

F

Factors Effecting Valued-Resource Distribution



Lucy Atieno¹ and Joseph Muiruri Njoroge²

¹Sustainable Travel and Tourism Agenda,
Nairobi, Kenya

²School of Hospitality and Tourism Management,
Murang'a University of Technology, Murang'a,
Kenya

Synonyms

[Sharing of indispensable resources; Targeted circulation or flow of valued supplies/property](#)

Definition

Resources play a vital role in development of communities. Valued resources are those supplies that populations depend on, and whose worth can be equated to substantial monetary value, social or even religious significance. A general definition of the term “valued resource distribution” is the way in which possessions of significance, of interest to multi population groups, are availed/allocated to target populations, for their benefit, in terms of a population’s rights to access, right to use, right to own, and/or right obtain income over such.

Inequalities occur when part of a population as a rights holder is excluded to some extent from

benefiting from a resource value, owing to decisions in allocating resources. For valued resources, populations can be denied the right to usage of resource, right to access to a resource, right to income from a resource, or right to possession of a valued resource.

The value of a resource can be defined by a combination of several factors, ranging from sacred value, to ecological values, historic value, market value, and even value for economic utility. In today’s developing world, many of the valued resources like minerals, food, valued landscapes, data, water, financial resources and energy, can all be attached to some economic utility value.

Introduction

Inequalities in distribution hinder optimum resource utilization for development. Unequal resource distribution is where select few can maintain lion’s share of capital and resources. This primarily occurs when there are flaws in approaches that guide targeting for distribution of resources. Targeting entails choice editing to match resources to select people. Targeting for resource distribution can be determined by any or a mix of these considerations: geographical balance, discretion of authorities, stakeholder push, population-based distribution criteria, and objective considerations.

1. Geographical balance considers needs of a region within a distribution context as a key factor that determines proportions of resource distribution. Some countries think through geographical balance when deciding on budget allocations for subregions.
2. Power can be concentrated to authorities responsible for resource distribution, who have discrete influence over distribution flows.
3. People who connect to certain valued resources as stakeholders can urgently demand for their rights over valued resources to be acknowledged. This often plays in a stakeholder needs space pushing for a bottom-up relevance in informing distribution choices.
4. Population-based distribution criteria prioritizes distribution based on numbers of people in distribution spaces.
5. Objective considerations, e.g., affirmative action to redistribute wealth to those marginalized groups, or ethical contemplations by humanitarian organizations to distribute emergency resources.

This chapter engages in aforementioned considerations, showing that inequality flaws can misguide targeting in valued resource distribution. Unfortunately, sharing of resources is a sociopolitical process with a plurality of stakeholder interests at state and society level. Preferential allocation is given to those who can influence direction of resource flows, leaving others marginalized in distribution outcomes.

Affirmative action can close in resource distribution discrepancies, especially at present time when the world that we live in is unequal, due to global power imbalances. Plenty of the world's valuable resources are held by a very small group of people, and this leads to financial and social discrimination. For instance (World Bank 2008), statistics on the share of world's private consumption show that the world's poorest 20% consume 1.5% whereas the richest 20% consume 76.6%. True equality is in redistribution of wealth and valued resources that are firmly held by select few positioned at top most apex of a distribution hierarchy.

Inequalities in resource distribution also manifest at country level. A highly uneven pattern of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) distribution in South Africa make it one of the most unequal countries worldwide (Hundenborn et al. 2019), and this concern has been among priority issues for the country's post-apartheid governments. Inequality in valued resource distribution has potential spillover effects to health, mobility, and social aspects of people's development. Certainly, most developmental challenges we face today are inequality problems in disguise. This is why Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 10, which aims at reducing inequalities within and among countries, is very important in shaping sustainable development.

SDG 10 on reduced inequalities has strong inter linkages with other SDG's, for example SDG 1 on poverty eradication, and SDG 2 on food security. Inequalities make it more difficult for us to achieve sustainable development targets on food security and poverty eradication, additionally making it more difficult for poor people to access markets. Malnutrition, a major cause of infant mortality worldwide, is still rampant in some countries. Nonetheless, feeding the world is no longer about higher agricultural yields, but rather a matter of fairer distribution of such produce. These are sufficient reasons to show that focus on economic growth alone cannot be fully effective as a pro poor strategy, unless this is anchored on an approach aiming to reduce inequalities. The World Bank (2018) equally acknowledges that reducing inequality index for countries guarantees a larger impact on global poverty than by increasing their economic growth. It is possible for countries to address inequalities on resource distribution by expanding income sources for poor, as well as reducing gaps in opportunities. For example, when a country eliminates income disparity, or stops unfair trade, it expands the window of opportunities for marginalized groups to access income on fair terms along business value chains.

