

Land Reform For Sustainable Development And Poverty Reduction In Nigeria

¹Chikaire, J., ²Orusha, J.O, ²Nwoye, E.O., and ²Onogu B.

¹Department of Agricultural Extension, School of Agriculture and Agricultural Technology,
Federal University of Technology Owerri.

²Department of Agricultural Science, Alvan Ikoku Federal College of Education Owerri
Email: bankausta@yahoo.com

Abstract: Land is an asset of enormous importance for billions of rural dweller in the developing world. The nature of property rights and their degree of security vary greatly, depending on competition for land, the degree of market penetration and the broader institutional and political context. Access to it and the ability to exchange it with others and use it effectively are of great importance for poverty reduction, economic growth, and private sector investment as well as for empowering the poor and ensuring good governance. This is where redistributive land reform programmes come in which aim to change the distribution of land within the society, reducing land concentration and promoting more equitable access to and efficient use of land. This paper surveys land reform strategies and the benefits that follows it. Land reform can reduce rural poverty not only by channeling a larger slice of the agricultural income pie to low-income households, but also by increasing the size of the pie by raising land productivity. The Land Use Act of 1978 has created two major classes of individuals- powerful landowners who hold large tracks of land acquired using state apparatus and the near landless who are the real farmers. The Land Use Act has widened the gap between the rich and poor when it comes to access to productive resources –land more especially. It is a threat to poverty reduction as it is now and needs a reform, to reflect the wishes and aspirations of Nigerians. With a supportive policy environment, land reform also can foster a transition to sustainable agriculture, due to the environmental comparative advantages of small farms who adopt better land management practices to keep the land fertile all the time.

[Chikaire, J., Orusha, J.O, Nwoye, E.O., and Onogu B. Land Reform For Sustainable Development And Poverty Reduction In Nigeria. World Rural Observations 2011;3(3):114-121]; ISSN: 1944-6543 (Print); ISSN: 1944-6551 (Online). <http://www.sciencepub.net/rural>.

Keywords: Land Reform, poverty, sustainability, environment, Agriculture

1. Introduction

The Rio Earth Summit in 1992 proclaimed sustainable development to be the most important policy of the 21st century. Since then governments around the world have endorsed ‘sustainability’ as a key principle which encompasses the integrity of biological systems, economic viability and social equity (Basiago 1995). The latter, however, is often ignored. Problems of poverty and inequality are particular stark in rural areas. Sustainable rural development must focus on reducing inequality in the ownership and effective control of both productive assets and the benefit streams derived from them. This will require a range of complementary measures, central to which should be a radical land reform aimed at both redistributing productive agricultural land and securing rights to land and other resources.

In Nigeria poverty and inequalities are concentrated in rural areas, despite some improvements in the provision of infrastructure and services. Over 70% of the country’s poorest people reside in rural areas, and over 70% of all rural people are poor (May & Roberts 2000; IFAD, 2006). Particularly vulnerable to poverty are households

headed by women, the elderly and people affected by HIV/Aids. A closer look at rural poverty reveals:

- A high degree of dependence on non-rural income, including pensions and migrant wage remittance.
- High population densities, extreme land shortages and a large proportion of households without livestock.
- Weak or absent support systems for agriculture and other-land based livelihoods, together with limited access to input and output markets. Among the consequences of this are under-cultivation and lack of interest in farming amongst the young.
- Food insecurity at household level, resulting in widespread under-nutrition.
- Rising levels of unemployment in the formal sector and continuing insecurity and low levels of income in the informal sector. Migration to urban areas does not provide an escape from rural poverty.
- Contrary to received opinion, movement between rural and urban areas is not all one-way: many unemployed workers are

returning to rural areas looking for new livelihood opportunities.

- Although poverty is widespread, the rural population is socially differentiated and pockets of (relative) wealth and privilege exist. Surprisingly, given the highly adverse conditions, land-based livelihoods remain significant for many poor rural households, and for some that are relatively wealthy.

In agriculture, land is the single most important asset. With access to arable land, rural people at a minimum can feed themselves and their families. Yet ironically, world hunger is concentrated in the country side. The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO 2004) reports that land-poor and landless households in rural areas account for 80 percent of the people who are chronically hungry in the world today. Land reform - here defined as the reallocation of rights to establish a more equitable distribution of farmland - can be a powerful strategy for promoting both economic development and environmental quality. Across the globe, small-scale farmers consistently tend to grow more output per acre than large farms. At the same time, when small family farmers hold secure land rights, they tend to be better environmental stewards, protecting and enhancing soil fertility, water quality, and biodiversity. For both reasons, democratizing access to land can be the cornerstone for sustainable rural development (Boyles *et al.*, 2005).

