, yet they produce surplus for investors' profits. Aside not being paid enough to provide for themselves, their energy

and time are consumed by the demands of their job. They are no more, able to work on their own farms, but to hire “*apatorwo*” (contract workers). The continuity of the rice project may cripple existing subsistence livelihood, as people are growing less effective in producing staple crops. They may eventually depend on the market for survival. However, they may not be able to negotiate market prices, hence, hunger and starvation may loom this society. These are contending issues of the two concepts of food security and food self-sufficiency within food studies. I argue that, both concepts are very important in development, however, when one is projected at the expense of the other, a more severe form of the former is expected. For instance, investors focused on rice production partially due to national food security demand, at the expense of the existing local efforts to attaining self-sufficiency in food. People’s time and energy are further exploited to meet the national food security demands. In effect, their farms are abandoned, yet wages earned cannot provide enough for them, although food is in high supply on the market. My study therefore provides an empirical data on the ongoing debate about food security and food self-sufficiency.

Recommendation for further research

In this thesis, I have established that, partnership between investors and community members in agricultural production is very important to control land grabs, and to contribute to national food self-sufficiency. The Fievie traditional area as a whole benefit enormously from the project, which otherwise may not have. However, I could not explore into details how the community’s percentage share is being distributed and used, and how it affects the livelihood of the people. I therefore suggest for further researches to investigate this aspect of the project in order to further throw more light on how cost and benefits are distributed in a highly politicized environment like Fievie.

References

- Abugre, C. (2000). *Still sapping the poor: A critique of IMF poverty reduction strategies*: World Development Movement.
- Acheampong, E., & Campion, B. B. (2014). The effects of biofuel feedstock production on farmers' livelihoods in Ghana: The case of *Jatropha curcas*. *Sustainability*, 6(7), 4587-4607.
- ADB. (2001). *Special Evaluation Study on Participatory Development Processes in Selected Asian Development Bank Projects in Agriculture, Natural Resources and Social Infrastructure Sectors*.: Asian Development Bank.
- Adema, P. (2007). *Foodways*. In *The Oxford Companion to American Food and Drink*, ed. A.F. Smith, *The Oxford companion to American food and drink*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Almerico, G. M. (2014). Food and identity: Food studies, cultural, and personal identity. *Journal of International Business and Cultural Studies*, 8, 1.
- Amanor-Boadu, V. (2012). Rice Price Trends in Ghana (2006–2011). *Department of Agricultural Economics, Kansas State University. METSS-Ghana Research and Issue Paper Series(02-2012)*.
- Amoatia, O. P. (2010). *Chiefs and traditional authorities an their roles in the democratic order and governance*: The Institute of Economic Affairs.
- Anderson, B. (1983). Imagined Communities. 9-36.
- Andersson, A. (2002). The bright lights grow fainter: Livelihoods, migration and a small town in Zimbabwe. *PhD Thesis, Stockholm: Stockholm University*.
- Antwi-Bediako. (2013). Land Grabbing and *Jatropha* Boom in Ghana. ELP 2013 Ghana.
- Appadurai, A. (1986). *The Social life of things : commodities in cultural perspective*. Cambridge Cambridgeshire ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Aryeetey, E., J.R.A., Ayee, K.A., Ninsin, and D., Tsikata. (2007). *The politics of land tenure reform in Ghana: From the Crown Lands Bills to the Land Administration Project*: Institute of Statistical, Social & Economic Research, University of Ghana.
- Asuming-Brempong, S., & Osei-Asare, Y. B. (2007). *Has Imported Rice Crowded-Out Domestic Rice Production in Ghana? What Has Been The Role Of Policy*. Paper presented at the AAE Conference Proceedings. Accra. Ghana.
- Bartelson, J. (2000). Three concepts of globalization. *International Sociology*, 15(2), 180-196.
- Bernard, H. R. (2011). *Research methods in anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*: Rowman Altamira.
- Berry, S. (2009). Building for the future? Investment, land reform and the contingencies of ownership in contemporary Ghana. *World Development*, 37(8), 1370-1378.
- Bertelsen, B. E. (2014). Effervescence and Ephemerality: Popular Urban Uprisings in Mozambique. *Ethnos*, 1-28.
- Biederlack, L., & Rivers, J. (2009). *Comprehensive Food Security & Vulnerability Analysis (CFSVA): Ghana*: United Nations World Food Programme.
- Biederlack, L., & Rivers, J. (2013). *Comprehensive Food Security & Vulnerability Analysis (CFSVA): Ghana*: United Nations World Food Programme.
- Biersack, A. (2006a). Red river, green War: the politics of place along the Porgera River. *Reimagining political ecology*, 233-280.
- Biersack, A. (2006b). Reimagining political ecology: culture/power/history/nature. *Reimagining political ecology*, 3-40.
- Bishwajit, G., Sarker, S., Kpoghomou, M.-A., Gao, H., Jun, L., Yin, D., & Ghosh, S. (2013). Self-sufficiency in rice and food security: a South Asian perspective. *Agriculture & Food Security*, 2(1), 1.