The geographic occurrence of resources across world regions exhibits variance, with some areas either being rich in resources that populations desire or being poor in others. Because of uneven

distribution of resources geographically, populations migrate to areas where their access to required resources may be enhanced. A remarkable example of such a migration in history is the California gold rush in 1849. This rush followed discovery of gold in a remote outpost in California, and resulted to a great influx of settlers in the region. The global pattern of human settlement shows concentration of populations in places that have in plenty resources they need to survive or valued resources. Unequal resource distribution and climate change creates climate refugees. The (UNHCR 2019) confirms that the number of people forcibly displaced globally in 2018 stood at 70.8 million, and some of these displacements are because of climate change. Harsh climate change impacts may erode resources and lead to migration as adaptive response, especially where distribution skips those at the bottom of a distribution hierarchy. Podesta (2019) foresees a situation in Middle East and North Africa, where there will be more competition for food, water, and other valued resources, at both intra and interstate levels, because of climate change.

Valuation

Factors underpinning value of a resource include natural scarcity, artificial scarcity, and desirable physical qualities, e.g., gold has to be scarce and socially confined to retain its value. Speaking of environmental resources, Vatn (2000) uses the term “property” interchangeably with the word “resource.” He defines property as a social relation inseparably connected to the sense of a right. Resource valuation is relative and contingent to dynamic variables, such as self-interest, immediacy of economic gains, counterfactual perception, and social norms. These variables influence individual judgment on ranking of a resource value along a continuum of relative importance, and validate dynamics of resource valuation (Dorsch et al. 2017).

The value in some resources may be defined in their role as trade capital. Take the example of minerals, the worth of which can go up to the tune of millions of dollars. For valued landscapes,

the benefits derive from scenic, historic and other activities. Local communities also have valued attachments to land resources and have competing positions with companies whose demand for natural resource capital increases by the day. The aspect of scarcity elevates the value of a resource; thus, a scarce resource may be considered of a higher value than readily available abundant resources. Abundant resources also carry a measurable value to populations; therefore, they need to be allocated as well. Better targeting in abundant resource distribution can minimize cases of inequalities.

A resource value can be pegged to cultural factors, economic, artistic, typological, service provision, and social aspects. Many sacred forests in Asian countries are of great value to religious communities like the Buddhists. The *Kaya Kinondo* in Kenya’s south coast is also an example of sacred natural heritage held dearly by communities. Likewise, the expansive Aravalli sacred forest in India is of utmost spiritual significance to indigenous communities.

In academic literature, land is among the valued resources that features prominently in terms of analysis of ownership and control, with value for economic utility (Wang et al. 2019; Bantekas 2015; Ellsworth 2002). Nonetheless, land can have sacred value, ecological value, and even historic value. Among the earliest documentation of aforementioned values of land is Chief Seattle’s 1854 letter addressed to the 14th president of the United States, Franklin Pierce (Buerge 2019). Buerge describes Chief Seattle as a Native American living in the Pacific Northwest, serving as tribal chief for the Suquamish and Duwamish tribes. Chief Seattle’s letter was written as a response refuting President Pierce’s proposal to buy native land in the Puget Sound islands along the North Western coast of the USA. This letter emphasizes value of the land as sacred to the Suquamish natives of the islands, and it cannot just be given out for exchange of money. The social uses of land for survival of the local community, which ultimately forms part of their heritage, is also mentioned in the letter. It further suggested that the Suquamish hold dear the

historic value of their land, and therefore treasure every memory lived.

