

**Online Publication Date: 15 March 2012**  
**Publisher: Asian Economic and Social Society**



**Social Constraints Of Rural Land Management In Côte d'Ivoire And Legal Contradictions**

**Kouassi N'Goran François** (University of Bouaké, Côte d'Ivoire;  
Centre for Research and Development (CRD) )

**Citation:** Kouassi N'Goran François (2012): "Social constraints of rural land management in Côte d'Ivoire and legal contradictions" *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, Vol.2, No.3, pp.310-319.



**Author (s)**

**Kouassi N'Goran François**  
University of Bouaké, Côte  
d'Ivoire; Centre for Research  
and Development (CRD)  
**E-mail:** [k\\_ngofr@yahoo.fr](mailto:k_ngofr@yahoo.fr)

**Keywords:** Customary Law, Constraints, Lands, Legal Contradiction, Land Management

**Introduction**

Among the most recurrent conflicts in Côte d'Ivoire, are those related to land? They occur mostly in rural areas around the sale of land and bring into conflicts the most indigenous and the non-indigenous, the indigenous authorities and the state institutions (Chauveau and Matthew, 1998; Chauveau and Koné, 1999; Chauveau, 2006), or different members of the same family or clan (Kouamé, 2006; Colin and al., 2007). The main source of those conflicts is the plurality of management standards. The actors of the land do not act on the same basis.

Land management in Côte d'Ivoire is based on two major systems of values: custom on the one hand, laws and regulations of the other. To supervise the land, everyone based on the register which provides the greatest possible benefits (Lavigne Delville, 1999). Based on the law, the State, local, large public or private companies expropriate populations who, referring to the customary law, refuse to give up the yield.

This article, extracted from a 2008 study in the region of San Pedro, is analyzing the case of Bakwé in the South-West, facing the rubber company Gô (hevego). The survey was conducted in five villages located around the field of Hevego and also in two infiltrated camps. In addition to the literature, the study has mainly used the tools of MARP (the

**Social Constraints of Rural Land Management in Côte d'Ivoire and Legal Contradictions**

**Abstract**

Land management in Côte d'Ivoire is based on two major systems of values: custom on the one hand, laws and regulations of the other. To supervise the land, everyone based on the register which provides the greatest possible benefits (Lavigne Delville, 1999). Based on the law, the State, local, large public or private companies expropriate populations who, referring to the customary law, refuse to give up the yield.

problem tree, semi-structured interviews and Venn diagram).

We first present the method of land management in Bakwé community before exposing the legal bounds for the management of rural land and the consequences that arose from expropriations carried out by Hevego based on this legal framework.

**Land management in Bakwé community**

**Importance of the social organization**

Bakwé community is organized around the tribe, township and village. Unlike other regions of Côte d'Ivoire, the tribe is rooted in the social life of Bakwé. It plays an important role in problems related to land.

At the village level, power is exercised by a chief assisted by his distinguished persons, who are seniors considered as the guardians of tradition. But increasingly, young people are chosen as village chiefs. They are involved in the process of making decision in the management of village affairs. Traditionally, young people have not the ability to allocate a portion of family's or village's land patrimony to any foreign person. For themselves the access to land can only be effective if given by seniors.

Social control of the land in the traditional framework is made through the collective land

holdings, traditional land tenure and the rights to land

### **Land holdings**

The village, as a social and concrete unity of residences, is not only defined by institutions governing and encompassing a number of individuals, but also by a own territorial basis, and a homogeneous soil, originally occupied by the founding lineages of the village.

The soils of each of the villages generally include areas actually cleared or left fallow and their immediate land extensions and also the uncleared land reserves, with very small dimensions (practically nonexistent), and limits usually approximate.

Those limits are relatively accurate in areas with frequent or constant contact, as well as on the slopes, and they generally follow natural landmarks: no water, mountains, rocks, etc... In the absence of any "natural boundary" and even more so outside the areas of contact, those limits can be very approximate. In extreme cases of very remote areas of any runway, where meeting between people from different villages never happened, it may be that no limit has been set. For opposite reasons, the important bands of rainforest separate the different ethnic groups with the most time confrontational relationships.

