

COMPONENTS OF DEFIANCE AT LOCAL LEVEL IN LAND CONFLICTS IN MOZAMBIQUE

MARCIO PESSÔA

Doutor em Estudos do Desenvolvimento (Universidade de Sussex)
E-mail: M.Pessoa@ids.ac.uk

Recebido em 13/abril/2019
Aprovado em 30/abril/2019
Sistema de Avaliação: *Double blind review*

Abstract: This paper looks at the emergence of defiance at a local level through an ethnographic description of one of ProSAVANA's Master Plan hearings in the first half of 2015, and will include the narratives and behaviours of members of civil society organisations, smallholder farmers and Mozambican government agents. It briefly presents features about ProSAVANA, and looks at the public meeting that showed the greatest level of defiance which took place in April 2015, and which makes clearer the contrasts between what the government offered to the peasants, how civil society organisations reacted to this offer, and what the peasants were seeking. The paper provides a better understanding as to what the real issues are, both main and peripheral, for the subsistence farming communities in ProSAVANA's framework and how they managed to expose these issues, facing power barriers in the field.

Keywords: ProSAVANA. Mozambique. Civil Society

INTRODUCTION

This article reviews the public hearings related to the ProSAVANA project in Mozambique which took place from April to July 2015, and highlights the components that generated a strong peasant challenge to local and national government representatives in Mozambique under the ProSAVANA agricultural programme. These public hearings ended up being annulled due to a series of irregularities in their organisation and convening, but they bring to light the way in which the implementation of the tripartite project, involving the Brazilian, Japanese and Mozambican governments, was taking place. First, the article provides a brief contextualisation of the situation of ProSAVANA until the end of 2017. It later observes the narratives presented by Mozambican government agents, representatives of civil society organisations and peasants in Nampula, Mozambique. Finally, it analyses the generating and performative elements of what was the strongest act of local contestation to power during the public hearings.

This study was made through elements collected during field research conducted from 2013 to 2015, in interviews, reports and newspapers, and participant observation in Mozambique. The analysis is constituted from the perspective of the theory of defiance in civil society and elucidates what are the ‘real issues’ and the ‘peripheral issues’ for the peasants of Nampula, in addition to describing how peasant resistance occurred during the public hearing. There are many relevant studies and recent work that consider land issues, South-South cooperation and civil society in the context of ProSAVANA. Of important note in this context are the works of Cabral, Shankland, Vaz and Favareto (2013), Fingerhann (2014), Watanabe and Akimoto (2014), Mandamule (2015); Ikegami (2015), Mosca and Bruna (2015), Cabral and Leite (2015), Shankland, Gonçalves and Favareto (2016), Cabral and Norfolk (2016), Classen, Chichava and Portes (2016). The analysis of defiance in civil society based on the methodology of civil society defiance theory is relatively recent. The 2015 public hearings are also rarely addressed, and even less so from the perspective of the defiance theory – which considers civil society much more as *individuals* – rather than the toquevillian view which values organisations themselves.

THE PROSAVANA THAT ARRIVED IN NAMPULA

ProSAVANA is a triangular co-operation programme of Mozambique, Brazil and Japan for agricultural development, which covers the savannah region of the Nacala corridor, with an area of 14 million hectares. It is linked with the Nacala Corridor Economic

Development Strategies Project (PEDEC), a bilateral initiative by the Mozambican government and the Japanese Official Development Assistance. PEDEC has increased ProSAVANA's reach by integrating a network of infrastructural improvements, thus making it more attractive to private investors. In this context, it includes the construction of a railway that spans Malawito connect mining production in Tete with the Port of Nacala.¹ In 2014, the Japanese government announced they would be investing US\$680 million in the Nacala Corridor (Chichava and Duran, 2016:10). Although there have been many cooperation programmes between the two countries focussing on this area, the Japanese Agency for International Cooperation (JICA) also has economic development and infrastructure projects in several other areas of Mozambique (see Chichava and Duran 2016).