Equitable and secure access to land and land use is fundamental for the approximately 2.5 billion rural people in developing countries who depend on agriculture, forests, and forest products for their livelihoods. Land provides a source of income, livelihood, food security, cultural identity, and shelter. It is a basic asset for the economic empowerment of poor people and a safety net in times of hardship. It defines power relations between and among individuals and social groups and thus has enormous political implications. It is a critical factor in the formation of individual and collective identity and in the organization of social, cultural and religious life. Sustainable management and conservation of land resources and agricultural biodiversity, along with secure rights to land and greater equity in land access, are central for poverty reduction, and of great relevance to the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), notably MDG1 on the eradicating poverty and hunger (UNESCO, 2008).

Population growth, urbanization, and the weakening of customary land tenure institutions and systems are increasingly threatening poor people's access to land and tenure security, leading to escalating conflicts within and between countries.

Local and national dynamics shaping the access of poor people to land are linked to broader processes and global factors. Trade regimes, global consumer- and corporate- driven food systems, increasing demand for bio-fuels, and crises such as climate change are creating greater competition for land and subsequently greater pressure on land use and on tenure systems.

These trends are occurring in the context of a degraded and dwindling natural resource base, which climate change is projected to exacerbate further. Land degradation and desertification affect over two million people. It is estimated that 5 - 7 million hectares of land are lost each year due to advanced (degradation or other environmental damage, such as salinization). During the last fifty years, one-fourth of the world's top soil, one-fifth of the agricultural land, and one-third of its forests have been degraded or lost. This has contributed to the loss of biodiversity and the weakening of ecosystems that are the foundation of agriculture and food production. As a result of global warming, the world's agricultural gross domestic product is estimated to decrease 16 percent by 2020, with output falling by 20 percent in developing countries and by 6 percent in industrialized nations (Cline, 2007).

These trends and challenges point to unprecedented changes in the rural spaces. These changes, unless managed carefully, further threaten the sustainable livelihoods and food security of poor rural people. Rural poor populations, who are among those that will be most affected by these trends, have limited capacity to cope with their effects. Their ability to mobilize and manage assets -- in this case, land -- is fundamental to their resilience in the face of these challenges. Thus there is a growing urgency to understand and address the threats posed by changes in land use and to reinforce the capacity of individuals and communities to withstand or recover from negative effects and to exploit the opportunities that may be available to them. From the above, this paper argues that sustainable development and poverty reduction in Nigeria can be achieved with radical land reform that will favour the landless and empower individuals who are eager to farm.

2 Nigeria's Land Tenure System: An Appraisal

Land tenure arrangement embodies those legal and contractual or customary arrangements whereby people (in farming) gain access to productive opportunities on the land. It constitutes the rules and procedures governing the rights, duties and liberties of individuals and groups in the use and control over the basic resources of land and water (Dormer, .1972). Thus, land tenure system defines

the relationship among men in the use and control of land resources.

The basic concept of ownership is that of tenure. This means the right or capacity to have and to hold land for certain uses. The word "tenure" means the holding of property, especially real estate, or by reference to a superior. Inherent in the word 'held' is the ideal of exclusion, that is, to set aside and keep as one's own by shifting out and excluding others. Another indispensable dimension of tenure is the period of time for which the property is held (Harris, 1953). Land ownership (tenure) is a bundle of rights held jointly by individuals, groups, corporate bodies and the state. The land ownership systems in Nigeria, constitute the basis of property rights in land resources. The traditional land tenure system in Nigeria was pre-state, based upon local sovereignty in land matters. The land tenure system in Nigeria is not uniform due to local variation in land matters. There are, however, some identifiable common factors which facilitate analysis. In the early stages of the native system, upon the acquisition of lands; by conquest or settlement by members of a given community, the land so acquired or settled upon would be apportioned among those worthy of them in the order of merit (Hayford, 1971). Alternatively, the original immigrants acquired the land by squatting on it.