The desire and need for these boundaries were obviously based on population density, frequency and nature of contacts between neighboring villages, and finally the terms of occupation and land use. In any event, and whatever the practical difficulties to find the customary boundaries between villages, the frequency of disputes and wars caused by borders, attest at once the non-intangible characteristic of these limitations and the prevailing tendency to the division of the territory between villages, in areas more or less accurate depending on the case. Thus do we find at the base of the unity of Bakwé village, a community of individuals and a particular soil related to a vital relationship for these peasant societies, usually held by a village chief (the subordinate tribal chief) working many prerogatives.

Descendant of one of the founding lineages, the tribal leader has over the prerogatives of the master of the land to the village level. These powers include religious dimensions enabling the chief to play the role of high priest of the earth and the ancestors for the whole village and even of the tribe. They include legal dimensions. He settles land disputes between residents of different neighborhoods and villages in the presence of village chief who plays an administrative role. However, the powers of the tribal chief are limited to judicial arbitration, and he cannot encroach on the powers and areas lead by the chief of the village. Next, he cannot return to the land grants already made.

A political prerogative, more important in the contemporary period, is to be absolutely consulted and be the only authorized as a last, to grant land to a stranger in the village.

About the powers on the land, one can note the existence of the dual leadership of village and tribal chiefs. The tribal leader, founder of the clan from the village, is also the head of land. In general, in the Bakwé society, the tribal chief (or if the village chief) combines all the powers on earth, political power: land grants to a "foreigner" and judicial power: Settlement of land disputes.

In Bakwé, this duality is related to the traditional dominance of chthonic cults (given to the land) in the religious beliefs and practices of peasant societies. Priest specialized in an area considered as vital, the tribal chief (or sometimes the village chief) has all the religious powers (sacrifices and rituals). Heir of the first head having led the first settlers, the chief or king is basically the only qualified for the rituals and sacrifices to the ancestors and to the earth.

At the village level, there is no real coercive force depending on the single head of village or tribal chief, and could allow him to impose his dominant views. He can only make decisions in accordance with all the notables and even with all the representatives of different social strata, getting them through the agreement of the majority of villagers. The basis of this consensus is the adherence of all to common

customary rules, whose leaders are only the most qualified servants. This reinforces the principle observed everywhere, involving liens and charges, government leadership and the role of agent.

System of values, norms and customary rules specific to each civilization has always religious justifications and are based on the example of ancestors. Social efficiency is increased and ensures the maintenance of public order. The process of making decisions affecting the whole village is like "unanimously," that is to say, based on the research of the prior agreement of all, by reference to a common custom.

If switching the process "unanimous", the head or a majority cannot impose his will without the risk of a part of the village to secede and go to create another autonomous village on a portion of village land or beyond. The power of a leader is measured in traditional societies of Bakwé by the number of men supervised; any split represents a feared weakening. Traditional societies are not free from internal contradiction than modern societies. Oppositions between members or between neighborhoods of the same village have occurred and resulted in segmentations of villages. This situation has contributed to the settlement of the tribe Gnity, increasing the geographic dispersion of residents.

### **Traditional land system**

The sacredness of the land justifies the fundamental principles of the system that can be summarized as follows:

- land is a natural welfare available for human beings by God the Creator of all things, as well as air and water. Everyone therefore has a natural right of free access to land, subject to compliance with the rites and rights of others;
- no one may dispose of lands, both because of its sacred character and its collective nature of ownership. The traditional property rights exclude the right to use or sell the land, even if today in the society of Bakwé, this is no more practically observed;

- the earth is a god. Indeed, all cultures equate the notion of African earth-mother reincarnation and the existence of the clan that is renewed by successive revival of all the deceased. This design illuminates the links between members of a clan and a particular land. Mother earth, protector, goddess of fertility and life abhors violence and blood from this sacredness, were born obligations and prohibitions.

Leonard and Vimard (2005) show here that, despite these obligations and the influx of migrant farmer, sale of forest accounted for indigenous of Bakwé the only possible social and economic value of land holdings lineage. For sales, the indigenous people continued to bet social control on the ground through mentoring relationships "institution" the land transfer between the purchaser and the assignor or transferor's family.

