



# Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) KONINKLIJKE NEDERLANDSE AKADEMIE VAN WETENSCHAPPEN

## **New frontier spaces: Complex entanglements and power relations (re)shaping land governance in Laos**

Suhardiman, Diana; al, et

### ***published in***

Contested resource frontiers in mainland Southeast Asia  
2022

### ***document version***

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

### ***document license***

Taverne

[Link to publication in KNAW Research Portal](#)

### ***citation for published version (APA)***

Suhardiman, D., & al, E. (2022). New frontier spaces: Complex entanglements and power relations (re)shaping land governance in Laos. In O. Tappe (Ed.), *Contested resource frontiers in mainland Southeast Asia* (pp. 129-142)

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the KNAW public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the KNAW public portal.

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

### **E-mail address:**

[pure@knaw.nl](mailto:pure@knaw.nl)

# 6

## NEW FRONTIER SPACES

### Complex Entanglements and Power Relations (Re)shaping Land Governance in Laos

*Diana Suhardiman and Jonas Kramp*

#### INTRODUCTION

Land, and the way it is governed in Laos, reflects its central positioning for the country's socio-economic development and how the state views it predominantly as an economic asset and extractive resource. Increasing commodification of land and other natural resources has also manifested in the state's territorialization approach and strategies that have sought to reorder relationships between people, land, and the natural environment in ways that facilitate state aims of political control while also promoting economic development. Since the country's independence in 1975, the state has been focusing on various policies to sustain, expand and strengthen its political control. These policies

include internal resettlement (Baird and Shoemaker 2005; Évrard and Goudineau 2004; Ponce, this volume), land use planning and land allocation programme (Lestrelin 2010; Rigg 2005), as well as various forms of land commodification through the granting of state land concession (Kenney-Lazar, Dwyer, and Hett 2018; Kenney-Lazar 2019).

In this chapter,<sup>1</sup> we look at the interplay between the state's territorialization approach and strategies and the (re)shaping of frontier dynamics which (un)make the Lao uplands (Kramp, Suhardiman, and Keovilignavong 2020). Rasmussen and Lund (2018) have advocated for a bifocal perspective of territorialization and frontier dynamics, making visible their interplay in (re)configuring space, property relations and institutional arrangements. Both concepts have been used by scholars to analyse and discuss the transformations of upland areas across Southeast Asia (Barney 2009; Diepart and Sem 2018; Hall, Hirsch, and Li 2011). Scholars have also shown how territorial politics shape institutional structures (Bolloyer 2018; Keating 2018) and public policies (Agnew and Mantegna 2018). In Laos, and the region in general, state's territorialization approaches and the (re)shaping of frontier dynamics are most apparent in how states "divide their territories into complex and overlapping political and economic zones, rearrange people and resources within these units, and create regulations delineating how and by whom these areas can be used" (Vandergeest and Peluso 1995, p. 387).

Building on these works, we identify two venues where new frontier spaces emerged and took shape: policy formulation processes and programme implementation. First, we show how the process of (re)creating space, or the unfolding of frontier dynamics, has entered policymaking arenas drawing on the case of the national master plan on land allocation (NMPLA) formulation process. Viewing the NMPLA both as a state's territorialization strategy and breeding ground for new frontier spaces, we illustrate how its formulation process is (re)shaped by ongoing power struggles driven by sectoral government ministries' development targets and bureaucratic competition between various government agencies. Second, we illustrate how different groups within a local community (re)shape local land use planning processes, how they are rooted in complex entanglements of property relations and access to land, and how this manifested in various forms of contestations, both within and outside state spaces (Kenney-Lazar 2019).