Distribution

Decisions on scarce and abundant resource allocation should have utmost consideration of egalitarian principles. (Dworkin 2000) suggested that resource sharing should be based on equal mathematical division of a resource value to a population number that includes all interested beneficiaries. His distribution strategy is basic, limiting itself to mathematical formula, with the assumption that equal division will eliminate inequalities in distribution system. In a distribution context that ensues from a previously unjust distribution system, Dworkin's principle would not result to fairness unless it considers other variables like vulnerability needs, gender, disability, social class etc. It is a question of whether resources should be distributed equally to ALL, or previously marginalized groups should be prioritized. As much as an inclusive distribution strategy may be ideal, priority on redistribution of resources to vulnerable populations should inform any strategy for inclusivity. This means in demonstrated cases of inequalities, the primary focus should be on first addressing vulnerabilities of marginalized groups, before embarking on an all-inclusive strategy.

The major sources of inequalities with regard to valued resource distribution include:

1. Political biases in resource governance processes. Support for resource distribution based on minimal factor criteria, that disregards interests of multi population groups dependent on the shared resource
2. Dynamics of resource use. Increased demand for a scarce resource may shrink access options for the same for some sections of population, due to skewed distribution avenues. In addition, unsustainable use of resources may lead to their depletion, and consequently affecting distribution. During drought, people may cut down their water usage as a conservation measure.

3. Economic mechanisms, e.g., regulations in international trade have an impact on distributional effects of resources in cross border sharing.

Both state and society have some level of control in shaping decisions that guide distribution of valued resources. Nonetheless, in most world regions, decisions on how to allocate both scarce and abundant resources are yet to fully embrace egalitarian principles. Key authorities in allocation decisions prefer top down approaches in their resolutions, and political, social, cultural and economic interests may shape these.

To reduce inequalities in valued resource distribution, the state can act on some targets defined by the United Nations for SDG 10.

1. Progressively achieving and sustaining income growth of the bottom 40% of its population.
2. Adopting policies, especially on income and social protection, that will allow progressive achievement of greater equality.
3. Improve regulation and monitoring of international trade, and strengthen implementation of such regulation.

States in conflict over shared resources have to adeptly address political difficulties in managing transboundary resources. A state may be viewed as a perpetrator of resource distribution inequalities, if its pattern for resource use may infringe the value accrued from the same or related resource in a transboundary resource-sharing context. For example, the proposed construction of Gibe III dam in Ethiopia stirred an uproar from the neighboring Kenyan side over the possibility of drying up lake Turkana, which would lead to the Turkana community losing their fishing and farming livelihoods. The proposed project site for the dam was Omo River, a tributary of Lake Turkana, and also a UNESCO world heritage site. Similar predicaments were solved by the arguing countries with water treaties that established rules of co sharing, e.g., Nile Water Treaty signed by Egypt and Britain, Indus Water Treaty attempt between India and Pakistan.

Social systems that pressure inequalities in resource distribution determine how decisions over resource allocation are reached. It is possible that conditions for valued resource governance process are hyped on an equity focused front but still fail to deliver on evidence for addressing inequalities. A system where resource flows are shaped by economic positions as well as political explanations of the dominant distributing power imposes some level of restriction to resource access by recipients. Inequalities in resource distribution can also be driven by lack of social systems.

According to Khondeker (2017), social processes sustaining inequalities include (a) *distanciation*, which uses alienation strategies to produce winners and losers, (b) *exploitation*, which is based on categorical division between superior and inferior groups as bases on strengths of their negotiating power over resource distribution decisions, (c) *exclusion*, which is reflected in group-out versus group-in relationships, and (d) *hierarchization*, which is common in bureaucracies and traditional social orders (e.g., caste system).

A common practice for resource distribution among countries is international trade, whose essence is efficient allocation of scarce resources through imports and exports, which facilitate exchange of valued commodities between countries. This relates to considerations of geographical balance. Cross-border trade has been made easier by country membership to regional/global trade blocs, and economic integration of countries within a specific region, e.g., the European Union (EU), the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), the Gulf Cooperation Council for Arab states of the Persian Gulf, Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), the Africa Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA), expected to take effect in 2020, and the World Trade Organization (WTO). These trading blocs provide a framework for possibility for trade in food items. Yet poor regulation on the world food market leads to an overall increase in hunger levels, aggravated by rising food prices and economic crisis. When food prices go up, the vulnerable poor, especially in developing

countries, go hungry, as they cannot afford to buy food in markets next door. The 2008 food crisis, which had several countries facing unrest as families went hungry, was linked to US policy on biofuels, which saw an increasing use of crops for energy production. As a result, food prices inflated, and countries in Africa and Asia were affected the most. At country level, devolved governments guide geographic balance within countries, and this can strengthen equity in resource distribution by bringing resources closer to people. Nonetheless, this approach risks duplication and waste.