- Blaikie, P. (1985). *The political economy of soil erosion in developing countries*: Longman.
- Blaikie, P., & Brookfield, H. (1987). Defining and debating the problem. *Land degradation and society/Piers Blaikie and Harold Brookfield with contributions by Bryant Allen...[et al.]*.
- Boamah, F. (2015). *Biofuels and land politics: Connecting the disconnects in the debate about livelihood impacts of jatropha biofuel land deals in Ghana*: The University of Bergen.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Vol. 16): Cambridge university press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction : a social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2005). Taste of Luxury, Taste of Necessity. *The taste culture reader: experiencing food and drink, 1*, 72-78.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1999). On the cunning of imperialist reason. *Theory, Culture & Society, 16*(1), 41-58.
- Bräutigam, D. A., & Knack, S. (2004). Foreign Aid, Institutions, and Governance in Sub-Saharan Africa*. *Economic development and cultural change, 52*(2), 255-285.
- Broch-Due, V. (1995). Poverty paradoxes: the economy of engendered needs. *Occassion Paper series, 1*-24.
- Broch-Due, V., & Schroeder, R. A. (2000). *Producing nature and poverty in Africa*. Uppsala: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet.
- Brown, A. (2011). *Understanding food: Principles and preparation* (4th ed ed.): Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (pp. 56-311): Cambridge University Press.
- Bryant, R. L. (1998). Power, knowledge and political ecology in the third world: a review. *Progress in physical geography, 22*(1), 79-94.
- Bryant, R. L., & Bailey, S. (1997). Third world political ecology Routledge. *New York*.
- Caldeira, T. (1988). The Art of Being Indirect: Talking about Politics in Brazil. *Cultural Anthropology, 3*(4), 444-454.
- Caldeira, T., & Holston, J. (2015). Participatory urban planning in Brazil. *Urban Studies, 52*(11), 2001-2017.
- Carney, J. (2002). *Black rice: the African origins of rice cultivation in the Americas*: Harvard University Press.
- Comaroff, L., & Comaroff, J. (1987). The madman and the migrant: Work and labor in the historical consciousness of a South African people. *American ethnologist, 14*(2), 191-209.
- Cooper, F. (2001). What is the concept of globalization good for? An African historian's perspective. *African affairs, 100*(399), 189-213.
- Counihan, C. M. (1992). Food rules in the United States: Individualism, control, and hierarchy. *Anthropological Quarterly, 55*-66.
- Curran, S. R. (2006). Research Ethics are Essential. *A Handbook for Social Science Field Research: Essays and Bibliographic Sources on Research Design and Methods. USA: Sage Publications, Inc.*
- Davidson, A. S. (2013). Phenomenological approaches in psychology and health sciences. *Qualitative research in psychology, 10*(3), 318-339.
- Diao, X. (2010). Economic Importance of Agriculture for Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction: Findings from a Case Study of Ghana. *O ECD, 1*-79.
- Douglas, M. (1972). Deciphering a meal. *Daedalus, 61*-81.
- Dzudzor, M. (2015). Analysis of rice production and opportunities in Ghana. Masters in Agricultural Food and Environmental Policy Analysis (AFEPA). *Clinical Diabetes and Endocrinology, 1*-24.
- Escobar, A. (1995). The Problematisation of Poverty: The Tale of Three Worlds and Development in Encountering Development (pp. 21-54): Princeton University Press.
- FAO. (2012). *Analysis of incentives and disincentives for maize in Ghana; Monitoring African Food and Agricultural Policies*.
- FAO. (2013). *Agribusiness public-private partnerships – A country report of Ghana*.