Specifically, in the area Hevego, land transactions between Bakwé and non-native and alien were really a practice common to the point where we can say that Bakwé tenure is limited to the right to use land and to collect the fruits; when a man cleared for the first time a piece of forest, it must do (or rather to be performed by a qualified person) a number of rituals and sacrifices to contract an alliance with the earth. This alliance with a deified earth is by nature eternal, and it remains even if the fields are then left fallow, and it is transmitted automatically to its descendants. The chief of these descendants has the powers acquired by the first ancestor, but as a community representative of the descendants, not individual or personal gain. A formula quoted by Denise Paulme Schaffner (1964), in his study of traditional land tenure systems, reflects perfectly this particular concept of collective ownership, valid in most traditional societies: "the land belongs to a family many of whom are dead, few are living and which is still more to be born".

These elements constituted the basic principles of traditional land tenure Bakwé. Applying these basic principles and practice inevitably leads to a superposition of land rights.

### **Land rights**

Two basic types of land rights can be distinguished: the "eminent" right of leaders and the right to use the farmer.

#### **a. The right of "eminent" leaders**

The leaders of various social units accumulate, as a rule, all religious and political functions, military and judicial. Their authority extends both to those charged with property assets in the group and specific social group. The head is normally the only qualified for the rituals and sacrifices of the ancestors on earth. It has powers that include legal, political and economic aspects.

#### **Judicial aspects**

The tribal chief settles disputes occurring in the territory it controls. It uses the head of the higher level when members of two different groups come into conflict.

#### **Politic aspects**

The tribal chief defends and represents the interests of his group, and its property assets, with respect to the outside in particular, any foreigner wishing to establish positions on non-cultivated land was asking his permission, and offer a gift, usually symbolic (for example a bottle of Gin, or a chicken for sacrifice), but sometimes up to a true royalty in kind.

#### **Economic aspects**

In some respects, the tribal chief seems not to have any real economic power. Indeed, it has its own fields, the provision of free work from members of the group. Various gifts in kind owed on the occasion of traditional festivals and receive a share of the revenue of the field, that is to say palm wine, cola, game, and fish from areas controlled by the land chief.

#### **b. The right to use of the farmer or the "owner"**

Housed in a heritage building, the farmer shall follow the political authority, judicial and religious leader of his social unit (group). It is customarily a number of benefits and gifts.

With these reservations, the farmer has the right to cultivate and use freely the crops. This is a right of use, excluding the right to sell the land,

and therefore closer to the right of an "owner" as that of an owner.

This right of use for all parcels cleared by the farmer (with the help of people dependent on it) or inherited from its predecessors, they are currently cultivated or left fallow. The right of use extends to portions of virgin forest surrounding agricultural fields, as part of a semi-itinerant agriculture, those immediately adjacent portions are regarded as natural extensions for the future of clearings each farmer.

The right of use acquired by a first work of clearing and is transmitted automatically to the heirs. It is indeed acquired permanently, regardless of the length of fallow following a period of cultivation. The head itself is unable to resume land and cleared the first time, except in the absence of any heir (Schaffner, 1964). So there is a strong link between use rights and land clearing work. And as part of archaic farming techniques, where the duration of cultures in one place does not exceed three or four years, can hardly be transmitted (by bequest or land grant) a right to clear and not a good production of commercial value. This gives full importance of the right initial clearing.

However, the right to clear has special arrangements in traditional society. Indeed, the natural right of free access to land is evidenced by the strong link between residence and right to clear. When the customary rules or authorization of the head allows an individual or family to reside with a group, these rules or authorization include the right to clear a portion of virgin land within the land assets of the group. In fact, the abundance of land and the type of agriculture makes it easy to move fields when changing residence. However, the right to clear has the following limitations.

*Respect for the authority of the head holding a right of eminent domain on land*

From this point of view, there is a difference between group members and outsiders to the group. For example, migrants from a village were allowed to clear without first seeking the blank portions of collective land holdings,

while remaining subject to customary obligations towards the village chief, a stranger should ask before any clearing, the authorization of the head: in general authorization granted against a small token gift, or sometimes a fee of short duration, consisting of one share of the first harvest. The conditions are more or less strict depending on whether one belongs or not to the same ethnic group or clan.

*Respect of the rights of the other farmers and of their expansion possibilities*

Avoid (on a very expressive) "beheading" another farmer coming occupy land lying in the natural and close to its current fields. The custom seems to always be flexible in such matters. The minimum distances are mostly a matter of individual cases and depend on the state of relations between the two farmers involved. Meetings between the two axes of clearing are also infrequent, except in the immediate vicinity of the villages, because of the habit of clearing in perpendicular to the tracks from the "front" of the crops still in the advancing direction.