The commonest type of land ownership system is corporate (group ownership) and this accounts for about 80 percent of the land, while family and individual ownerships account for the remaining 20 percent. The relationship between the individual and the group in the corporate land ownership system is rather complex but distinct. Individual right of ownership is derived from the group to which one is born or adopted. The group manages the family land and allocates this to members according to needs. The individual does not possess absolute title to the land, but has right to use it - usufructuary rights. The individual use rights are established by initial clearance and use of land (Fabiya *et al.*, 1981; Fabiya, 1990).

The rights of the individual to use the land are protected as long as he continues to make a beneficial use of the land. Furthermore his rights to use the land evidently extends to, and is transferred temporarily to, the pledgees, should he pledge the land to another person as security for debt. Individual use rights are transferable along family lines becoming a family property to be shared out among the heirs according to the rules of inheritance adopted when the initial user dies. This right to use the land remains with the initial user of the land and his heirs who also become part owners until the land is abandoned. When the land is abandoned, the residual

interest of the community in the land is re-asserted and reverts to the community to be held until it is required by another member of the group, or it may be allocated to any stranger who requests for it. The holder of usufructuary rights lacks the capacity to alienate the land due to the allowable field of discretionary action implicit in the terms of the grant. Also, non-economic factors, like the pride of family, social interest, political ideology and social and political status may define who gets what interest in land and how much interest. These factors also institutionalize channels through which interests in land can be acquired and disposed (Uchendu, 1970).

Tenant farmers had no security of expectations, while large scale farmers found difficulties in acquiring sufficient amount of contiguous tracts of land for agricultural purposes either by lease or purchase. The above stated land tenure system has given rise to a number of problems - duplicity of ownership with the consequent excessive transactions costs, fragmentation of land into uneconomic sized tracts and inalienability of land which makes land part of the physical capital but not a part of the financial capital. However, Johnson (1972) argues that restriction on sale of land have the effects of raising the cost of transferring land to certain uses and users. This reduces the size of land market and limits the way of capturing wealth inland.

The need to ensure equitable access to productive opportunities on the land and the security of such access once gained, makes land reform measures mandatory. To exacerbate the situation, wide-scale speculative purchases of large tracts of (communal) land, in the absence of land taxes has reached a crescendo. Most of the purchases are done by wealthy non-farmers who hold the land idle, waiting to capitalize on an appropriate market situation, while food production is on the decline (Fabiya, 1974). Many government development projects have been stifled by a prohibitive amount of, compensation demanded by speculative purchasers who had previous knowledge of government intentions (Famoriyo *et al.*, 1977). In other instances, disputed claims and counter claims over ownership of the proposed site and the attendant law suit coupled with court injunctions which often prevent the development of land subject to litigation make such land unavailable.

3. Land Reform

Land reform is concerned with the interrelated aspect of productivity and equity of land use. It is a means of bringing about structural change in the agricultural sector, thereby altering the size distribution of holdings or distribution of income.

- (i) Land reform can take one of the following forms (World Bank, 1975),
- (ii) Redistribution of public or private land in order to change the patterns of land distribution and size of holdings;
- (iii) Consolidating of individual holdings, thereby reorganizing the physical patterns of control;
- (iv) Changes in land-ownership and tenurial rights with or without physical redistribution of land; and
- (v) Changes in conditions of tenure without changing ownership or redistributing land.

4. Land Reform and Poverty Reduction

Rural development programmes focused on improving the productivity of agriculture and natural resources use in the communal areas of Nigeria will not reduce poverty on their own. Overcrowding and high population-to-resource ratios remain major constraints, and increased access to land and other natural resources by the rural poor through redistribution is clearly needed. This does not have to result in 'poverty traps', as skeptics assert, but has the potential to contribute to significant economic development and poverty reduction.

Lack of clarity in respect of tenure rights to land and natural resources is also a major obstacle to development. It contributes to inappropriate land use and management practices, and to ineffective rural governance. Lack of legal security can constrain new forms of enterprise, such as eco-tourism or community forestry, which often involve partnership with outsiders (Adams *et al.* 2000).

Although necessary, land reform will only be effective if embedded within a broader programme to restructure the agrarian economy. Amongst other things, this must ensure access to inputs, equipment, draught power, and marketing outlets. Infrastructure for transport and communications, and support services such as extension, training and marketing advice, are also essential. These are largely absent in the communal areas at present, and are inadequately provided for in most land reform projects. Government should play a central role in planning and implementing such programmes, but must work closely with other agencies such as NGOs and the private sector, and in partnership with communities and enterprising individuals.