Public and private Brazilian institutions began to engage with Mozambique under the terms of Presidents Lula da Silva and Armando Guebuza as part of South-South Cooperation. Brazilian business involvement in Africa over Lula's two terms and Dilma Rousseff's first term grew from US\$6 billion in 2013 to US\$26 billion in 2012 (BBCBrasil, 2015).² For Mozambique, this reached US\$146 million. In 2011, Brazilian government resources allocated for Mozambique reached US\$32 million, of which US\$22 million were dedicated to bilateral cooperation and almost US\$10 million to trilateral cooperation (ABC, 2013). Over the same period, Getúlio Vargas Foundation projects (a subsidiary of Getulio Vargas Agro), set up the Nacala Fund, which aimed to attract US\$2 billion in Brazilian and Japanese investment to the region, with an aim of getting a return of between 18 per cent and 23 per cent per year (Revista Dinheiro Rural, 2012). The regional intention to 'build industries to process agricultural products and expand transport and storage infrastructure' was reported in 2012 (Agroanalysis, 2012).

However, Brazil's commercial presence on the continent declined dramatically after the global recession and after the country's economic and political crisis (Folha de São Paulo, 2015). At one point, the Getúlio Vargas Foundation had 60 projects in seven countries, with a value of over US\$3 billion. However, in 2015, it had just two projects in Mozambique and Angola, both with limited budgets. In the context of ProSAVANA, financial difficulties halted building on the Lichinga soil laboratory, which had started with an initial budget of US\$1.5 million from Brazil. Since Rousseff's impeachment in August 2016, the trend has been for cooperation projects to be seen with greater caution, and this is not only due to the political and economic crisis. The *Lava Jato* [Car Wash] scandal – which continues to investigate corruption schemes involving state and private enterprises and

politicians from several political parties – has affected 25 projects with a total budget of US\$7 billion (Agência Brasil, 2016). This has had knock-on effects on projects in central and northern Mozambique, including in the Nacala Corridor.

In the next section, the reader will be led to a moment of field research, so events will be described through a first-person narrative.

DISCOURSES, REAL AND PERIPHERAL ISSUES AT LOCAL LEVEL

It was Monday, 27 April at almost 10:30 am by the time the ProSAVANA team arrived in Mutuali. Around 70 people were sitting on the chairs inside the barn. Almost all the women – who were in the minority – were sitting on the floor, behind the chairs that were occupied by the men. There didn't seem to be tensions, but the neighbourhood chief then started shouting in Makwa at a group inside the barn. It caught my attention and I found only a few hours later that they had in fact been arguing. The community leader was shouting about how 'he didn't know there were people from the opposition in the community'. It was this leader who had introduced the official opening to the public hearing in Vila Sede de Mutuali with the Mozambique Liberation Front (FRELIMO) anthem of independence, sung in Makwa. 'Who freed us? FRELIMO!' is the anthem's reprise, according to an activist of *Forum Terra*, who kindly translated for me. The neighbourhood chief sang: 'Who freed us?', and the peasants sang in response: 'FRELIMO!' ³ It was as if the power of the Party/State was slowly affecting everyone's minds, hearts and souls.

Ana Maria Costa, an agronomist with ProSAVANA, gave a 25-minute presentation of the draft of the master plan to farmers, local authorities and civil society organisation representatives. The tone of the explanation was conciliatory and polite. A subsistence farmer offered to interpret what was said at the meeting from Portuguese into Makwa. The engineer said the Master Plan wasn't complete and that the government had plans and wanted to hear communities' opinions. Given the complexity of the issue, she spoke slowly and tried to be clear, articulate and concise – using simple Portuguese. She tried to give illustrative examples: 'Just as in my own house I have plans and projects, and I sometimes ask my brothers for help, the government is asking its brothers and partners for help,' referring to the cooperation with the Japanese and Brazilian governments.

She also pointed out that new models of agrarian development were going to be introduced, taking into consideration cultural, so-

cial and economic aspects and seeking ‘market-oriented regional developments’ with ‘competitive advantages’:

The [government] dreams of sustainability and competitiveness in an agrarian industry that is able to respond to the challenges of food security and reach other markets. The government’s vision is for the private sector and partners to work together to strengthen family farming [...] to contribute to the farmers’ income streams and to gender equality.⁴

While on the one hand, concepts such as sustainability, competitiveness, productivity, equality and values in the production chain sometimes made the explanation a little inaccessible; on the other, it showed that the government’s team was interested in more complex themes and appeared to want to hear suggestions. She said the programme also focuses on developing research capacity and technology transfers. ‘We will leave no small farmers out, we will not exclude anyone. Here in Malema [district] you grow potatoes and corn. The programme can help you to work with these products as best as possible,’ she said.