Resource ownership may imply authority. Authorities have discretion of determining resource flows based on influences from resource ownership. Scarce and nonrenewable resources that are communal or state owned have to be allocated, and decisions taken to guide equity in distribution. A weighty debatable issue regarding decisions to allocate valued resources is the extent to which rights to a resource authorize rights to exclude those who lack present ownership rights but may have interest to resource benefits. Brundtland report's (World Commission on Environment and Development 1987) definition for sustainable development, as "*development that meets needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs,*" is a clear example on rotational right to resource ownership across generations. This definition cautions that man's right to access, use, and own finite earth's resources in unsustainable consumption patterns exclude future generations and other species from any rights to the same resources. In reality, development that met needs of previous generations compromised the ability of today's generations in meeting their own needs, resulting in loss of agricultural landscapes to sustain populations, climate change whose harsh impacts are already being felt by communities, and pollution. A growing population globally propels agriculture to cause 80% of deforestation. Yet forests are critical water towers, which would create reservoirs to support future generations. On the same note of authorities determining distribution, a pastoralist land owning community may have restrictions in

accessing grazing land for their herds if a government in pursuit of other developmental agendas dictates alternative land use benefits like farming, industrial development, or tourism investment. The community may have the right to own land, but the state dictates land use that favors development. The rights exert a sense of entitlement to a valued resource. Yet, availability of resources does not guarantee entitlement, due to certain sociopolitical factors (Sabar 2017). Entitlement to resources is determined by factors such as institutional structure, political process, ecological system, and traditional social institutions.

Authorities can permit incompatible land use for developers, in deals authorized by governments, e.g., through by laws authorizing increases in height and density of development (Levine-Schnur and Ferdman 2015) analysis shows that between 2007 and 2011, Toronto entered in to 157 agreements permitting increases of height and density of development contrary to wishes of some residents. System of decision-making in land use law is not transparent and is open to bias and personal corruption. Offers for land use can target the highest bidder, especially where the value of the resource is relative and contingent upon speculative and dynamic variables, consequently implying vulnerabilities based on financial status.

Different people have different interests in the value of a common resource, and each will push to safeguard their interests accruing from a valued resource. Take the example of competing needs for water, relative to economic and agricultural growth, and its distribution in such instances has been on unfair terms resulting in inequalities. California drought between 2011 and 2017 resulted in water shortage, with competing needs of irrigation for commercial agriculture versus domestic household use. It was a matter of targeting distribution flow, on whether prioritized focus should be on economic growth to support irrigation needs for commercial agriculture or urgency be given to house hold use. For tourism rich destinations, such as Cape Town in South Africa, luxury tourism guests enjoy abundance of water for daily consumption in various uses while host communities may live in water

scarcity, encountering challenges such as unsafe access to water points or lack of access to quality water for drinking. A similar situation can be observed in the Baixada Santista region in Sao Paulo state, Brazil, where local populations are deprived of water for domestic use every summer, due to influx of tourists who exert additional pressures to the destination's resource consumption (Loyola and Bini 2015). Statistically, a regular tourist uses 10 times more water everyday than a local inhabitant does in developing countries (Tourism Concern 2012). Imbalances in access to, and use of water between vulnerable host communities and affluent visitor groups are based primarily on the privilege of the latter due to their social class, and a misconception of luxury in tourism to mean over consumption, and excessive use of resources. For the aforementioned cases, the matter of targeting distribution recipient is clear, and it is possible that preference is given based on evaluations of how important and influential a particular group of people can be, and what vulnerabilities lie with majority residents and households. Water table depletion because of extreme wastefulness and restricted consumption by select few, denies access to others in need of the same resource.