There is not concretely a problem of delineation and materialized when two clearings, whose axes intersect, come close to each other. Thus, by agreement between the two farmers, or after arbitration of the appropriate Chief or King, it is planted halfway between the two areas cleared, a row of pineapples, or small trees symbolic variables across sectors.

**Practices to access to land**

**Access by conquest**

In Bakwé countries, access to land by conquest or clearance is the primary mode of land ownership. This type of ownership is often the result of the first occupants of land or forests not yet exploited. It is to enter a forest considered not yet occupied and make markings on the trees that serve as boundaries of the areas conquered by each actor or stakeholder groups. Once conquered, the land becomes public goods that fall in the register of family assets following the mode of transmission patrilineal line of inheritance in Bakwé. Only

indigenous benefited from this mode of access to land

**Access to land by donation**

The donations, which were previously not developed practices in Bakwé countries, are now almost nonexistent due to the scarcity of arable land and forest reserves. Two forms of donations, however, emerged in the area: the simple donation and the donation by compensation in kind. In the simple donation, the donor (usually a Bakwé) by an agreement recognizes the recipient of the earth (a non-native or alien) a right of general culture. The latter, before settling, offers to the head of the plot or the tribal chief some liquor (a bottle of Gin for example), poultry for propitiatory rituals. Regarding compensation for the donation, the landowner sells a customary part of his land to migrants (Baule, Guro, Yacouba, Abron, Burkina Faso, etc.) in exchange for the creation of a cocoa plantation for his own benefit (holder) or pension benefit.

**Access by purchase**

The practice of access to land is the source of the installation of non-native and alien populations in the Heritage Land of Hevego. This method evolved from the 1970s with the development of village plantation (cocoa, coffee) in the South West. In Bakwé, the purchasers of the land sales are non-native (Baule, Abron, Malinke and alien Burkinabe) living in camps in the forest heritage of Hevego. These land transfers are reported often in "small" papers that provide information on contract terms (price of land sold, names of the signatories, etc.).

These local practices of land transactions are illegal in terms of modern law on rural land code.

The earth is in the field of social production, a privileged witness of exchange, a reorganization of the social group.

**Legal and regulatory framework for the management of rural land**

The search for a legal structure best suited to the needs of development has always struck the principles and values that have hitherto governed the traditional society. Faced with the

constraints imposed by the requirement of private property and the progressive marginalization of customary tenures, the reaction of the holders of customary rights to land is not expected, resulting in the rejection of state regulation and maintenance of management customary rural land

The hostile reaction of the traditional owners will not disarm the state. Best, to ensure the triumph of his ideal of agricultural development, the state will develop a land use regulation that reflects the aspirations of traditional owners while ensuring the rights of all occupants of rural land on the Ivorian territory. To do this, a new concept of national heritage, will be launched with the Land Law of 1998.

### **Land, national heritage**

The theory of eminent domain of the state that vacant land without an owner, the land policy of the colonial administration and then the Ivorian government has always been marked by the willingness of governments to ensure the property state on all lands have not been an outright assignment to individuals. But it is so coveted that land is held from time immemorial by traditional owners. Also, understanding that he could not deprive the traditional land owners and assume the prerogatives exercised by them, the state will use the concept of national heritage through the 1998 land law.

### **The legal basis**

Article I, paragraph 2 of Law No. 98-750 of 23 December 1998 on the rural land states "the rural land is a national heritage which any person or entity can access. However, only the State, public authorities and individuals entitled to Ivorian to own". The concept of national heritage, which made its appearance in land, ends the principle that any vacant land without an owner belongs to the state. Today, rural land is a resource that belongs to the entire national community. Compared to the right that can be exercised on this heritage, the state is found in the same position that an individual who must follow a legal procedure to become the owner. However, this law is not retroactive; it is effective only for situations land after the

publication of the said Act (January 14, 1999). Vested rights are not undermined. Thus, the State, public authorities, individuals and even corporations that could be preparing or issuing an occupancy plots as they operate in are still holding. These securities are legal and holders must comply with the requirements of the Land Law of 1998 for their regularization. Hevego follows this process.

Unlike the land tenure anterior to 1998, the current system specifies the composition of rural areas.