## FRONTIER SPACES, STATE TERRITORIALIZATION AND STATE FORMATION

Frontier spaces indicate where new resources and commodities come into being and may thus be described in their basic form as “epistemological, discursive and political operations [that enable] powerful actors to turn nature into economic commodities” (Rasmussen and Lund 2018, p. 391). Anna Tsing has famously described this phenomenon in the Indonesian context of Kalimantan (Tsing 2005, p. 32): “A frontier is an edge of space and time: a zone of not yet mapped, not yet regulated. It is a zone of unmapping: even in its planning, a frontier is imagined as unplanned. Frontiers aren’t just discovered at the edge; they are projects in making geographical and temporal experience.” In their recent work, building on Tsing (2005), Cons and Eilenberg (2019, p. 12) and colleagues call for an understanding of the frontier as an imaginative zone, i.e., an entanglement “anchored in the imaginative, the material, the known and the unknown” that goes beyond frontiers merely being conceived in terms of resource discovery and exploitation.

In this sense, rather than delineating a geopolitical separation of physical space, frontier spaces construct a contact zone or epistemological and political distinction between civilization and the wild (Rasmussen and Lund 2018). In the Lao upland, the government’s<sup>2</sup> reforestation policy, for example, aiming to increase forest cover by 2020 to 70 per cent (MRLG 2019), paired with framing swidden agriculture as destructive have worked among other factors as frontier dynamics conjuring an image of the desired future situation in which “backward” swidden agriculture is stabilized and production is fixed. This legitimizes the demarcation of swidden fallows as state-owned forest land (“degraded forest”) rendering them unfit for production under shifting cultivation, i.e., appropriating land and resources for environmental ends (Fairhead, Leach, and Scoones 2012). Moreover, recent economic policies have produced frontier spaces in the Lao upland through concessions and encouragement of foreign investment under the slogan of “turning land into capital”<sup>3</sup> and under the rationale of progress and rural development (Kenney-Lazar, Dwyer, and Hett 2018).

Aligned with Tsing’s (2005) understanding of frontiers, Barney (2009, p. 152) describes the Lao upland frontier as unevenly distributed (“striated and patchworked”) and produced by legal and extralegal means. Drawing on Rasmussen and Lund (2018), we argue that

frontierization processes in Laos and beyond have not only transformed uplanders' property relations but also dissolve other aspects of existing social orders—e.g., customary rights, political jurisdictions and subjectivities. Hence, these two sets of dynamics are co-existent and constitutive as frontier dynamics unmake and territorialization establishes spatial control.

At the heart of this interplay lies a dialectic relation between (political) authority and rights and the ensuing contested (re)production of social contracts of recognition (Lund 2016; Lund and Rahman 2018). The latter is manifested in power struggles over multiple interests across scales. This begs the question of how these struggles centred on actors' (in)ability to produce and/or translate political authority and rights through the (re)shaping of local institutional arrangements. This directs our attention not only to how state territorialization and frontier dynamics have formed an integral part of state formation processes, but also to the agency of institutional actors, including the different groups in local communities, and their capacity to shape the process of state formation. Here, we view national policy formulation processes on land in general, and with regard to the NLMPA formulation in particular as an arena of power struggles, a space in the making, (re)shaped by policy actors' interests, strategies and access to resources. Similarly, local arrangements over access to land and customary land rights regimes in Laos illuminate the complexity of state formation—as the latter is shaped by territorialization and the production of frontier space, which are themselves shaped and reshaped by various actors' (i.e., state actors, private sector actors such as rubber companies, and farmers) multiple and often competing goals and interests.

## **THE NLMPA AS A NEW TERRITORIAL FRONTIER**

Despite the lofty goals of the NMPLA as a technical means to address the country's land governance challenges and serve as the national master plan for land allocation, as outlined in the 2017 Party Resolution on Land, the NMPLA in practice has largely been driven by sectoral ministries' bureaucratic interests to ensure the incorporation of their respective development targets into the plan (Suhardiman, Keovilignavong, and Kenney-Lazar 2019). The NMPLA reflects the Lao government's centralized, socialist planning, similar to the country's

national socio-economic development plan produced every five years and, thus, is carried out in a top-down manner. It is more concerned with checking off boxes of state goals rather than fundamentally changing how land use is planned throughout the country. Thus, the NMPLA can be seen as a strategy of state territorialization in that it seeks to incorporate the country's land use planning strategies and approaches under a unified and centralized umbrella.