Paradoxically, countries that enjoy abundance of valued resources may also experience the challenges of poverty. The "resource curse" is a situation in which resource abundant countries experience lower long-run economic growth than resource poor countries due to mismanagement (Clootens and Kirat 2018). This is today evident in oil rich nations such as Nigeria, Ghana, or Venezuela. The sub-Saharan Africa is endowed with valuable natural resources, yet majority of people in sub-Saharan countries live in poverty (World Bank 2018) because of weaknesses in resource distribution structures (Knutson et al. 2016). Corruption accompanying oil discovery in sub-Saharan African countries like Angola, Gabon, and Libya amplifies poverty situation for already poor populations, allowing investors to benefit at the expense of citizenry (Lumor 2017). In Gabon, increase oil revenues led to an overdependence on oil as the only source of income, consequently destroying/replacing the

competitiveness of non-mineral resource sectors like agriculture, and eventually forcing the whole country to rely on imported food (Front Page Africa 2019). On the other hand, Botswana, one of the diamond rich countries in the world, manages its income from minerals effectively, thereby evading the resource curse. The country's best practice on managing income from mineral wealth revolve around good governance, political stability, and strong fiscal discipline (ibid). Botswana's economic approach is diversified, to avoid over dependence on finite mineral resources.

Public expenditure can improve efficiency in resource distribution, with better targeting and impact monitoring. Nonetheless, even the best practice in targeting can be susceptible to restriction elements of resource rights.

Restriction of Elements of Resource Rights

A resource regime refers to the patterns of resource use, ownership, and exchange, present in a given society (Horak 1998), and in a distribution context, such can constrain the extent of exercising rights over a resource. Regimes are shaped by political, economic, and cultural pressures (Marston and Perreault 2016), and this may restrict elements of resource rights, opening up ways for inequality to flourish in resource distribution. Generally, overlaps in political, economic, and cultural pressures deriving from state and society as focal distribution powers for resources influence targeting. Both political and economic pressures shaping resource regimes are closely linked to the state as an authority in distribution. For societies, bulk of this pressure is cultural.

Decisions, which construct entitlement rights to valued resources, have bias to political affiliations, social class, cultural beliefs, and economic influences. Such a bias when interwoven in rights to income from a resource, right to access, right to ownership, and right to manage valued resources, results in inequalities in distribution.

The exploration of forests, land and mineral resources by multinational corporations as invited by the state affects traditional livelihoods in many countries. In Kenya, for example, the laissez faire open door policy for foreign investment in tourism has resulted in ad hoc facility development in

pristine areas for wildlife conservation, compromising ecological integrity as well as creating conflicts with local communities over land use patterns. A survey report by the National Environmental Management Authority in Kenya (Kemei 2014) spotlighted over 50% of accommodation facilities developed in the wildlife-rich Maasai Mara Game Reserve in Kenya operating illegally, with no compliance to environmental standards, and most of them built along riverbanks without consideration of their environmental footprints. Through the state also, natural resource governance strategies can foster inequalities. For instance, diversion of land-based resources for development projects creates inequalities in access to valued resources. Communities are displaced from their traditional pattern of livelihood to pave way for development projects. For example, in Nepal and Indonesia, indigenous people's customary rights to resources get scant attention, if any, on government agenda (Rights and Resources Initiative 2015). In Indonesia, a court decision in 2012 directed that forests customarily belong to indigenous people and should be removed from state managed forests (Rights and Resources Initiative 2015), followed by edits to an article in Forestry Law that stated "*customary forest is STATE forest in indigenous territory*", to "*Customary forest is forest in the ancestral domain/indigenous people's territory*". This provision has about 40 million hectare under indigenous people's territory. The victory in people's rights was as a result of multi stakeholder consultation with government agencies, political leaders, and civil society organizations for support of indigenous people's rights in development of national forest policies.

Right to Income from Resource

This means entitlement to receive payment accruing from value of certain resources. In a best practice scenario, income from a country's valued resources should in principle benefit the citizens. Its allocation should be guided by the country's developmental policies (Zaremba and Szczygielski 2019). In Norway, for instance, the distribution of income from the country's oil resources ensures that future generations will

benefit through a wealth fund to save oil and gas revenue. However, in Belarus, weak social security policies divert revenue from resources tends to fund interests of political class and select elite (Chulitskaya and Matonyte 2018).

For transboundary-valued resources, it is not clear where boundaries lie in extraction of income from resources. Conflicts over shared trans boundary resources may constrain income activities for conflicting parties. Political impasse at the South China Sea, between China, Taiwan, the Philippines, Vietnam, Malaysia, and Brunei, shrinks income sources for an estimated 3.7 million people who rely on the sea fisheries for their livelihood. In this impasse, unsustainable fishing practices go unnoticed. For example, China's construction of artificial islands on reefs by draining coral sand has destroyed over 160km² of offshore reef. This results in declining fish stocks (Cao et al. 2017).