- Country case studies – Africa.* : FAO, Roma (Italia).
- FAO. (2015). *The state of agricultural commodity market in depth. Food self sufficiency and international trade; a false dichotomy?* <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5222e.pdf>.
- Ferguson, M. (1992). The mythology about globalization. *European journal of Communication*, 7(1), 69-93.
- Flikke, R. (2014). *On the Fractured, Fragmented and Disrupted Landscapes of Conservation*. Paper presented at the Forum for Development Studies.
- Franco, J., Twomey, H., Ju, K. K., Vervest, P., & Kramer, T. (2015). The Meaning of Land in Myanmar A Primer. *Published by the Transnational Institute*, 1-10.
- Frank, A. G. (1969). Capitalism and underdevelopment in Latin America; historical studies of Chile and Brazil-Rev.
- Gallagher, C. (1986). The body versus the social body in the works of Thomas Malthus and Henry Mayhew. *Representations*(14), 83-106.
- Gallagher, C., & Greenblatt, S. (2000). The potato in the materialist imagination. *Practicing New Historicism*, 114, 110-135.
- Gardner. (2013). *Self-Sufficiency Doesn't Guarantee Food Security*. <http://briangardner.blogactiv.eu/2013/09/24/self-sufficiency-doesn%E2%80%99t-guarantee-food-security/>.
- Geertz, C. (1973). Thick Description; Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture. *The interpretation of cultures*, 3-30.
- GhanaNews. (2008). Crime and Punishment. <http://www.ghanaweb.com/GhanaHomePage/NewsArchive/Court-to-deal-harshly-with-communal-labour-defaulters-146962>.
- Gibbs, G. R. (2007). Thematic coding and categorizing. *Analyzing qualitative data*. London: Sage, 38-56.
- GNRDS-MoFA. (2009). Ghana National Rice Development Strategy”, Accra, Ghana: http://www.jica.go.jp/english/our_work/thematic_issues/agricultural/pdf/ghana_en.pdf.
- Goulet, D. (1997). Development ethics: a new discipline. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 24(11), 1160-1171.
- Green, M. (2003). Globalizing Development in Tanzania Policy Franchising through Participatory Project Management. *Critique of anthropology*, 23(2), 123-143.
- GSS. (2010). Population and Housing Census. http://www.statsghana.gov.gh/docfiles/population_by_region_district_locality_of_residence_age_groups_and_sex_2010.pdf. 1-2.
- Gupta, A., & Ferguson, J. (1997). Discipline and practice:“The field” as site, method, and location in anthropology. *Anthropological locations: Boundaries and grounds of a field science*, 100, 1-47.
- Hall, C. (1993). *White visions, black lives: the free villages of Jamaica*. Paper presented at the History Workshop.
- Hall, R. (2011). Policy Brief No. 41. Land grabbing in Africa and the new politics of food. 1-8.
- Harrell, S. (2006). Essentials for Ethnography. *A Handbook for Social Science Field Research: Essays & Bibliographic Sources on Research Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc., 163.
- Harris, M. (1987). Foodways: historical overview and theoretical prolegomenon. *Food and evolution: Toward a theory of human food habits*, 57-90.
- Hauck-Lawson, A. (2004). Introduction to special issue on the food voice. Food, Culture, and Society. *Food, Culture & Society*, 7(1), 24-25.
- Holt-Jensen, A. (2009). *Segregation versus Social Mix*. Pp. 157-165.
- Husserl, E. (1982). General introduction to a pure phenomenology.