Even these complementary measures will not lead to significant reductions in rural poverty without a redistribution of political and economic power in favour of the poor. International experience shows that elites tend to capture the benefits of land reform unless there are decisive shifts in power relations. This means that the rural poor, together

with their allies in the labour movement and progressive political formations, will have to confront the power of communal area elites, including traditional leaders, and organize to renegotiate the terms and conditions of employment of both permanent and seasonal labour in the commercial agricultural sector. They must address the concentration of economic power in the hands of big business within agro-food commodity chains. It is clear that agrarian restructuring will only be realized through struggle. Thus a further necessary condition of sustainable rural development is political mobilization by emerging social movements in the countryside. These should be supported by NGOs, churches and others in civil society, and linked to urban movements organizing around issues such as forced evictions and electricity cut-offs.

By expanding the land rights of the poor, land reform adds to their wealth and thereby reduces asset poverty. This, in turn, helps to reduce income poverty in two ways: first, by increasing the poor's share in the agricultural income pie; and second, by increasing the total size of the pie.

The first effect is straightforward. Assets are stocks of wealth, and these generate flows of income. By redirecting an important flow- the returns to land - into the hands of the poor, progressive land redistribution augments their incomes. At the same time, assets enhance a person's social status and political power. Land reform reduces these 'non-economic' dimensions of poverty, too (Boyce *et al.*, 2005).

The second effect is more complicated, and less certain. In the short run, land reforms can have 'transaction costs' that reduce agricultural output, particularly if accompanied by political instability that disrupts input supplies or access to markets. Moreover, it may take some time for the beneficiaries to learn how best to manage their new assets. But in the long run, land reforms can increase the size of the agricultural income pie by promoting more labor-intensive farming. In other words, land reform can be a 'win-win' strategy that improves both equity and efficiency.

Farm size and land productivity

Evidence from around the world demonstrates that small, owner-operated farms typically produce more output per acre than large farms cultivated by means of wage labor or tenants. A recent report on the relationship between farm size and total output in fifteen countries in the global South found that in all cases relatively smaller farms were more productive per unit area, by a factor of two to ten times (Rosset 1999).

This higher output per acre takes four forms:

- Higher cultivation intensity: In any given year, small farms tend to cultivate a bigger percentage of their land than do large farms. In Latin America, in particular, large farms often leave a substantial proportion of their lands uncultivated a fact that helps to open the legal space for the MST's land occupations in Brazil (landless Workers Movement).
- Higher cropping intensity: Likewise, small farms tend to have a higher cropping intensity; that is, they grow more crops per year on a given piece of land. In Bangladesh, for example, 79% of farms of half an acre or less grow two or three crops per year, while only 41% of farms larger than 25 acres do so.
- Higher-value crop mix: Small farms also tend to grow crops that are higher-value and more labor-intensive than those grown on large farms. The cultivation of vegetables, for example, usually requires much more labor per acre than the cultivation of grains; at the same time, vegetable cultivation yields much greater value per acre.
- Higher yields per acre: Finally, small farms often get higher yields per acre for any given crop, simply by virtue of putting more time and care into their farming. While it is not negligible, this differential generally is less important to overall land productivity differences than the other three.

These four effects combine to create a significant advantage, even when the political environment favors larger farmers in multiple ways. In Brazil, for example, family farms account for 40% of total national value of production, while occupying just 30% of agricultural land area. They generate 77% of Brazil's agricultural employment, while receiving only 25% of farm credit (Pengue, 2005).

These land productivity differences can be traced above all to differences in the use of labor. As a rule, small farmers get more output by applying more labor per acre. Labor productivity -output per unit labor - is often lower on small farms. But in settings where land is scarce and labor relatively abundant, land productivity is the more relevant indicator of overall efficiency.

Rural poverty is strongly associated with poor access to land, either in the form of landlessness or because of insecure and contested land rights. Economic analysis has long recognized the importance of secure property rights for growth, and therefore for the poverty reduction which growth can bring. Increased land access for the poor can also bring direct benefits of poverty alleviation, not least by contributing directly to increased household food

security. In countries where agriculture is a main economic activity, access to land is a fundamental means whereby the poor can ensure household food supplies and generate income. This applies both to societies in which subsistence agriculture is prevalent, where access to land is the *sine qua non* of household food security; and to societies where agriculture is more market-oriented, in which family farming provides a principal source of employment generating the income with which to buy food. Even where agriculture and land are becoming less important with the growth of alternative sources of income, secure land rights provide a valuable source of income for investment, retirement or security in case of unemployment (Cotula *et al.*, 2006).