In promoting international trade, some countries encourage export on certain goods through incentives like tax relief for exporters and international advertising financed by government. This may inspire overproduction of certain commodities, for example, the over production of agricultural goods. This action additionally discourages sale of goods to local markets, because local consumers may pay more for a good than consumers in foreign export market may. Because of overproduction in agriculture, income margins of local farmers doing export may be restricted, and this threatens livelihoods of poor farmers dependent on agricultural income. An example is the incentives to promote cotton export has created trade barriers for many cotton farmers in West Africa, creating losses in their access to income from the valued agricultural produce. In December 2015 the World Trade Organization (WTO), directed its member states to discourage export promotion for agricultural produce, as this denies access to income for farmers in least developed countries.

Right to Access

The right to access to valued resources, honors people's requests, individually or collectively, to approach, reach, and/or make contact with resources, whether on temporary or permanent

basis. A group may enjoy right to access a natural resource through mechanisms such as social relations or property tenure systems perceived as legitimate by authority governing the resource. Such can be influenced by approaches from stakeholder engagement, population factors, and objective considerations.

Community determined entitlements, e.g., customary laws, have a great influence on access to resources such as land. Some gendered rules on agricultural land ownership may disadvantage women in accessing and using land resources. Measures or indicators for this may include incidences of landlessness among households and discrepancies in access to irrigation water among groups.

Rural livelihoods depend much on agricultural land, water, and forest resources. Tiwary (2006) posits that the value of access to water for a rural population may be influenced by factors such as: (a) who will grow multiple crops, (b) who will be compelled for current or seasonal fallowing, (c) who will grow cash crops or who will grow less water demanding, coarse subsistence crops, (d) who will grow market oriented crops, (e) who will lease in land and who will lease out? A farmer with no access to water for irrigation may be forced to lease out his land to someone else who would afford irrigation costs. Leasing out land often times translates to less revenue obtained by a farmer, as compared to when a piece of land will be tilled to full harvest. Water diversions upstream may hinder access to water resources for downstream communities. Apart from use in farming, it is also necessary that communities have access to clean drinking water.

Places of sacred value may have restricted access for various society members. Also a population may be denied access to environmental resources, e.g., restricted access to forest resources, to shield conservation interests. Changes in environmental resource use patterns can impose some level of restriction of access to users within a population. For example, when communal land converts use from farming to urban development, the local geographic community is restricted access to arable land. Sarap (2017) details how tribal communities in the

central belt of India have a declining access to land and other resources due to land alienation and increased diversion of forest, as well as other common property resources.

Right to Ownership

This right regards claims to possess resource(s). Valued resources may have some degree of co ownership, with some being categorized as common property or state property. An example of the importance of the right to possess a valued resource is the dispute between Kenya and Uganda over ownership of the aquatic life rich Migingo Island on Lake Victoria, a fresh water lake shared by these two countries. In this dispute, ownership by the Ugandan side imply nil dispensation of aquatic resources to the fishing community on the Kenyan side, and vice versa.

Inequalities on right to ownership are also bred based on gender. For example, Kosovo legislation favors men over women in property, especially land inheritance (Joireman 2015), whereas in Ivory Coast, the law gives the husband the authority to administer and dispose of marital assets in a community-property marriage (USAID 2013).

Resource capture, which refers to appropriation or threat of appropriation, of resources on indigenous territory without the approval of the indigenous population (Horak 1998), can be a hindrance to resource ownership. State can be an external pressure facilitating resource capture. Governments permit resource capture by external actors, overlooking ownership rights structure of communities. External interests are favored over indigenous group's considerations. Inequality in such cases is when external actors fully assert authority over a traditional resource base. State policy in India on land ownership does not accept communal land tenure system, and allows land not settled as private property to automatically become state property (Xaxa 2007). This land included forestland, primarily owned by some tribal communities, who now lost their rights over ownership in the agrarian policy (Xaxa 2007).