She also added that maize, cassava, beans and peanuts were the main crops chosen by the programme, as well as commercial crops like soya beans, potatoes, cotton, tobacco and fruit, and other products like sesame, sunflower and tea. ‘We are not going to tell farmers to stop producing what they are already producing. No. The support of the government will go to these selected crops. It will also work on developing livestock farming,’ she commented, further adding that the programme promised to improve production by supporting individual and group production. ‘The government believes it needs to offer technical support, access to markets, irrigation and credit so as to improve productivity. Access to markets is the pillar, and the strategy is to increase and add value to products.’ During the explanation, the agronomist talked about managing natural resources, strengthening the Land Law, bringing together private capital and local communities, a desire for conflict resolution and continued dialogue between ‘representatives of producers, civil society, NGOs and other partners.’

After the ProSAVANA team’s introduction, one of the journalists who has most closely followed the subject in Mozambique – and with links to defiant civil society organisations – introduced the activists’ tone of contempt to the public hearing. He accused the agronomist of falsely aligning ProSAVANA with the peasants. He recalled the Maputo Summit in 2003, which agreed that African governments would invest 10 per cent of the state budget in agriculture. ‘And we looked to the unsustainable agrarian sector in Mozambique. Does

ProSAVANA have a way of changing this?’ He queried the assertion that it is an exclusive programme: ‘We need to re-position ourselves: is it true that the tri-partite cooperation has failed? If it’s not true, why aren’t the Brazilians and Japanese here?’ he asked. This speech provoked loud applause, but then the enthusiasm was suddenly interrupted: ‘We need order!’ The intervention led to discussion and jeers from assembled peasants. ‘You have to respect the rules. You were told there would be a meeting, you’re getting the information – you must show some respect’, announced the head of the province’s Agricultural Service, Joaquim Tomas, which led to a generalised silence.

Tomas had taken on the mantle of host and moderator for the hearing. ‘But when the proposal is valid, we should applaud!’ commented a Provincial Peasants’ Union (UPC) member. ‘But who was it who said this proposal was valid? What we are saying is that the applause should happen at the end. Please, we are asking for respect. That’s enough!’ the moderator said in the tone of an order. The meeting carried on with interventions from organisation members and peasants farmers. One of the Forum Terra representatives criticised the agronomist’s language during the presentation: ‘Even the translator found it hard to make out what she was saying. Next time, please try to find more accessible words to avoid today’s situation.’ They pointed to the agronomist’s explanation of ProSAVANA’s roots in government policies. ‘There is a general question here: does anyone here in this room know anything about the government’s policies?’ ‘No!’ was the group answer to the questions and he repeated: ‘Has the government disclosed these documents? If so, they have to implement them, but we as citizens have the right to know what’s behind them don’t we?’ ‘Yes!’

The activist said that he had taken part in another public hearing in Rapale and had noted that ProSAVANA’s presentation had not even touched on the subject of environmental management. When talking about environmental management he is also referring to land ownership:

I think it’s a good idea – someone can own a plot of land and have a document to prove it. It means that anyone can instigate cooperation using these documents as the land belongs to the state and everyone can take advantage of it. But is it true that environmental management within ProSAVANA only considers land? We are facing issues of climate change that are not reflected in ProSAVANA’s approach. I started to read the summary document, but I couldn’t get through the full 200 pages. I didn’t find anything about environmental management (...). ProSAVANA also uses pesticides intensively. What is the programme’s policy to reverse these products’ damaging effects?

The Forum Terra activist went on to identify lacunae in conflict resolution provision, the viability of input supplies and in machine costs accessible to producers and the research-extension-farmer tri-

angle. 'How can this link be implemented? So far, no one appears to be able answer. There's no joined-up thinking.' Forum Terra brought applause, catcalls and enthusiastic laughter from the audience. Those calm farmers who had been sitting in front of the barn hours before the hearing had turned into an [increasingly] excited audience. 'We have three hours. We were late, but we only have a limited amount of time. We can't stay here all day. When the time comes we'll tell you we have to leave,' Tomas tried to halt public reaction.