- IMF. (2008). Poverty and Social Impact Analysis of Economic Policies. Retrieved July 8, 2008, from; http://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/facts/sia.htm#P17_1096. *International Journal of Health Services*, 39(4), 771-781.
- IMF, W. B. (2001). Fighting poverty and strengthening growth in low-income countries. Joint memorandum of the president of the World Bank and the managing director of the International Monetary Fund.
- Jackson, J. L. (2004). An ethnographic filmflam: Giving gifts, doing research, and videotaping the native subject/object. *American Anthropologist*, 106(1), 32-42.
- Jayathilaka, A. (2015). Development Ethics and Political Ecology. *Development*, 3(1), 1-60.
- Kasanga, R. K., & Kotey, N. A. (2001). Land management in Ghana: Building on tradition and modernity (pp. 1-33): International Institute for Environment and Development London.
- Katz, M. B. (1990). *The undeserving poor: From the war on poverty to the war on welfare*: Pantheon Books.
- Kittler; Sucher; & Nelms. (2012). Food and culture (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. *Journal of International Business and Cultural Studies*, 8(1).
- Knudsen, S. (2009). *Fishers and scientists in modern Turkey: the management of natural resources, knowledge and identity on the eastern Black Sea coast* (Vol. 8): Berghahn Books.
- Korsmeyer, C. (2002). Delightful, delicious, disgusting. *The Journal of aesthetics and art criticism*, 60(3), 217-225.
- Kurz, W. S. (1985). Luke 22: 14-38 and Greco-Roman and biblical farewell addresses. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 104(2), 251-268.
- Kwasi, B. R. (2015). Long run and short run causality of rice consumption by urbanization and income growth in Ghana. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 5(2), 173-189.
- Larson, N., & Story, M. (2009). A review of environmental influences on food choices. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 38(1), 56-73.
- Leach, M., Mearns, R., & Scoones, I. (1999). Environmental entitlements: dynamics and institutions in community-based natural resource management. *World Development*, 27(2), 225-247.
- LeCompte, M. D. (2010). *Designing and conducting ethnographic Research an introduction* (0759118698). Retrieved from
- Leslie, H., & Storey, D. (2003). Practical issues. *Development Fieldwork: A Practical Guide*, Sage Publications: London, 77-95.
- Lester, S. (1999). An introduction to phenomenological research.
- Leturque, H., & Wiggins, S. (2011). Ghana's sustained agricultural growth: Putting underused resources to work. *Report, London: Overseas Development Institute*.
- Martell, L. (2010). *The sociology of globalization*: Polity.
- Matthew. (2014). Trends in EY agricultural Self-Sufficiency. <http://capreform.eu/trends-in-agricultural-self-sufficiency/>.
- Mauss, M. (1967). *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*: Norton.
- Mauss, M. (2002). *The Gift: the Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- MCC. (2014). *Millennium Challenge Corporations, Investment Opportunities in Ghana*. Ghana Programme. United States of America.
- MFEP, G. (2011). Private participation in infrastructure and services for better public services delivery. National policy on public private partnerships. *Ministry of Finana and Economic Planning*(1), 1-20.
- Moe, Y. (2007). Economic Growth Environmental Conservation and the Asia-Pacific Region. *Agents of Change, Asian Development Bank Publication, Manila*, 1-9.

- Morris, M. L., Binswanger-Mikhize, H. P., & Byerlee, D. (2009). *Awakening Africa's sleeping giant: prospects for commercial agriculture in the Guinea Savannah Zone and beyond*: World Bank Publications.
- Mwalimu, C. (2009). *Seeking viable grassroots representation mechanisms in African constitutions: integration of indigenous and modern systems of government in sub-Saharan Africa*: Peter Lang.
- Mwesigire, B. b. (2014). Land Grabbing Africa, the new colonialism. <http://thisisafrica.me/land-grabbing-africa-new-colonialism/>. 1.
- Mzamu, J. J. (2012). The ways of Maize: Food, Poverty, Policy and the Politics of Meaning among the Chewa of Malawi. i-28.
- Narayan-Parker, D., & Patel, R. (2000). *Voices of the poor: can anyone hear us?* (Vol. 1): World Bank Publications.
- Narh, P., Lambini, C. K., Sabbi, M., Pham, V. D., & Nguyen, T. T. (2016). Land Sector Reforms in Ghana, Kenya and Vietnam: A Comparative Analysis of Their Effectiveness. *Land*, 5(2), 15.
- NDPC. (2013). The implementation of the Ghana shared growth and development agenda (GSGDA), 2010–2013. *2013 annual progress report. Accra, Ghana: NDPC*, 48-98.
- NDPC. (2014). Medium-term national development policy framework: Ghana shared growth and development agenda (GSGDA) II, 2014-2017. 1.
- NSEHS. (2010). Housing stock report 2008. Community and local government, 2010. Department for Communities and Local Government. Website: www.communities.gov.uk. *Department for Communities and Local Government*, 5-7.
- Nukunya, G. K. (2003). *Tradition and change in Ghana: An introduction to sociology*: Ghana Universities Press.
- Nyanteng, V. K. (1998). Rice in West Africa: consumption imports and production with projections to the year 2000. Monrovia, WARDA. WARDA.
- O'Connor, A. (2001). Giving Birth to a " Culture of Poverty": Poverty Knowledge in Postwar Behavioral Science, Culture, and Ideology. Poverty Knowledge: Social Science. *Social Policy, and the Poor in Twentieth-Century US History*. Princeton and Oxford, Princeton University Press.
- Oberdabernig, D. A. (2010). *The effects of structural adjustment programs on poverty and income distribution*. Paper presented at the The Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies, Seminar in International Economics, March.
- Oberdabernig, D. A. (2013). Revisiting the effects of IMF programs on poverty and inequality. *World Development*, 46, 113-142.
- Ojha, G. P., & Morin, S. R. (2001). *Partnership in agricultural extension: Lessons from Chitwan (Nepal)*: Overseas development institute (ODI). Agricultural research & extension network (AgREN).
- Oteng, J. (1997). Rice production and development in Ghana. *International Rice Commission Newsletter (FAO)*, 38-42.
- Owusu, G. (2005). The role of district capitals in regional development: Linking small towns, rural–urban linkages and decentralisation in Ghana. *International Development Planning Review*, 27(1), 59-89.
- Park, A. F. (2006). Using survey data in social science research in developing countries. *A handbook for social science field research: Essays & bibliographic sources on research design and methods*.
- Polanyi, K. (1944). *The great transformation: The political and economic origins of our time*: Beacon Press.
- Polanyi, K. (1957a). The economy as instituted process. *Trade and market in the early empires*, 243, 20-86.
- Posey, D. A. (1985). Indigenous management of tropical forest ecosystems: the case of the Kayapo Indians of the Brazilian Amazon. *Agroforestry Systems*, 3(2), 139-158.
- Price, R. M. (1975). *Society and bureaucracy in contemporary Ghana*: Univ of California Press.
- Ragasa, C., Chapoto, A., & Kolavalli, S. (2014). *Maize productivity in Ghana* (Vol. 5): Intl Food Policy Res Inst.