### **Composition of rural land**

According to Paragraph 2 of Article 2 of the Land Law of 1998, the rural land consists of land for permanent state ownership, land ownership communities, individuals and land without a master. Provisionally, this area consists of rural land and customary land granted by the State to public bodies and individuals.

According to this text, it is no exaggeration to say that there is a willingness of the legislature to clarify the rights of each other on the lands of rural land. Indeed, contrary to pre-1998 land law, it is crucial to identify the land on which any right is exercised; it was a customary right or right of ownership resulting from a land title. So, if claim, we can connect with each case as an occupation. Thus, the property of the state, communities and individuals will result from the land title. As to the right on the customary domain, it follows from the land certificate as the concession thus based on provisional concession decision.

Specifically, one who, in rural areas may represent a way to occupy his plot is outside the law. Taking into account both social traditions and modern legal realities may promote the development of a land market vital to economic and social development, the law promotes the national heritage and regulates the management of that heritage.

### **Regulation of Land Management**

For the management of rural land, the state has established various management bodies such as the Rural Land Commission, the Rural Land Management Committee and the Committee on

Rural Village Land Management. These bodies are responsible for ensuring the proper implementation of the rural land law regarding access to land use and ownership of the land.

### **Access to land use**

If the land can still be considered "property" of the ancestors, we must recognize that a shift towards individualization and private ownership takes place at a dizzying pace. Today, this phenomenon is irreversible and is accompanied by sharp confrontation involving a series of mechanisms and strategies for complex and multiple occupancy space. Traditional strategies of access to land must be distinguished from legal proceedings.

Customarily, one strategy involves the solicitation of an area of land to the traditional village authority recognized as owner or agent. Thus, as mentioned in A. SCHWARTZ, "the immigrant seeking admission on a soil is required to go through the agent of the community. The request is transmitted to the notables who introduce and make the decision to grant a piece of land. The immigrant whose application is approved was accompanied on the forest portion assigned; the limits are set using natural landmarks. This is often a front of several hundred meters of forest tracks which is the basis of unlimited depth". This form of access to land use tends to disappear with the scarcity of forest land. She has given way to the illegal practice of selling land. In this context and following the frustrations of broken promises that the people of Gnity encouraged the infiltration of the area regularly assigned Hevego by the procedure of concession, one of the legal channels of access to land use.

In accordance with the regulations in force, 50 to 5588 ha of land of 01 ca rural land, located Soubré Road - San Pedro have been registered on behalf of the Ivorian as No. 1193 of the division Lower Sassandra. Following this registration, a long lease of 144/MINAGRI/DGDR/DFRCR No. 5 November 2007 was concluded between the state represented by the Ministry of Agriculture, manager of rural land and rubber society GB (hevego) for a period of 50 years from 5 November 2007. This lease creates in favor of a

right of accession Hevego and gives him the power to oppose all usurpations and encroachments of all or infiltration of the area that was granted by the state.

The exercise of this right in the face of intense competition for land cannot be done smoothly. This is the place to recall that according to the survey, Hevego inherited the assets of the former IRCA who won by Order No. 01/AGRI/DAC/SADR January 05, 1981 made available a 5500 ha land concession provisional subject to the rights of third parties for the purpose of experimentation to practice and culture of rubber. By Order No. 51 of June 25, 1986, this area is officially licensed by the state of society Hevego.

This sequence of actions illustrates the regularity of the land by Hevego the area that remains legally the property of the state. However the relationship between Hevego and local residents has always been difficult. The comments below are revealing:

**Box 1:** "People who come from elsewhere were easily 100 ha of land here, so that we who are here for you have nothing. Is this normal? Mr. Doumbia is who is responsible for all that. It was he who gave our land to others, especially the big shots" denounces Mr. M. D. Roland, village chief of Naboville.

To Mr. G. Oly, land chief and chief Gnity-Pebbles

**Box 2:** "Hevego makes promises it does not. She had promised 500 acres of plots when she moved. It has not kept his word, because the 500 acres planned for the populations were in fact awarded to friends' Hevego frames. Nobody trusts a Hevego because of some officials, such that a Doumbia and others that have tarnished its image. "

Mr. S. Bernard, head of village Ménégbé adds:

**Box 3:** "To this day no one here agrees with Hevego, because no one trusts him

On analysis, a trend emerges

Hevego seems to be the source of all the current problems faced by indigenous riparian



People feel expropriated by Hevego (by settling the land of their ancestors), which causes a lack of arable land and land disputes in the area; Hevego do not really involved in the development of their village; Hevego does not keep its promises (several conventions seem to be not executed).

