

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56593**Title: UNE ETUDE SOCIO-ANTHROPOLOGIQUE DE CONFRONTATION DE LOGIQUES D'ACTEURS EN CONTEXTE DE MISE EN ŒUVRE DE LA POLITIQUE DE SECURISATION FONCIERE RURALE CHEZ LES PEUPLES DE TIAPOUM ET DE DIKODOUGOU (COTE D'IVOIRE)****Recommendation:****Accept after minor revision**

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓,		
Techn. Quality		✓,		
Clarity	✓,			
Significance	✓,			

Reviewer Name: Dr Abdul Haseeb Mir**Detailed Reviewer's Report**

The article titled "Une étude socio-anthropologique de confrontation de logiques d'acteurs en contexte de mise en œuvre de la politique de sécurisation foncière rurale chez les peuples de Tiapoum et de Dikodougou (Côte d'Ivoire)" is a sophisticated and critically engaged piece of scholarship that addresses one of the most contentious issues in contemporary African development: the formalization of rural land rights. By conducting a comparative study of two distinct ecological and cultural zones in Côte d'Ivoire—Tiapoum in the southeast and Dikodougou in the north—the author provides a nuanced exploration of why the 1998 Rural Land Law (Law No. 98-750) has often failed to deliver the social peace and investment security it promised. The paper's central thesis—that land formalization is not a neutral technical process but a socio-political field where conflicting "logics of actors" collide—represents a significant contribution to the fields of rural sociology, political anthropology, and land governance.

The methodology is one of the article's primary strengths. The author utilizes a robust socio-anthropological framework, drawing on the sociology of power relations and strategic analysis (notably the works of Crozier and Friedberg) to deconstruct the behaviors of stakeholders. The study is grounded in a massive empirical undertaking, involving 355 respondents across various social strata, including traditional chiefs, migrant farmers, youth leaders, and state officials. This multi-vocal approach allows the author to move beyond official state narratives and capture the "lived reality" of land reform. By triangulating archival data with qualitative interviews, the research provides a three-dimensional view of

REVIEWER'S REPORT

how legal instruments like the "Certificat Foncier" (Land Certificate) are interpreted and manipulated on the ground.

The author's conceptualization of the "confrontation of logics" is particularly insightful. The paper identifies four primary competing logics: the **Etatique (State) Logic**, which views land as a taxable, mapped, and legally transparent asset; the **Customary Logic**, which views land as an ancestral heritage and a source of social identity that cannot be easily alienated; the **Economic Logic**, driven by the desire for productivity and collateral; and the **Identity Logic**, which uses land as a marker of "autochthony" versus "allochthony." The article brilliantly demonstrates that the implementation of the law acts as a "catalyst" that forces these latent, often contradictory logics to confront one another in the public sphere. This confrontation frequently results in what the author terms a "paradox of security," where the very act of attempting to secure a title creates a new state of legal and social vulnerability.

A significant portion of the analysis is dedicated to the "recomposition of norms." The author argues that local actors are not merely passive recipients of state law; they are strategic "bricoleurs" who hybridize customary and modern norms. For instance, the paper documents how some actors use land certificates to retroactively validate dubious customary sales or to exclude long-term "guest" farmers (allogènes) from rights they had previously held under the customary "tutorat" system. This "weaponization" of the law highlights the dark side of land formalization, suggesting that without strong social mediation, formal rights can become a tool for the dispossession of the politically and economically weak. The author's critique of the "Evolutionary Theory of Land Rights"—which assumes a linear progression from communal to individual private property—is well-founded and supported by the findings in both Tiapoum and Dikodougou.

The comparative aspect of the research adds a layer of depth that is often missing from single-site studies. By contrasting the N'zima people of the south with the diverse ethnic groups of the north, the author shows that while the specific cultural textures of land conflict may vary, the underlying structural tension created by the state's intervention is universal. In the south, tensions are often linked to the high value of industrial plantation land, while in the north, they are tied to pastoral-agricultural transitions and ancestral territorialities. This broadens the article's appeal, making it relevant not only to Ivorian specialists but to anyone studying land reform in the Global South.

However, for the manuscript to reach the highest level of academic impact, a few minor revisions are recommended. First, the paper would benefit from a more explicit discussion of the role of the "Village Land Management Committees" (Comités Villageois de Gestion Foncière - CVGF). While mentioned, a deeper look at whether these committees serve as genuine bridges between logics or as sites of elite capture would provide valuable practical insight for policymakers. Second, while the qualitative data is

REVIEWER'S REPORT

extensive, the inclusion of a few "case vignettes"—specific narrative accounts of a single dispute—would help humanize the abstract "logics" discussed and make the "confrontation" more tangible for the reader. Furthermore, the author should consider a more detailed exploration of the "procedural" barriers. The high cost and bureaucratic complexity of obtaining a land certificate are noted as deterrents, but a brief analysis of how these barriers specifically exclude women and youth—groups often marginalized in both customary and state systems—would add an important intersectional dimension to the research. This would strengthen the author's argument regarding the fragility of social systems under the pressure of formalization.

From a structural and linguistic perspective, the article is exceptionally well-written. The narrative flow from theoretical development to empirical findings and finally to a critical synthesis is logical and persuasive. The bibliography is current and reflects a deep engagement with both Francophone and Anglophone scholarship on land tenure, ensuring the work is well-situated within global academic standards. To improve scannability, the author might consider including a comparative table or diagram that summarizes the "conflicting logics" for quick reference.

In summary, this article is a vital and necessary contribution to the discourse on land governance. It successfully deconstructs the myth of the "neutral law" and reveals the complex social negotiations that determine the success or failure of development policies. By documenting how formalization redessine (redraws) the local balance of power, the author provides a warning and a guide for future interventions. The research is a testament to the power of socio-anthropological inquiry in uncovering the "hidden transcripts" of state-led reform. With the addition of a few specific case illustrations and a more detailed look at the internal dynamics of village committees, this paper will be a landmark piece of scholarship.

Recommendation: Recommend for publication with minor revision.