However, the NMPLA's ability to enhance state territorialization is complicated by institutional fragmentation among different sectoral ministries that conflict over different goals matching their institutional targets and sectoral base of power. While the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MoNRE), where the Department of Land (DoL) resides, is intended to be the coordinating, cross-sectoral ministry for all land-related matters in the country, such as land use planning and land registration, it does not always fulfil this role. Only recently established in 2012, MoNRE was the result of the merging of several environmentally related government agencies, such as the former National Land Management Authority (NLMA) which was established in 2007. Thus, although MoNRE has the mandate to play a coordinating role, the reality is that other ministries still assert strong influence and control over the lands also pertinent to their sector. For example, the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF) seeks to maintain its control over agriculture and forestry lands while the Ministry of National Defense (MND) seeks to control borderlands that are viewed as critically important for national security (see as well Tappe's contribution to this volume for a related discussion on Lao mining legislation).

As a result of these centralizing dynamics of land use planning combined with institutional fragmentation, the NLMPA process has largely become a process of negotiating different targets for different types of land, with different underlying frontier imaginaries, and within an overarching ratio which aims to fix land uses throughout the country. Here, land classification is reduced to categorizing various types of land use (e.g., forest land, agricultural land) in pursuit of respective government ministries' and departments' political agendas and development targets. For example, one of the most powerful targets for land use planning is that of increasing forest cover to 70 per cent of the country's land area, pursued by the Department

of Forestry (DoF). In practice, however, achieving this target seems impossible due to the overlapping boundaries of agriculture and forest land. A DoL/MoNRE official explained that “while DALaM and DoF respectively define 4.5 million ha of agricultural and 70 per cent forest cover as their development target, in practice, the distinction between forest and agricultural land is not always clear” (Interview with DoL/MoNRE official, August 2017). Overlapping boundaries between forest and agricultural land have their roots in the way the government delineates farmers’ swidden agricultural land and forest land, relying mainly on its objective to eradicate shifting cultivation and thus categorizing upland farms as areas for forest rehabilitation. This is done even though swidden cultivators often lack any other access to land for their farming activities. Theoretically, NLMPA can only be applied and implemented if overlapping boundaries between forest and agricultural land are sorted out. In practice, however, the mapping of these lands alone is hampered by the physical challenges of seasonal fluctuations and yearly rotation of swidden fields. The latter means that a piece of land that is classified as forest land this year can technically be an agricultural land in the next year if farmers decide to do swidden cultivation on that land. Similarly, a piece of swidden land can turn into forest land over time when farmers cultivate elsewhere.

Consequently, the overlapping boundaries of agricultural and forest land show not only how land relations are politically contested but also reveal the re-shaping of the Lao frontier at the policy formulation level, as the latter is (re)shaped by various government agencies’ competing interests and visions. In this context, we argue that while the state’s land-use planning could impose on existing land uses and significantly reduce farmers’ customary land use rights, the way land use planning has been applied in Laos, on the ground, rather reveals that such interventions are often a contested terrain.<sup>4</sup> Our case study of NLMPA shows how different interests are rooted in and entangled in complex property relations on land and how the state aims to (re)shape the latter to sustain and strengthen its political and economic control with severe policy implications. Even though land categorization has become a political process, driven by competing bureaucratic interests, NLMPA merely reflects underlying contestations and power struggles, with little or no prospect for policy implementation.

## OVERLAPPING TERRITORIAL ORDERS AND INTERNAL POWER STRUGGLES

In the Namai upland, Luang Prabang province, overlapping territorial orders and internal power struggles created an internal momentum for rubber expansion on a smaller scale, exacerbating land scarcity, while also reducing the actual significance of land-use planning processes. Over a period of four to five decades (from the early 1970s until recently), territorial aspirations and frontier dynamics have come together in shaping the upland landscape in a contemporaneous effort. Customary land rights occupy in this regard a central role in villagers' decision-making as they are used as a means to secure land holdings and in consequence work to defy state territorialization. The conversion of upland land into rubber gardens feeds on the other hand into the broad-scale project of turning land into capital (e.g., specifically the promotion of rubber as a modern cash crop and a form of forest cover), while also reaffirming the government's misrecognition of claims to swidden land. Even though such conversions are primarily made to secure access to land locally,<sup>5</sup> they reinforce state authority over land by contributing to, rather than challenging, overarching structures. Moreover, by producing rubber independently or as contract farmers, villagers enter into a relationship of mutual recognition in which villagers "breathe life" (Lund 2016) into the Sino-Lao Chilan Rubber Development Company by recognizing its political authority while indirectly lodging a claim (to be recognized by the government) to their land.