Secure rights to land are also a basis for shelter, for access to services and for civic and political participation. They are also a source of financial security, as collateral to raise credit or as a transferable asset that can be sold, rented out, mortgaged, loaned or bequeathed. Moreover, secure access to land creates incentives for the user to invest labour and other resources in it, so as to maintain or enhance its value and sustain its productivity, and to access social and economic development opportunities.

In addition, research has documented a positive relationship between equitably distributed land and economic growth (Deininger & Squire 1998). While history provides of countries that have developed with very unequal and distributions research shows that, over the period 1960-2000, countries with a more distribution of land tended to be characterized by higher levels of economic growth (Deininger 2003). More egalitarian land distributions are also associated with greater social peace and cohesion. Where land rights are highly concentrated, may spawn a sense of in justice, entailing risks of land occupations and even violent clashes over land. The experience of several East Asian countries (South Korea, Taiwan) shows how a reform resulting in more equitable land distribution is fundamental in creating the basis for sustained economic development.

The relationship between access to land and poverty reduction cannot be seen in from broader agricultural and economic policy. Equally, these issues are intimately connected with rural development policies and environmental outcomes. The distribution of land rights and opportunities for access to land will have implications for distribution of wealth, rates of economic growth and the incidence of poverty, and the shape and direction of agricultural development will affect the incomes and returns from different types of farming activity, the value of land and demands for access to land

resources (Cotula *et al.* 2004), The incentives and tenure structures that largely determine how land is used will profoundly affect environmental impacts and sustainability.

Discussion on access to land is placed in the context of the debate on agricultural modernization that is taking place in many parts of the world. Broadly speaking, two models of agricultural development are competing in the market for ideas. On the one hand, a commonly held view calls for the promotion of agribusiness as a way to attract private capital and increase agricultural productivity. On the other, family farming remains the backbone of rural livelihoods in many parts of the developing world, and has been shown to be dynamic, responsive to change, and an important source of investment in agriculture, such as West Africa (Toulmin & Guèye 2003).

Concerns are often expressed in relation to the ecological sustainability of small-scale agriculture and natural resource harvesting in communal areas. Although these dangers are often exaggerated as in the case of 'overgrazing' of rangelands – under current socio-economic conditions, some land-based livelihood activities are indeed unsustainable. One example is current rates of harvesting of medicinal plants, in response to an expanding market, growing commercialization, and the desperation of the rural poor in need of cash for survival. Suitable technologies and practices should be researched and promoted to ensure that land and resource use is indeed sustainable.

When people's land and resource rights are secure, and their incomes are beyond the bare minimum, they are much more likely to invest effort and resources in conservation and land use practices which 'meet the needs of the present, without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Conversely, when people are uncertain about their long-term rights to land or resources, their immediate needs take precedence, and severe resource degradation can occur.

To reduce poverty and achieve sustainable development, Nigeria needs to explore and promote smaller-scale, more economically competitive farming technologies that operate within the limits of the mostly fragile environment. There will be no point in achieving better rural land rights and access if farming ceases to be a viable livelihood. But so far, nobody seems to have effective answers about how to get agriculture working again. It needs to be internationally competitive. Locally, it needs to be socially, economically, technically and economically efficient, providing quality livelihoods to much larger numbers of people.

5. Land Reform and the Environment

Land reform also has a critical contribution to make to the other core component of sustainable development: caring for the environment.

Sustainable development requires maintaining or enhancing the health of ecosystems. People must be committed to the governance of resource use and conservation within a framework of efficiency, equity and social justice. They must be motivated to conserve natural resources as they use them, or to have this attitude even if they do not use such resources. If people consider their rights to natural resources to be insecure, or if they perceive themselves to be unfairly excluded from some of the nation's natural heritage, they are less likely to use natural resources sustainably. In situations where land rights are clear and where land administration is democratic and efficient, the motivation to use natural resources sustainably will be stronger.

Land reform must thus deliver three badly needed enhancements to land rights and land administration. It must achieve justice and equity, so that opportunities to acquire land rights and to use natural resources are fairly and transparently administered. (Accountability and user participation are key qualities in this regard.) It must provide for clarity and security of land rights, to give people adequate incentive to conserve land that they are sure is theirs. It must deliver administrative efficiency, so that resource use and conservation can be effectively controlled and promoted within a technical framework in which users have confidence.