None of the outsiders appeared to be inhibited by what Tomas said. Another Forum Terra representative stated that he wanted to see ProSAVANA cover 'concrete action' on environmental issues. Tomas challenged him to offer a concrete proposal: 'This poison is not only consumed in *machamba* [farming], but reaches the communities as well. People are constantly coughing. So, what kind of health assistance does ProSAVANA provide?'

After being interrupted and responding promptly, the activist set out what he called 'concrete actions', for example, the inclusion of local agriculture schools and faculties as 'receivers' in the ProSAVANA technology transfer process. He reminded the audience that the ProSAVANA project foresees contract farming and stated that he would like to hear the agronomist Ana Maria talking about conflict resolution in cases of contract farming. The second segment of Forum Terra highlighted that there are already conflicts between tobacco companies and communities around contract farming, and proposed that ProSAVANA's team should be learning from these existing conflicts. He asked for safeguards and assistance for the communities when undertaking negotiations with the private sector. 'Sometimes people say "yes" but don't have the power or ability to measure what this actually means. I also suggest a set of rules for the private sector, drawn up together with peasant farmers.' The activist finished by suggesting that the government should respect the Land Usage and Exploitation Rights (DUAT), and stop allowing companies to transfer concessions. In addition, he suggested they should no longer ignore the involvement of civil society in conflict resolution. The latter was warmly received.

The Academic Action for the Development of Rural Communities (ADECURU) representative suggested the ProSAVANA team apologise for being late. 'I was disgusted to hear that although you know you were late, you don't have any more time and when the time's up you have to leave. I think you should apologise to the people who have been waiting for you since 7am.' He stressed how important the meeting was:

I think everyone is aware that we are here to discuss the Mozambican people's future. Moreover, for me it is a nonsense to discuss a complex document that has reached the hands of only a few of us. I got it, but what about everyone else?

He thought it absurd to be forcing people to contribute ideas after a 'simplistic 10-minute presentation' on a very complex project, and that used 'opaque' language on several occasions. 'I'm aware that before the meeting you distributed formal invitations. You should also have handed out a summary of what was presented here today.' The activist complained that Brazilian and Japanese interests in ProSAVANA were unclear. 'I think it would be good to explain our brothers' interests to the "mamas and papas". Is it pure solidarity? Are they doing it "mahala" [without anything in return]?' He accused the state elite of being an interested party in the programme and labelled the whole process as '*uma fantochada*' [a puppet show].

In 2012, National Peasants' Union and Rural Association for Mutual Aid produced the documentary *The Hidden Face of ProSAVANA*, which shows a land grabbing case experienced by Brazilian peasants under the Prodecer programme – the Japanese-Brazilian initiative that initially inspired ProSAVANA (UNAC and ORAM, 2013).⁵ Months before the meeting in Vila Sede de Mutuali, advocacy agents from UPC showed the movie to raise awareness of ProSAVANA. These agents convinced each community to buy one litre of fuel for an electrical generator, which enabled them to screen the film. This documentary was often mentioned by the subsistence farmers during the public audience. It worked as a mobilisation tool for the activists, who explored similarities between the two cases – in Brazil and Mozambique (Shankland and Gonçalves 2015).

The Agromoz case was another that they repeatedly raised. At the public meeting, the traditional leader of 'Mutuali 5' – a community in the district of Malema – showed the adverse impact of Agromoz's activities on communities, highlighting that many peasants had migrated to Mutuali. He said that a traditional leader in Guruè had agreed to sell 500 acres. He went on to say that the villagers watched their houses being literally blown up and had lost banana, orange, lemon and mango trees. 'Now we've realised that ProSAVANA has arrived in Nampula and suddenly I've realised that those people from Zambezia are with us now, here [in Nampula province]. If the same thing happens to us, what will we do?' he asked.⁶

A peasant farmer reminded those at the meeting that some people had only heard of ProSAVANA for the first time in 2012. He said the idea of ProSAVANA had initially sounded interesting, but that a few months later farmers had seen the film [The Hidden Face of ProSAVANA] that showed what had happened to small-scale

farmers in Brazil in a similar situation. ‘The images show the theft committed against people who are now in a very bad position. They were expelled from their land and moved to the hills. That is why we are concerned now.’ The peasant farmer said that the same process had almost happened in another village, but that ‘people knew how to defend themselves’: ‘In [the village of] Anameli they are also scared (...). What is going on with our government? Policy and ideas are different things. We are asking for an explanation here!’ he said. Tomas replied: ‘We see there are only questions here. It is easier to criticise than to present suggestions. Please, we also ask you for suggestions.’⁷