Apart from turning land into rubber gardens, some Tai-Lue and Khmu upland holders have also actively engaged in making territory, for example by clearing upland plots, and planting crops on them (e.g., upland rice, maize, mangos), fencing them or by providing use rights to other people. In the local scramble for land, such efforts impeding the defined land-use plan of The Agro-Biodiversity Initiative (TABI) (and its associated mechanism to unmake spatial control of villagers) are often based on subsistence ethics,<sup>6</sup> aiming to maintain customary land (use) rights that ensure access to farmland for upland rice and the production of other crops for consumption. Customary tenure, based on reciprocity, family (and/or former village) ties and traditionalism, in that sense works as a sort of homeostasis in the spatial organization of the Namai upland. However, as discussed in the earlier section,



customary land tenure in the immediate proximities of the village has been increasingly transformed by powerful upland holders who preserve land rental arrangements and plant rubber as a territorial strategy with implications for social as well as labour relations, land use and land control.

While labour relations among Khmu relatives are still based on reciprocity, wage labour has become prominent after Khmu resettlement to Namai village as Khmu settlers had to compensate for their lack of access to farmland or the poor quality of the soil of their plots. Khmu settlers, for example, clear and prepare upland plots for Tai-Lue rubber gardens and tap trees to harvest the latex in return for land or payment in cash or kind. Yet, working as a wage labourer on the plantation of the Sino-Lao Chilan Rubber Development Company is more attractive for Khmu villagers as the salary is higher compared to that of working for Tai-Lue employers. Moreover, many of our Khmu informants stated that they preferred tapping rubber compared to cultivating upland rice on rented plots from Tai-Lue as the latter was very labour intensive. During a focus group discussion some of our Tai-Lue informants agreed that despite the current competition over resources, the positive aspect of Khmu resettlement was that the previous shortage of labour was now solved. Khmu informants described labour relations between Khmu and Tai-Lue villagers as more distant than those among Khmu settlers. However, as described by Bouté (2018), these relations between employer and employee are based on certain conditions for example visits of the Tai-Lue to their employees' homes to celebrate Khmu festivities.

The assemblage of state and non-state institutional actors in Namai village has co-produced a complex patchwork of territorial projects. In this fragmented landscape, uncolonized interstitial spaces have been strategically exploited by villagers to secure their customary land rights (Kramp, Suhardiman, and Keovilignavong 2020). For example, by starting small-scale rubber plantations. TABI does not differentiate on their maps between different categories of rubber production such as agro-industrial rubber plantations, contract farms and independent smallholdings. The general category "rubber" used by TABI thus does not make explicit and thereby does not "expose" which land belongs to independent smallholders, contract farmers or the company. TABI's generalization has in that sense allowed those villagers with enough resources to secure their landholdings as rubber gardens, as stabilized

rubber cultivation as opposed to rotating swidden farming has been tolerated and has met no opposition by government authorities or TABI so far. Rubber expansion and TABI's land use planning process in this regard overlap as rubber spills into the land use plan's reserved area for swidden cultivation.<sup>7</sup>

## CONCLUSION

Our national policy and local case studies have shown how frontier spaces are (re)shaped in policy and local arenas. Furthermore, they illuminated across scales how power relations, different legal orders, and accumulation processes intertwine and are shaped by key stakeholders (e.g., sectoral ministries to sustain and increase their bureaucratic power and villagers to secure their access to land). We have also shown how a rubber frontier space has unmade local land tenure, but more recently has been used as a means to secure farmers' upland plots. Integrating frontier dynamics with a territorialization lens thus allowed us not only to better understand state's and farmers' strategies to secure their respectively bureaucratic power and access to land, but also to unpack the rationales behind these strategies and how they are rooted in views of their customary land rights vis à vis external policy interventions.