Historically, natural resource base has been instrumental, in addition to human resources, for development purposes. The issue is critical especially where large populations and government revenue depend on agriculture and exploitation of resources. Local resource management, because of its holistic view of humankind within the biosphere and the awareness of human dependence on scarce natural resources, is in a position to reduce resource depletion, improve the environment, improve food self-sufficiency and hence improve the development of the societies. The economic implications of resource degradation include reduced wood fuel supply, increased time lost in food fuel collection, increased prices of marketed biomass fuels, similar impact on the water supply) and reduced nutritional intake via reduced cooking activities. The impact indirectly extends to national and regional economics through reduced agricultural yield. Increased rural-urban migration and depletion of natural resource assets which are the basis of both indigenous and export industries (Pearce 1988).

Land is perhaps the most important production input. Ownership affects land use,

farming systems, institutional structures, ecological conditions, adoption and use of technology, food production and self-sufficiency, and overall well being of the rural and urban population. Poverty and resource misuse is linked because of the pattern of land distribution, which often favors the rich class. The rich have access to land, which is less prone to degradation or erosion. In addition the rich class has the economic resources to invest in and improve the land. However, poor farmers continue to till a marginal resource base despite increase in their number. In many countries, projected population increases superimposed on exiting land holding pattern will result in an incredible increase in poverty derived pressure on the environment with accelerated erosion, deforestation and desertification along with continued loss of the genetic resources need to provide steady stream of new seed varieties (WCED, 2010). Land use coupled with the effort of small farmers is the key instruments for achieving sustainable increases in yield and productivity. However, insecurity of tenure, especially among small-scale farmers, has been known to act as a disincentive to the conservation of resources, including reforestation and soil conservation projects. This is so because farmers are not willing to make necessary investments for which they may be unable to reap future benefits. Of all social reforms, and distribution is perhaps one of the most difficult to initiate and see through but without it, resource conservation and hence food security and poverty elimination will.

Resource policy planners have recently begun to recognize that many resource management stems embodied in the farming system that have persisted for years exemplify careful management of soil and water. In addition, such systems exemplify efficiency and a regenerative approach to agriculture development. The principles underlying local management systems can be utilized to develop new techniques that will preserve the land's capability and productivity even as population increases. One example is the continuous cultivation agroforestry system of 'alley cropping' which uses the local resource management principle of natural regeneration in a fallow. The method is a scientifically based but locally acceptable way of meeting the resources conservation needs of farmers in third world countries not met and sustained.

Small Farms and Agricultural Biodiversity

The environmental advantages of small farmers are illustrated by their vital role in the evolution and conservation of agricultural biodiversity. The food crops on which we depend for survival are not simple gifts of nature: they are the

fruits of interactions between humans and plants that began ten millennia ago when the inhabitants of Asia Minor domesticated wheat and barley.

As a rule, it is small farmers who practice high-diversity agriculture today. In so doing, they generate a "positive externality" by conserving crop genetic diversity in situ (in the field). Not only do different small farmers in a given locality often cultivate different varieties of the same crop, but also individual small farmers often cultivate several different varieties. Large farms, on the other hand, often sow a single variety over a large acreage. The result is an inverse relationship between farm size and varietal diversity.

One reason for this is the comparative advantage of small farms in labor-intensive farming practices. It takes more time and effort to grow multiple varieties with different sowing dates, cultivation requirements, and harvest times than to grow a single, uniform variety. Considerable labor is also needed to maintain physical infrastructures—such as watercourses and terraces—that often accompany high-diversity agriculture (Boyce *et al.*, 2005).

A second reason is again the importance of local knowledge. Small farmers are the repositories of wisdom about the characteristics of different crop varieties. They know which varieties grow best in what locations, which are most resistant to what pests and diseases, which are best suited to what culinary purpose. Without the farmers, it not only would be harder to sustain agricultural biodiversity, it also would be harder to know what is being sustained. In many parts of the world, women play a particularly important role in managing agricultural biodiversity and maintaining this knowledge.

6. Conclusion

The analysis of the current land reform—the Nigeria Land Use Act, showed that all is not well with its conception and implementation as it has impeded economic and sustainable development. It should therefore be reviewed or repealed. Improved access to land for the poor can result directly in poverty reduction, not least by contributing to increased household food security. It provides important buffers that protect vulnerable groups against deepening poverty—particularly in a world where competition for access to resources and efficiency enhancing land use change are the main drivers of the development process.