This perception is even more confrontational with young people: target whose dynamism and capacity for mobilization may be a threat to the prosecution, in peace, Hevego activities.

Indeed, to the youth village residents, especially those old enough to have plantations, Hevego is seen as an intruder in their village. This image is rooted in the approach, just as confrontational, made of both sides of the thorny issue of land.

These difficult relations with local populations are recognized by the primary responsibility of Hevego, as shown in the words of D. Doumbia, formerly director of research and development department of the station's Gô.

**Box 4:** "Hevego has always had a tumultuous relationship with the people. There were several conflicts with people. These conflicts between Hevego and local residents were due to the fact that there was no formal exchange with these people. Management was done in Africa. I was hard on these people because they are in bad faith. When my responsibility entrusted to me a spot, I'm going through. I assume all my actions. The mistake we made in our relations with these people is not to have defined a formal and written. We tried to deal with problems in Africa, staying in the oral tradition.

Despite the regularity of the occupation Hevego the concession, the opposition of local residents including residents and Gnity Naboville as well as non-native and alien illegally occupying plots Hevego, are a concern for those responsible for Hevego.

Faced with the persistence of customary claims to the need for the capitalization of the land expansion of the proposed development of rubber cultivation which a beneficiary is found to be the indigenous population which claims ownership of the space Hevego, several negotiating sessions were held to resolve

differences of view not only the ownership of plots occupied by Hevego but also on possible compensation.

The conflicting nature of the relationship between Hevego and local residents is enhanced by the interests pursued by the same officials of the company and the urban elite and rural areas that are in search of land, as shown by the villagers about:

**Box 5:** "For the time Mr. Doumbia, he joined the strangers in the plantations of Hevego, they secretly created the plantation for him, and then we were told that there is arable land for us. He set up the people who worked for him and who also benefited acres of forests. There are also other officials currently in office who Hevego currently logged forests by squatters. These officials have installed and they accuse us. Mr. Doumbia also granted five acres of forest to the member of the sub-prefecture, while the plot was reserved for the village.

There in the appearance of conflict between local residents and Hevego, the important place of Mr. DA, former Director of Research - Development of the station to Hevego Gnity. All charges raised by local residents have their origin and their manifestations in the management (17 years) of Mr. DA.

The purchasers of the plots are as individuals or administrative and political authorities and legal persons, exercising (or have worked) in the region. These individuals have taken advantage of their status and their position to grab land and farm produce rubber, including the Heritage Land Hevego. In the words of the village authorities and Naboville Gnity center:

**Box 6:** "Mr. Doumbia, without consulting us, has allocated land to the authorities and others who have nothing to do with socio-land of our villages. These people now have large patches of rubber they purchased with Mr. Doumbia. These people are generally senior government officials, religious and other wealthy people living in San Pedro, in Abidjan, and elsewhere.

Among the buyers, there are prefectural authorities and the Ministry of Agriculture and a deputy. Their uniqueness lies in the fact that they are seen as those responsible for regulating

the social game and land in terms of conflicts between Hevego and local residents. However, the state authorities, instead of being neutral regulatory bodies, are actors playing a role (and subtle stealth) and protecting their interests ahead of those actors in conflict.

### **Access to land ownership and compensation**

According to Article 4 paragraph 11 of the Land Law of 1998, "the ownership of land from rural land is established from the registration of this land in the land register opened for that purpose by the administration and in on public land by customary land certificate.

In relation to Article I of the Act which prescribes that only the State, public authorities and individuals are allowed the Ivorian to be owners, the State of Côte d'Ivoire is the owner of the domain of Hevego by Title Property No. 1193 of the registration division of the Lower Sassandra. The land title is final and unassailable. Indeed, the registration procedure requires investigation tends to reveal any real rights on the property subject to that procedure. These are the real rights of or even the customary rights. If at the end of this procedure no objection is registered, the land title is created and is the starting point for all rights will be exercised on the land registered.

The land title created for the benefit of the State a right of ownership. Therefore any action to claim the right not revealed during the proceedings and has the effect of calling into question the ownership of a property registered is inadmissible.