Resources such as land or rubber and the dynamics surrounding them have profound consequences on the governance of people and places, as they reshape space and its state-society relations. Frontier dynamics, in our case study, take an ambiguous role in the overall production of authority and rights as the commodification of upland space has become a strategy by both local cash crop farmers, to secure their land tenure, and by the Government of Laos, in its plan to "turn land into capital".<sup>8</sup> Baird (2019) has in this regard recently pointed to the GoL's changed understanding of land which is now to a greater extent treated as an economic asset and to a lesser degree as a building block of national sovereignty. Within the GoL's increasingly neoliberal economic agenda, land concessions have become a crucial component and have, as we have shown, provided a channel for smallholders to turn their land into capital and their customary rights over it into a territorial strategy to secure their land tenure. This process of neoliberalizing nature (Bakker 2005) took shape within a larger spatial-territorial configuration (Dwyer 2013) involving other modes of governance (e.g., coercive resettlement, controlling swidden agriculture by delineating

resource use, patronage and rent-seeking of villagers and subsistence ethics). What is interesting in this development is that farmers who have historically faced difficulties in getting government institutions to recognize their land tenure were able to secure the latter through rubber cultivation following a process of territorialization from the ground up. Local rent-seeking of villagers in their scramble for land has in that sense worked together with a neoliberal mode of governance that has established a market for rubber and has allowed for an increasing influence of the Sino–Lao Chilan Rubber Development Company over local resource use. Looking at the process of state formation and the intensification of capitalist relations from below has shown how new social contracts among non-state actors have crystallized giving rise to new configurations of recognition on the local level.

Subsistence ethics and the existing institutional setup have in this process undergone a capitalist transformation with implications for the village's social structure, prompting an increasing social differentiation between villagers. Ethnic minorities in particular take on a disadvantaged position due to their ethnic, educational, political, social and geographical resources. Social inequality of ethnic minority groups within the Laotian process of state formation has become more pronounced as the reconfiguration of spatial relations engendered exclusionary effects. In this paper, we have tied this unequal development to the sectoral ministries' competition for bureaucratic power and to the resulting institutional impasse that cements an imaginative project (see Tsing 2005) rendering swidden farmers as backward and destructive and leaving upland farmers' swidden plots, at best, in legal limbo. Land use policies and planning interventions seeking to transform upland regions, therefore, need to take into account more carefully local power relations, customary land rights and the dynamic nature of swidden cultivation.

## Notes

1. Key findings from the chapter are derived from authors' earlier work (Suhardiman, Keovilignavong, and Kenney-Lazar 2019; Kramp, Suhardiman, and Keovilignavong 2020). Jonas Kramp's field work for this article was undertaken previous to his joining the GIZ's Land Governance Team in Germany. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not reflect the positions of the GIZ.

2. Department of Forestry (DOF).
3. The umbrella policy phrase “Turning Land into Capital” that was coined at the 8th Party Congress in 2006 (Kenney-Lazar, Dwyer, and Hett 2018; Dwyer 2007). Since 1986 and Laos’s transition towards a market economy, the government has promoted various forms of land commodification, especially land titling and the granting of state land concessions. New territories of commodified land, especially in the form of concessions, were created through widespread land dispossession, whereby companies acquired farmers’ land and communal forest as part of their land concession agreement (Kenney-Lazar, Suhardiman, and Dwyer 2018; Suhardiman et al. 2015; Schumann et al. 2006).
4. While the issue of overlapping agriculture and forest land could in principle be sorted out from the perspective of different government agency’s defined development targets, this is not so straightforward with regard to land titling. The idea is that with the new land law the government will push for rapid land titling to reach 100 per cent coverage in 2025. In practice, however, different agencies are still discussing as to whether people living in the protected forest can also be given land titles. This highlights that while the land-titling program could in principle increase some farmers’ land tenure security, it can also reduce others’ especially those whose lands are located in national protected forest.
5. Baird (2008) similarly showed how ethnic minorities in northeastern Cambodia planted cashew trees to protect land from external intervention.
6. Drawing on Scott’s (1976) idea of subsistence ethics, Rehbein (2007, p. 26) writes, “[p]leasants’ interests are focused on having enough until the next harvest, not on having as much as possible. They achieve this by mutual aid (reciprocity) and by reinforcing family ties and traditionalism. They aim at survival and security, not at affluence and profit. Reciprocity, family orientation and traditionalism, subsumed under the term subsistence ethics, characterize village society in Laos.”
7. PAFO and TABI staff underlined that one of the primary goals of the joint venture is to promote food crops such as rice and livestock farming to tackle food insufficiency.
8. See note 3 above.