Another peasant farmer told the meeting that there are a number of companies that have appeared in the last few years in the region between Zambezia and Nampula. Their owners promised development with communities, but nothing happened. He complained about the lack of assistance for small-scale farmers. ‘What happened in Agromoz is disturbing. If they call us to work and we don’t want to go, what will happen? A poor man like me can’t say anything against a rich entrepreneur because of the danger of retaliation.’⁸ Another farmer, on the other hand, welcomed the ProSAVANA team and said that peasants wanted to know more about increasing production for small-scale farmers and about the benefits of ProSAVANA for the target population:

You won’t find people’s proposals here today. You will hear people saying: ‘You’re mafiosos’ (gangsters), your project is nonsense and there are companies that have already fooled us and expelled us from our lands.’ This, you will find here today. [...] However, if Mr Tomas brings us an agricultural tractor, for example, he will be welcome. Motivation is needed. ProSAVANA’s team cannot be insensitive to people’s needs.⁹

After the two-hour long meeting, it was clear that this was not a hearing to co-create the project; rather, it was a debate, and a platform to air questions and opposition. Nina Manganhelas, the Ministry of Agriculture (MINAG) representative, said that it seemed that people didn’t want the programme in the community, saying: ‘We need to get a conclusion and I don’t want to hear it from civil society [i.e. dwellers in urban areas]. I want to hear it from the people that live here. Those who have already spoken, please let the landowners say something [...]’ But she was then interrupted by a voice from the audience: ‘The main conclusion will be that people don’t need the Brazilians or Japanese here. They are all ‘*mafiosos*’ [gangsters] and that’s that.’ The same idea of ‘legitimacy’ that was ‘suitable’ for the state officials was also used by Manganhelas to question civil society’s presence there. Manganhelas wanted to stop civil society’s ‘scene’, undermining activists’ legitimacy and giving another chance for the landowners to speak for themselves.

Maganhelas' words seemed to suggest indirectly that Mutuali could carry on without the benefits offered.

Among the women sitting behind the group of men on the chairs in the audience, one asked to speak for the first time. Speaking in Makwa, she said she was tired of her community being hungry. 'We don't want ProSAVANA because we end up doing the planting, and then what we produce leaves the country,' and this is a common impression of Agromoz. Another man added: 'The company produces things with machines, while we suffer. We are not against the government; we just want to know how ProSAVANA can help us.' After this declaration, the peasants said they were tired and left, leaving the civil society outsiders and ProSAVANA members to argue. In Mozambique, a public meeting is expected to have an official start and close. According to a UPC member, 'It's part of our tradition.' That particular hearing in Mutuali had no official closure, in any sense of the word.

GENERATING AND PERFORMATIVE COMPONENTS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

It was officially declared that public hearings were open to peasant input because ProSAVANA's Master Plan Draft Zero 'was still incomplete'.¹⁰ Ten days after the Mutuali hearing, however, representatives from the Peasants' Association were threatened because the community had not endorsed ProSAVANA at the hearing. The administrative head wanted to know who had invited so many people, as the government had only sent 25 invitations. The community authority had asked representatives of the peasant farmers' associations in the towns of Iapaca and Mulicana to convince farmers to change their stance (Blog ADECRU, 2015). Endorsement through imposition of power was also clear when the Mutuali chief sang FRELIMO's independence anthem. The song served to set the tone, and drew attention to the fact that even though everyone was in opposition and resentful, and were full of questions, the freedom fighting FRELIMO was a representative of the state. The anthem and Tomas' rigid approach were also intimidating and served as a reminder to the peasants of who they are and where they were. Decades before, this was a field in which FRELIMO had – in addition to freedom fighting – implemented violent coercion measures after the liberation war and during the civil war, and had kept retaliation methods alive for those contesting the party in rural areas (Seibert, 2003).