Corresponding Author:

Chikaire, J. Department of Agricultural Extension, School of Agriculture and Agricultural Technology, Federal University of Technology, Owerri bankausta@yahoo.com (08065928862).

7. References

1. Adams, M., Cousins, B. and Manoma, S. Land Tenure and Economic Development in Rural South Africa: Constraints and Opportunities. University of the Western Cape, South African 2000.
2. Basiago, A. Methods of Defining Sustainability. Sustainable Development, 1995 3:109-119.
3. Boyce, J.K. Rosset, P and Stanton, E. Land Reforms and Sustainable Development. Working Paper Series Number 98. Political Economy Research Institute University of Massachusetts, Amherst, U.S.A. 2005.
4. Cline, W.R.. Global Warming and Agricultural: Impact Estimates by Country. World Bank, New York. 2007
5. Cotula, L. Toulmin, C. and Hesse, C. Land Tenure and Administration in Africa. Lessons of Experience and Emerging Issues. International Institute for Environment and Development, London 2004.
6. Cotula, L. Toulmin, C. and Quan, J. Better Land Access for the Rural Poor. Lessons from Experience and Challenges Ahead. International Institute for Environment and Development, London 2006.
7. Deininger, K. and Squire, L. New Ways of Looking at Old Issues: Inequality and Growth: Journal of Development Economics 1998 57 92): 257-287.
8. Dormer O. Land Tenure Institutions. Balse, A. (ed) Institutions in Agricultural Development Iowa State University Press. Iowa. U.S.A. 1972.
9. Fabiyi, Y.U. Land Tenure Innovations in Rural Development: The Problems with Western Nigeria with some Tanzanian Comparisms. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, U.S.A. 1974.
10. Fabiyi, Y.U., Adegboye, R.O. and Afolayan, T.A. Case studies of the Impact of Water Resource Development Projects on Rural Communities in Nigeria. Africa Journal of Agricultural Sciences 1981 9 (1): 11-30.
11. Fabiyi, Y. Land Policy for Nigeria: Issues and Perspectives. An Inaugural Lectural Delivered at Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, on June 12. 1990.
12. Famoriyo, A.O., Fabiyi, Y.L. and Gandonu, A. Problems Posed by Land Tenure in Nigeria Agriculture. Nigeria Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Ibadan. 1977.
13. FAO. The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2004. Food and Agriculture Organization, Rome. 2004.
14. Harris, M. Origin of The Land Tenure System in the United States. Iowa State University Press, Iowa U.S.A. 1953.
15. Hayford, G.Y.E. The Truth About the West Africa Land Question Second Edition. Frank Case and Company Limited, London. 1971.
16. IFAD Human Development Report. International Fund for Agricultural Development. New York. 2006.
17. Johnson, O.E. (1972) Economic Analysis: The Legal Framework and Land Tenure Systems. Journal of Law and Economics. Vol. Xv, 1:259-276.
18. May, J. and Robert B. Monitoring and Evaluating the Quality of Life of Land Reform Beneficiaries 1998/1999. Unpublished Report. Department of Land Affairs, Pretoria. 2000.
19. Pearce, D. The Use of Natural Resources in Developing Countries: In Turner, K.R. (ed) Sustainable Environmental Management: Principles and Practice West View Press, U.S.A. 1988.
20. Pengue, W. Agricultura Industrial Agricultura Familiar end Mercour: El pez grande se come al Chico Siempre. Le monde Diplomatique, Edition cono Sur 71:7-9. 2005.
21. Rosset, P. The Multiple Functions and benefits of Small Farm Agriculture in The Context of Global Trade Negotiations. Food First Policy Brief No. 4 Institute for Food and Development Policy Oakland. 1999.
22. Toulmin, C. and Gueye, B. Transformations in West Africa and the Role of Family Farms. SAH/D SAI. SWAC. Secretariat. 2003.
23. Uchendu, V.C. The Impact of Changing Agricultural Technology on African Land Tenure. The Journal of Developing Areas. 1970 4:477-480.
24. UNESCO Land and Vulnerable People in a World of Change Issue Paper of the United Nations Economic and Social Council, New York. 2008
25. WCED. Global Policies for Sustainable Agriculture. Zed Book Limited, London. 2000.
26. World Bank. The Assault on World Poverty Problems of Rural Development Education and Health. The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, U.S.A. 1975.