## References

- Agnew, John, and Agostino Mantegna. 2018. “Territorial Politics and Economic Development”. In *Handbook of Territorial Politics*, edited by Klaus Detterbeck and Eve Hepburn, pp. 306–18. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Baird, Ian G. 2008. "Various Forms of Colonialism: The Social and Spatial Reorganization of the Brao in Southern Laos and Northeastern Cambodia". PhD dissertation, University of British Columbia.
- . 2019. "Changes in Understandings of Land in Laos: From State Sovereignty to Capital Mobilization". *Kyoto Review of Southeast Asia* 25. <https://kyotoreview.org/issue-25/land-in-laos-from-state-sovereignty-to-capital-mobilization/> (accessed 10 October 2021).
- , and Bruce Shoemaker. 2005. "Aiding or Abetting? Internal Resettlement and International Aid Agencies in Laos". *Development and Change* 38, no. 5: 865–88.
- Bakker, Karen. 2005. "Neoliberalizing Nature? Market Environmentalism in Water Supply in England and Wales". *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 90, no. 3: 542–65.
- Barney, Keith D. 2009. "Laos and the Making of a Relational Resource Frontier". *Geographical Journal* 175, no. 2: 146–59.
- Bolleyer, Nicole. 2018. "Challenges of Interdependence and Coordination in Federal Systems". In *Handbook of Territorial Politics*, edited by Klaus Detterbeck and Eve Hepburn, pp. 45–60. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Bouté, Vanina. 2018. "New Paths of Work at the Lao-Chinese Border: From Subsistence Agriculture to Wage Labor". In *Searching for Work: Small-Scale Mobility and Unskilled Labor in Southeast Asia*, edited by Matteo Alcano and Silvia Vignato, pp. 23–53. Chiang Mai: Silkworm Books.
- Cons, Jason, and Michael Eilenberg eds. 2019. *Frontier Assemblages: The Emergent Politics of Resource Frontiers in Asia*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Diepart, Jean-Christian, and Thol Sem. 2018. "Fragmented Territories: Incomplete Enclosures and Agrarian Change on the Agricultural Frontier of Samlaut District, North-West Cambodia". *Journal of Agrarian Change* 18, no. 1: 156–77. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joac.12155> (accessed 8 October 2021).
- Dwyer, Mike. 2013. "Building the Politics Machine: Tools for 'Resolving' the Global Land Grab". *Development and Change* 44, no. 2: 309–33. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dech.12014> (accessed 8 October 2021).
- Évrard, Olivier, and Yves Goudineau. 2004. "Planned Resettlement, Unexpected Migrations and Cultural Trauma in Laos". *Development and Change* 35, no. 5: 937–962. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7660.2004.00387.x> (accessed 8 October 2021).
- Fairhead, James, Melissa Leach, and Ian Scoones. 2012. "Green Grabbing: A New Appropriation of Nature?". *Journal of Peasant Studies* 39, no. 2: 237–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2012.671770> (accessed 8 October 2021).
- Friis, Cecilie, Anette Reenberg, Andreas Heinemann, and Oliver Schönweger. 2016. "Changing Local Land Systems: Implications of a Chinese Rubber Plantation in Nambak District, Lao PDR". *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 37, no. 1: 25–42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sjtg.12137> (accessed 8 October 2021).