Among the peasants and subsistence farming communities in Nampula, there is a narrative about a 'secret policy' behind ProSAVANA (Santarelli, Nabuco and Mariano, 2015). This collective story argues that the political elite is conniving with foreign companies for

land-grabbing purposes. The alliance between the colonial political elite and foreign companies for over 100 years is part of the historical narrative about fallacies and moral contradictions that have resulted in defiance around issues of moral economy and civil liberties (see French, 1995). In the case of ProSAVANA, there are narratives that reinforce peasants' scepticism, and these were exposed during the public audience in Mutuali. While ProSAVANA promised support and a positive relationship between family and market, the peasant farmers highlighted that ProSAVANA's 'brother programme' in Brazil, Prodecer, encouraged land-grabbing cases and led to displacement and loss of subsistence. In addition, they exposed that they had witnessed land-grabbing cases in neighbouring areas. Therefore, the combination between recent visible elements and the historical narrative made the ProSAVANA agreement – proposed by the government's technical staff in the frontline – at best tenuous in the peasants' eyes, and at worst a threat to both land tenure security, the peripheral issue; and, consequently, subsistence security, the real issue (Pessôa, 2018). For the peasant farmers, ProSAVANA's promises are the new version of an old moral contradiction seen over the past century. In Mutuali, the public audience ended with the peasants walking out, something that is not normal in Mozambique.¹¹

Prior to the Mutuali event, defiance was generated in two ways in what I call a 'generating component'. The first was the documentary *The hidden face of ProSAVANA* – which brought the land-grabbing cases of Prodecer in Brazil to the notice of peasant communities and deconstructed the idea that ProSAVANA would not affect subsistence security. The strategy addressed the hidden power by focusing on strengthening awareness (Powercube, 2011). On several occasions, peasants cited the video when confronting the technical team about land-grabbing. The second was the evidence of actual threats to subsistence security in Guruè, a neighbouring district. In this case, land tenure insecurity had become very visible to the peasant farmers because the victims of the land-grabbing had sought refuge in Mutuali, and this fact was raised by the peasants. This connected the documentary with land-grabbing cases in the region and upheld the discourse of peasant resistance.

At Mutuali, two 'performative components' also helped to challenge the invisible and hidden power in the invited space (Gaventa, 2006). The first was the forceful discourse of activists, represented by members of regional and national organisations. Civil society activists used the first minutes in the audience to 'suggest' a contentious performance that was reproduced by peasants during the audience, questioning alleged contradictions in ProSAVANA. While the activists' discourse was multi-thematic and hard for the

poorly-educated peasants to take in as it intermingled environmental concepts with those of governance and gender equality – it served to technically challenge the government representatives and their hidden power expressions. They also deconstructed the authority of Party/State agents by challenging dominant stereotypes and discourses. This forceful discourse by the activists showed they understood the complexities of speaking publicly in such places, and how to break hidden and invisible barriers in such spaces with invited participants. The fact that the ProSAVANA technicians repeatedly asked for more respect is clear proof of this. The second component was made up of the ‘cryptic and opaque’ actions (Scott, 1990, p. 137). The peasant farmers’ content was mono-thematic, focused on fear of subsistence insecurity. They had their own way to deal with their ‘subaltern’ condition and expose their feelings in the invited space through play-like interventions with a behavioural component of cryptic and opaque actions. The playfulness proposed by the peasants in the public audience seemed to reduce the confrontational tone to amusing performances and humorous provocations.¹² Such actions express defiance and deconstruct invisible power in the frontline during stakeholders’ meetings by using a communication tactic that challenges ‘dominant stereotypes and discourses’ (Powercube, 2011). In the case of Mutuali, such actions are represented in the ironic, but critical discourse related to ProSAVANA, the form whereby the peasant farmers created scenarios and made their peers and even the technical staff laugh.

CONCLUSION

We have seen that performative and generating components of defiance deconstructed power on the frontline. On the frontline, the government representatives used conciliatory discourse and a narrative of advantages that ProSAVANA could bring to peasants. Activists presented multi-thematic confrontational narratives that met issues raised by the peasants’ discourses. Local and provincial civil society members recovered historical narratives based on unfulfilled expectations and powerful parties’ moral contradictions and fallacies. Observing these narratives during the defiance at the frontline leads to a better understanding of what the real issues are for the subsistence farming communities in ProSAVANA’s framework, and how they managed to expose it and overcome power barriers in the field.