Although it is undisputed that during the various negotiations, Gnity populations have repeatedly stated their customary ownership of the space occupied by Hevego, they are still aware that, for actions development of rubber cultivation these lands were ceded to the State which forwarded them to Hevego. If the questioning of the rights of the state is possible in the current state of investment, people, however, remain convinced that the state must compensate the loss of almost all their land holdings. It is around this issue that all meetings between Hevego and local residents are organized. Indeed, by establishing a parallel

with what is happening in urban areas and their development deferred in accordance with Decree No. 96-884 of 25 October 1996 regulating the purge of customary rights on the floor to public interest, it must admit the correctness of the claims of indigenous peoples Gnity that since the opening of this center development have benefited from the fallout of the economic and social growth. The populations of the state and consider Gnity Hevego as the source of all evil present in this community.

This situation of disagreement, however, tends to fade recurring with the litany of complaints from residents Gnity that are similar and consist of the implementation of the procedure for clearing and Hevego which pays particular attention since 2007. The claims revolve around the following points:

- an annual financial contribution of 5 million CFA francs for the shares of companies Hevego citizen for the benefit of the village of Gnity;
- the creation of a sports field;
- the creation of a community planting of 130 ha;
- the establishment of 500 ha of plantation villagers and the eviction of the promoters drivers;
- the hiring of young people of Gnity in the framework of the activities of Hevego.

Meeting these demands is the guarantee of further development of peace in Hevego's plots.

### **Conclusion**

Today there is a land law in Côte d'Ivoire, but this law, even if it takes into account certain customary rights, remains difficult to apply, because it does not take into account all the local practices. The difficulties met by Hevego to freely dispose of its legal parcels are due to the legal pluralism, the juxtaposition of the state law and the local customary conventions, most accessible and flexible, and that the majority of the rural population preferred more. For

example, while Hevego bases its action on the first, the local population is referring to the second and continues to claim their customary rights about the land legally acquired by Hevego. This situation called 'legal "fuzzy"' by Affou (2002) is a source of conflict. These difficulties are also an explanation of the conflictual relations between the different actors (villagers, the executives of Hevego, elected officials, school leavers) who are engaged in the local land game and pursue different interests for access and management of land assets granted to Hevego by the Ivorian government.

### References

- Affou, Y. (2002)** Blur legal and land practices in Agriculture, in Workshop on land rights and legal institutions in Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire, Bouake, in March 2002.
- Allen, D. W. and Lueck, D. (1997)** "Why are they family farms predominate in agriculture?" In Journal of Development Economics, No. 2, pp. 15-38.
- Chauveau, J.-P and Mathieu, P. (1998)** "Dynamics and issues of land disputes," in Lavigne Delville. P. (eds.). What land policy for Africa Rural? Reconciliation practices, legitimacy and legality, Paris, Karthala-French Cooperation, pp.243-263
- Chauveau, JP and Koné, M. (1999)** "The new land policy to the test of Ivorian local political dynamics" Transitions in Land and Social Change, Workshop CIESAS-IRD, Mexico, 2-11 March 1999.
- Colin, J.-P. (2007)** "Outside the autochthon-migrant configuration: access to land, land conflict and inter-ethnic Relationships in a pioneer area of lower form Cote d'Ivoire", Journal of Modern African Studies (London, Cambridge University Press, p. 179-196).
- De Fina, C. (1998)** "Power relationships, client relationships and agreements in access to production factors in agriculture production village", in B. contaminated and MEMEL-FOTE H. (eds), The Ivory Coast model in question. Crises, adjustments, reconstructions, Paris, Karthala, pp. 361-378.
- Lavigne Delville, P. (1999)** Harmonising formal law and local land rights: Experience in West Africa Francophone, Docket No. 86-IIED Drylands Programme, 27 p.
- Lavigne Delville, P. (1998)** "Privatize or secure," in P. LAVIGNE DELVILLE (eds). What land policy for rural Africa? Reconciliation practices, legitimacy and legality, Paris, Karthala-French cooperation.
- Leonard, E and P. Vimard (2005)** "Crises and recomposition of a pioneer farming in Côte d'Ivoire". Population dynamics and economic changes in the lower Sassandra (Ivory Coast), IRD-Karthala.
- Schwartz, A. (1982)** "Major development projects and land practices in Ivory Coast. The example of Operation San Pedro ", in Land Issues in Black Africa, Paris, Karthala.