The 2015, Rights and Resources Initiative (Rights and Resource Initiative 2015) demonstrated that globally land designated for

ownership by indigenous people is at 8%, which is less than the 10% they rightfully claim ownership to. Governments and private individuals take 82%. In Asia and Europe, very few countries have land ownership legislation that recognize both ownership and control of land resources for community and private entities, for instance, Sardinia in South Italy, Switzerland, and Myanmar. In both Latin America and Asia, there are countries with deficient legal frameworks for community-based land ownership guidelines, for example, El Salvador, Uruguay, and Guyana. These have minimal effort addressing request from indigenous people on land claims. Mexico's ejidos allow communal land ownership for agricultural use.

Right to Manage and Use

The right to manage and use grants authority to control and put into service valued resources.

Conflict over forest resource use between the Gorotire Kayapo community in Brazil and interests of non-Brazilian multi nationals aimed at developing gold, timber, and hydroelectric resources on traditional Kayapo territory is an example of community-led counter attack to maintain status quo (Horak 1998). The Gorotire Kayapo have been highly successful in asserting authority over their natural resource base, and this success is attributed to indigenous patterns of resource use, ownership, and exchange. These patterns ground their identities as a community that manages and uses the resources. While indigenous communities may be successful in resisting incursions on their resource base, a challenge usually arises entailing need for community to change patterns of usage. This may entail a shift from traditional patterns of resource use and ownership (Horak 1998) to other use patterns based on relative value of a resource.

Way Forward

Inequalities in valued resource distribution manifest at global, regional, country, community, and individual levels. It is mostly a question of where the distribution targets, who directs the targeting, and whether or not this results to vulnerabilities.

Vulnerabilities at the bottom of a distribution hierarchy can be linked to disability, age, gender, and social background.

Resource governance should be in a manner that ensures decisions on its distribution ensure efficient and equal allocation for all matters. With SDG 10, state and society should strive at ensuring access to benefits of valued resources for all, notwithstanding the gender, race, disability, social class, or political affiliations of individuals.

To work for better achievement of SDG 10 on reduced inequalities, countries should monitor distribution of their valued resource, to inform plans for better targeting and reducing inequalities. Quality data can track every progress and avail measurable evidence on efficiency of resource distribution. It is imperative to have a systematic process for collecting data to monitor distribution impacts, and use such information to shape the pattern of resource flow within a truly sustainable path. There is a need to widen the nest of valuing resources, to genuinely understand the less visible perspectives of community value derived from a resource. Inclusion strategies in valued resource distribution are yet to attain impactful participation of community members involved.

The current inequalities in resource allocation should be addressed with prioritizing disenfranchised groups. The favored groups in unequal systems often have more than they need and if possible a reduction system can be worked out to redistribute their illegally acquired resources. The key question to be addressed now in valued resource distribution, should be its redistribution, to whom, when and in what quantities.

Inequalities disenfranchise communities as a whole, as well as diversities within communities. The first step to addressing inequalities in resource distribution is for disenfranchised groups to have consensus over their entitlements to certain resources. A mapping of resources is necessary to guide on ownership rights. With such a tool, communities can then lobby through legal or any other reasonable processes for enhanced equity in resource distribution. Their consensus is key in countering state and societal imperatives

that may foster inequalities in valued resource distribution.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Climate Change and Inequality](#)
- ▶ [Ethnicity Related Discrimination](#)
- ▶ [Gender Inequality](#)
- ▶ [Gender Related Discrimination](#)
- ▶ [Race Related Discrimination](#)
- ▶ [Regulation of Global Financial Markets](#)
- ▶ [Trade with Less Developed Countries](#)