NOTES

- 1 The mining plan in Tete expects significant production increases from 12 million tonnes in 2013, to 53 million tonnes in 2017, and then up to 60 million tonnes in 2022. (Eight-Japan Engineering Consultants, 2014, p. 4-13) “Therefore it is crucial that certain concerns, such as those raised around land, be addressed not only in ProSAVANA but through PEDEC as well” (Classen, Watanabe and Akimoto, 2014, p. 5).
- 2 Public audience audio, Mutuali, 28 April 2015. One of the members of Forum Terra translated the Makua phrases for me.
- 3 Public audience audio, Mutuali, 28 April 2015
- 4 Ibid
- 5 Ibid
- 6 Ibid
- 7 Ibid
- 8 Ibid
- 9 Ibid
- 10 International NGO Worker interview, Nampula, 28 April 2015; NGO worker interview, Maputo, 13 May 2015
- 11 Local NGO Worker interview, Nampula, 28 April 2015;
- 12 In the western region of Nampula province and other areas of the country, catholic missions have encouraged community empowerment through using “role play” simulating theatrically their realities since the 1980s. Many local leaders emerged from these cultural activities in communities which tackled local issues (NGO worker interview, Maputo, 7 December 2014; NGO Worker, Nampula, 28 April 2015 and NGO Worker, Nampula, 30 April 2015)

REFERENCES

- ABC. Moçambique, 2014. www.abc.gov.br/Projetos/CooperacaoSul-Sul/Mocambique. Accessed 16 November 2016.
- AGÊNCIA BRASIL. BNDES suspende financiamentos a empreiteiras investigadas pela Lava Jato, 2016. Available in: <http://agenciabrasil.ebc.com.br/economia/noticia/2016-10/bndes-endurece-criterios-para-apoio-exportacao-de-servicos-de-engenharia>. Accessed: 17 October 2016.
- AGROANALYSIS. FGV lança fundo pioneiro de investimentos em agrogócio, 2012. Available in: <http://bibliotecadigital.fgv.br/ojs/index.php/agroanalysis/article/view/24613/23385>. Accessed: 12 November 2016.
- BBCBrasil. Africanos temem perda de espaço no novo governo brasileiro, 2015. Available in: <http://www.bbc.com/portuguese/brasil-36404339>. Accessed: 16 November 2016.
- Blog ADECRU. Governo do distrito de Malema persegue e ameaça camponeses que rejeitaram o ProSAVANA, 2015. Available in: <https://adecru.wordpress.com/2015/05/11/governo-do-distrito-de-malema-persegue-e-ameaca-camponeses-que-rejeitaram-o-prosavana/#more-338>. Accessed 05 December 2015.
- CABRAL, L.; LEITE, I. ProSAVANA and the Expanding Scope of Accountability in Brazil’s Development Cooperation. *Global policy*. v.6 n.4, p. 435-445, 2015.
- CABRAL, L.; NORFOLK, S. Inclusive Land Governance in Mozambique: Good Law, Bad Politics? *IDS Working Paper* 478. Brighton: IDS, 2016.

CABRAL, L., SHANKLAND, A., FAVARETO, A. and Vaz, A.C. Brazil-Africa AGRICULTURAL COOPERATION ENCOUNTERS: Drivers, Narratives and Imaginaries of Africa and Development. **IDS Bulletin**. v. 44, p. 53-68, 2013.

CHICHAVA, S.; DURÁN, J. Civil society organisations' political control over Brazil and Japan's development cooperation in Mozambique: More than a mere whim? **LSE Working Paper** n.2, London: LSE, 2016.

CLASSEN, S. F., WATANABE, N. and Akimoto, Y.. ProSAVANA Civil Society Report 2013 – Findings and Recommendations, 2014. Available in: <www.ngo-jvc.net/jp/projects/advocacy/data/prosavana-ikenkoukan-9-7.pdf>. Accessed: 20 Sep. 2015)

DINHEIRO RURAL. Rumo à África, 2012. Available in: <http://dinheiorural.com.br/secao/agronegocios/rumo-africa>. Accessed: 7 Dec. 2015.