- Hall, Derek, Philip Hirsch, and Tania Murray Li. 2011. *Powers of Exclusion: Land Dilemmas in Southeast Asia*. Singapore: National University of Singapore Press.
- Keating, Michael. 2018. "Rescaling the European State: A Constructivist and Political Perspective". In *Handbook of Territorial Politics*, edited by Klaus Detterbeck and Eve Hepburn, pp. 17–29. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Kenney-Lazar, Miles. 2019. "Neoliberalizing Authoritarian Environmental Governance in (Post)Socialist Laos". *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 109, no. 2: 338–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2018.1537842> (accessed 8 October 2021).
- , Mike Dwyer, and Cornelia Hett. 2018. *Turning Land into Capital: Assessing Ten Plus Years of Policy in Practice*. Vientiane: LIWG – Land Information Working Group.
- , Diana Suhardiman, and Mike Dwyer. 2018. "State Spaces of Resistance: Industrial Tree Plantations and the Struggle for Land in Laos". *Antipode* 50, no. 5: 1290–310. <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.1239> (accessed 8 October 2021).
- Kramp, Jonas, Diana Suhardiman, and Oulavanh Keovilignavong. 2020. "(Un) Making the Upland: Resettlement, Rubber and Land Use Planning in Namai Village, Laos". *Journal of Peasant Studies* 47: 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2020.1762179> (accessed 8 October 2021).
- Lestrelin, Guillaume. 2010. "Land Degradation in the Lao PDR: Discourses and Policy". *Land Use Policy* 27, no. 2: 424–39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2009.06.005> (accessed 8 October 2021).
- Lund, Christian. 2016. "Rule and Rupture: State Formation Through the Production of Property and Citizenship". *Development and Change* 47, no. 6: 1199–228. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dech.12274> (accessed 8 October 2021).
- , and Noer Fauzi Rahman. 2018. "Indirect Recognition. Frontiers and Territorialization Around Mount Halimun-Salak National Park, Indonesia". *World Development* 101, 417–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.04.003> (accessed 8 October 2021).
- McAllister, Karen E. 2015. "Rubber, Rights and Resistance: The Evolution of Local Struggles Against a Chinese Rubber Concession in Northern Laos". *Journal of Peasant Studies* 42, no. 3–4: 817–37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2015.1036418> (accessed 8 October 2021).
- MRLG. 2019. "Land Tenure Security in 70 Percent Forestland Policy of the Lao PDR". Discussion Note, Vientiane, Mekong Region Land Governance.
- Rasmussen, Matthias, and Christian Lund. 2018. "Reconfiguring Frontier Spaces: The Territorialization of Resource Control". *World Development* 101: 388–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.01.018> (accessed 8 October 2021).
- Rehbein, Boike. 2007. *Globalization, Culture and Society in Laos*. London: Routledge.
- Rigg, Jonathan. 2005. *Living with Transition in Laos: Market Integration in Southeast Asia*. London: Routledge.

- Schumann, Gunda, Pheuiphanh Ngaosrivathana, Bouakham Soulivanh, Somboun Kenpraseuth, Khamdeng Onmanivong, Khamthanh Vongphansipraseuth, and Chithasone Bounkhong. 2006. *Study on State Land Leases and Concessions in Lao PDR*. Land Policy Study no. 4 under LLTP II. Vientiane: GIZ.
- Scott, James. 1976. *The Moral Economy of the Peasant: Subsistence and Rebellion in Southeast Asia*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Suhardiman, Diana, Oulavanh Keovilignavong, and Miles Kenney-Lazar. 2019. "The Territorial Politics of Land Use Planning in Laos". *Land Use Policy* 83, 346–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.02.017> (accessed 8 October 2021).
- , Mark Giordano, Oulavanh Keovilignavong, and Touleelor Sotoukee. 2015. "Revealing the Hidden Effects of Land Grabbing through Better Understanding of Farmers' Strategies in Dealing with Land Loss". *Land Use Policy* 49: 195–202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2015.08.014> (accessed 8 October 2021).
- Tsing, Anna L. 2005. *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Vandergeest, Peter, and Nancy Peluso. 1995. "Territorialization and State Power in Thailand". *Theory and Society* 24, no. 3: 385–426. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00993352> (accessed 8 October 2021).