- Rahnema, M. (1991). *Global poverty: A pauperizing myth*: Intercultural Institute of Montreal.
- Riddell, P. (2009). Impact Investing in Commercial African Agriculture. *GIIN Terragua Group*, 1-20.
- Robbins, P. (2004). *Political Ecology*. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford
- Rozin, P. (2005). The meaning of food in our lives: a cross-cultural perspective on eating and well-being. *Journal of nutrition education and behavior*, 37, S107-S112.
- Sahlins, M. (1972). 1972 Stone Age Economics. Tavistock, London.
- Sawyer, S. (2003). *Subterranean techniques: corporate environmentalism, oil operations, and social injustice in the Ecuadorian rain forest*.
- Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*: Yale University Press.
- Sharma, R., Morrison, J., Larios, F., Otero, M., Pica Ciamarra, U., Otte, J., . . . Ward, W. (2011). *Articulating and mainstreaming agricultural trade policy and support measures*: FAO, Roma (Italia).
- Soubbotina, T. P. (2004). *Beyond economic growth: An introduction to sustainable development*: World Bank Publications.
- Spieth, J. (2011). *Ewe-Stämme*: African Books Collective.
- Strickrodt, S. (2015). *Afro-European Trade in the Atlantic World: The Western Slave Coast, C. 1550-C. 1885*: Boydell & Brewer Ltd.
- Thorne, S. (1997). 'The Conversion of Englishmen and the Conversion of the World Inseparable': Missionary Imperialism and the Language of Class in Early Industrial Britain. *Tensions of Empire: colonial cultures in a bourgeois world*, 238-263.
- Tylor, E. B. (1974). *Primitive culture: researches into the development of mythology, philosophy, religion, art, and custom*. New York: Gordon Press. ISBN 978-0-87968-091-6. *Gordon Press*, 1.
- Wallerstein, I. (1974). The modern world-system 1: Capitalist agriculture and the origins of the European world-system in the sixteenth century. *New York: Academic*.
- Warr. (2011). *Indonesia: why food self-sufficiency is different from food security*. *East Asia Forum Economics, Politics and Public Policy in East Asia and the Pacific* <http://www.eastasiaforum.org>
- Watts, M. (2006). *Essentials for Research Design. A Handbook for Social Science Field Research: Essays & Bibliographic Sources on Research Design and Methods: Essays & Bibliographic Sources on Research Design and Methods*, 175.
- Wills, W., Backett-Milburn, K., Roberts, M. L., & Lawton, J. (2011). The framing of social class distinctions through family food and eating practices. *The Sociological Review*, 59(4), 725-740.
- Yaro, J. A. (2012a). RE-INVENTING TRADITIONAL LAND TENURE IN THE ERA OF LAND COMMODITIZATION: SOME CONSEQUENCES IN PERIURBAN NORTHERN GHANA. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 94(4), 351-368.
- Yaro, J. A. (2012b). RE-Inventing traditional land tenure in the era of land commoditization: some consequences in periurban Northern Ghana. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 94(4), 351-368.
- Ystanes, M. (2011). *Precarious Trust: Problems of Managing Self and Sociality in Guatemala*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Bergen.
- Ystanes, M. (2014). *Saving Guatemala's 'Mayan Forest': The Environmental Crisis and Contested Development*. Pp.121-141.
- Zagema, B. (2011). Land and Power: The growing scandal surrounding the new wave of investments in land. *Oxfam Policy and Practice: Agriculture, Food and Land*, 11(6), 114-164.