References

- Bantekas I (2015) Land rights in nineteenth century ottoman state succession treaties. *Eur J Int Law* 26(2):375–390
- Buerge D (2019) Chief Seattle and chief Joseph: from Indians to icons. Available at University of Washington. <http://content.lib.washington.edu/aipnw/buerge2.html>. Accessed 15 July 2019
- Cao L, Chen Y, Dong S, Hanson A, Huang B, Leadbitter D, David C, Pikitch E, Qiu Y, Sadovy de Mitcheson Y, Sumaila U, Williams M, Xue G, Ye Y, Zhang W, Zhou Y, Zhuang P, Naylor R (2017) Opportunity for marine fisheries reform in China. *PNAS* 114(3):435–442
- Chulitskaya T, Matonyte I (2018) Social security discourses in a non democratic state: belarus between soviet paternalistic legacies and neo liberal pressures. *Public Policy Adm* 17(4):539–554
- Clootens N, Kirat D (2018) Threshold regressions of the resource curse. *Halshs-01944214*. <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-01944214>
- Dorsch M, Kjell YT, Ali K (2017) A review of resource theories and their implication in understanding consumer behaviour. *J Assoc Consum Res* 2(1):22–27
- Dworkin R (2000) *Sovereign virtue; equality in theory and practice*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge
- Ellsworth L (2002) A place in the world: tenure security and community livelihoods. A literature review. Forest Trends, Washington, DC
- Front Page Africa (2019) Africa's rich oil: from blessing to a curse of rampant corruption and bad governance on the continent. <https://frontpageafricaonline.com/opinion/africas-rich-oil-from-blessing-to-a-curse-of-rampant-corruption-and-bad-governance-on-the-continent/>. Accessed 4 Aug 2019
- Horak M (1998) Transforming the traditional: indigenous Amazonian resource Regimes and resource capture by external actors. The case of Brazil's Kayapo. *J Environ Dev* 7(1):32–44

- Hundenborn J, Woolard I, Jellema J (2019) The effect of top incomes inequality in South Africa. *Int Tax Public Financ* 0:1–30
- Joireman SF (2015) “Resigning their rights?” Impediments to women property ownership in Kosovo. In: Archambault C, Zoomers A (eds) *Global trends in land tenure reforms: gender impacts*. Routledge, New York
- Kemei K (2014) Mara hotels risk closure over waste. In Standard digital. Available via <https://www.standardmedia.co.ke/article/2000105359/mara-hotels-risk-closure-over-waste>. Accessed 5 Sept 2019
- Khondeker HH (2017) Globalization and inequality. *Int Sociol* 32(2):170–179
- Knutsen C, Kotsadam A, Olsen EH, Wig T (2016) Mining and local corruption in Africa. *Am J Polit Sci* 61(2):320–334
- Levine-Schnur R, Ferdman A (2015) On the just distribution of land use rights. *Can J Law Jurisprud* 28(2):317–342
- Loyola R, Bini LM (2015) Water shortage: a glimpse into the future. *Brazilian J Nature Conserv* 13:1–2
- Lumor K (2017) The impact of corruption on economic growth in sub Saharan Africa: combatting corruption through inclusive institution and policy design. Atlantic International University, Honolulu
- Marston A, Perreault T (2016) Consent, coercion and cooperativismo: mining cooperatives and resource regimes in Bolivia. *Environ Plan*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X16674008>
- Podesta J (2019) *The climate crisis, migration, and refugees*. Brookings, Washington, DC
- Rights and Resources Initiative (2015) *Who own’s the world’s lands? A global baseline of formally recognised indigenous and community land rights*. Rights and Resources Initiative, Washington, DC
- Sabar B (2017) Hunger amidst plenty: locating vulnerability in a resource rich India. *J Asian Afr Stud* 52(5):670–690
- Sarap K (2017) Erosion of access to resource, poverty and public action in the tribal belt of Central India. *Sociol Bull* 66(1):222–241
- Tiwary R (2006) Explanations in resource inequality: exploring scheduled caste position in water access structure. *Int J Rural Manag* 2(1):85–106
- Tourism Concern (2012) *Water equity in tourism: a human right, a global responsibility*. Tourism Concern, UK
- UNHCR (2019) *Global trends: forced displacement in 2018*. UNHCR, Geneva
- USAID (2013) *Cote D’Ivoire, property rights and resource governance profile*. https://www.land-links.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/USAID_Land_Tenure_Cote_dIvoire_Profile.pdf
- Vatn A (2000) The environment as a commodity. *Environ Values* 9(4):493–509
- Wang H, Wang Z, Chen J, Guan N, Li G (2019) Development of rule of law index for state land and resources in China. *Land Use Policy*:276–290
- World Bank (2008) *2008 world development indicators*. World Bank, Washington, DC
- World Bank. (2018) *Understanding poverty*. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/understanding-poverty>. Accessed 12 June 2019
- World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) *Our Common Future*. United Nations
- Xaxa V (2007) *Tribes, forests and livelihoods*. University of Mumbai, Mumbai
- Zaremba A, Szczygielski JJ (2019) And the winner is. . . a comparison of valuation measures for equity country allocation. *J Portf Manag* 45(5):84–98