EIGHT-JAPAN ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS, ORIENTAL CONSULTANTS CO. LTD., RECS International, International Development Center of Japan, Kokusai Kogyo. PEDEC-NACALA: O projeto das Estratégias de Desenvolvimento Econômico do Corredor de Nacala na República de Moçambique. Report. Tokyo: ECFA, 2014

Fingermann, N. A Cooperação Trilateral Brasileira em Moçambique, um estudo de caso comparado: Proalimentos e o ProSAVANA. PhD dissertation. Fundação Getúlio Vargas, SP, 2014.

FOLHA DE SÃO PAULO. Brasil recua e reduz projetos de cooperação e doações para a África, 2015. Available in: www1.folha.uol.com.br/mundo/2015/03/1606466-brasil-recua-e-reduz-projetos-de-cooperacao-e-doacoes-para-a-africa.shtml (accessed 17 November 2016).

FRENCH, S.A. What is Social Memory? **Southern Cultures**. v.2, n.1, p. 9-18, 1995.

GAVENTA, J. Finding the Spaces for Change: a power analysis. **IDS Bulletin**. v. 37, n.6, p. 23-33, 2006.

IKEGAMI, Koichi. Corridor Development and Foreign Investment in Agriculture: Implications of the ProSAVANA Programme in Northern Mozambique. In: LAND GRABBING, CONFLICT AND AGRARIAN-ENVIRONMENTAL TRANSFORMATIONS: PERSPECTIVES FROM EAST AND SOUTHEAST ASIA, Conference Paper n.30, 5-6 June 2015, Chiang Mai University.

MANDAMULE, U. (2015) *Discursos à Volta do Regime de Propriedade da Terra em Moçambique*, Observador Rural.No32, Maputo: OMR.

MARIANO, J, Nabuco, L.; SANTARELLI. Daqui à Nada, 2015. Available in: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YQWjWGrS7FA> (accessed 08 May 2016).

MOSCA, J.; BRUNA, N. (2015) *ProSAVANA: discursos práticos e realidades*, Observador Rural No31/Agosto, Maputo: OMR.

PESSÔA, M. Defiant Civil Society: Power and Contestation in Mozambique, PhD dissertation at University of Sussex/Institute of Development Studies, 2018.

POWERCUBE/IDS. Powercube, 2011. Available in: www.powercube.net. Accessed: 3 Mar. 2017.

SANTARELLI, M., NABUCO, L.; MARIANO, J. Daqui a Nada, 2015. Available in: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YQWjWGrS-7FA>. Accessed: 11 Nov. 2015.

SCOTT, J. **The moral economy of the peasant: rebellion and subsistence in southeast Asia**. London: Yale University Press, 1976

SCOTT, J. **Domination and the arts of resistance: Hidden Transcripts**. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990

SEIBERT, G. **The vagaries of violence and power in post-colonial Mozambique**. Leiden: Brill, 2003

Shankland, A., Gonçalves, E.; Favareto, A. Social movements, agrarian change and contestation of ProSAVANA. Mozambique and Brazil. **FAC Working Paper 137**, Brighton: FAC, 2016

SHANKLAND, Alex and Gonçalves, E. Imagining agricultural development in South-South Cooperation: the contestation and transformation of ProSAVANA. **Paper forthcoming in World Development**. 2015

UNAC and ORAM. The hidden face of ProSAVANA, 2013, Available in: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jUKmyKf5E0k>. Accessed 18 July 15.

COMPONENTS OF DEFIANCE AT LOCAL LEVEL IN LAND CONFLICTS IN MOZAMBIQUE

Resumo: Este artigo destaca a configuração da contestação em nível local em Moçambique através da descrição etnográfica de uma das audiências públicas sobre o plano diretor do ProSAVANA no primeiro semestre de 2015. O texto inclui narrativas e comportamentos de integrantes de organizações da sociedade civil, pequenos agricultores e agentes do governo moçambicano. Contextualiza brevemente o ProSAVANA e observa a audiência pública que mostrou o maior nível de contestação contra o programa, deixando claro os contrastes entre o que o governo ofereceu aos camponeses, como as organizações da sociedade civil reagiram ao que foi oferecido e o que os agricultores queriam. O artigo possibilita melhor compreensão sobre o que são questões reais e questões periféricas para as comunidades de pequenos agricultores em Moçambique e como os pequenos agricultores conseguiram superar imensas barreiras de poder para expor suas questões reais.

Palavras-chave: ProSAVANA; Moçambique; Sociedade Civil

