

# Land Grants in Colonial Brazil and Long-Term Effects on Development

Vinicius Okada da Silva\*

Department of Economics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Latest Update: February 1, 2024

[Click here for the Latest Version](#)

---

\*Contact information: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Department of Economics, 1407 W. Gregory Drive, David Kinley Hall: Room 126, Urbana, Illinois 61801. E-mail: vo10@illinois.edu

# 1. Introduction

Brazil is a country that historically faces issues of both land and income inequality. Estimates from USAID in 2016

However, land inequality in Brazil is something that can be found in the past.

This paper tries to answer how much of Brazil’s present-day inequality can be traced to colonial institutions. Specifically, this paper uses Portuguese land grants called *sesmarias*, to identify the historical persistence of colonial activity in Brazil to present-day inequality.

(Dell, 2010) (Sokoloff et al., 2000)

Ratnoo (2023) [Paper about land tenure in India]

# 2. Historical Background

Dean (1971) - “Anyone who claimed to have the means and desire to make use of the land was given a grant, customarily one to three leagues in extent (16.7 to 50.1 square miles).”

Simonsen (2005) - “the ones that don’t possess sesmarias or can’t own land are disowned by the own society they live in”

# 3. Data

The main source of data comes from the *Sesmarias of the Luso-Brazilian Empire Database*<sup>1</sup>. The database uses archival data from either state records or original manuscripts to obtain data on the concessions of sesmarias in Brazil. When available, information such as the year, the reason for the request, etc. are coded. The sesmarias are then georeferenced based on the geographical information present in the text, allowing us to trace them back to Brazilian municipalities.<sup>2</sup>

Data for current land tenure in 2021 in Brazil is obtained from Sparovek et al. (2019).<sup>3</sup>

Land usage from 1985-2010 is obtained from Mapbiomas.Souza et al. (2020)<sup>4</sup>

Census data for 1872 is obtained from the Nucleus of Research in Economic and Geographic History from the Federal University of Minas Gerais.<sup>5</sup> The 1872 Imperial Census contains demographic data at the

---

<sup>1</sup>Information on the content of the letters is available at <http://plataformasilb.cchla.ufrn.br/>. The georeferencing process was done in collaboration but as a separate project for this paper.

<sup>2</sup>A more in-depth description on how the sources of the letters and how the sesmarias were georeferenced is available in [Appendix B](#)

<sup>3</sup>Available at <https://atlasagropecuario.imaflora.org/>

<sup>4</sup>Available at <https://brasil.mapbiomas.org/en/>

<sup>5</sup>Available at <http://www.nphed.cedeplar.ufmg.br/>

municipality and parish level and was the last census taken before the abolition of slavery in Brazil. <sup>6</sup>

Other census data is obtained from the IBGE ().<sup>7</sup>

## 4. Descriptive

Following Lowes et al. (2021) I show balance on geographical characteristics at the 10 x 10km grid level in [reference to table here].

## 5. Identification Strategy

### 5.1. Coastal Ban on Livestock

In 1701, the Portuguese Crown enacted a ban on cattle ranching from 80km of the coast (10 leagues) (Fausto et al., 2014, p .40; Simonsen, 2005, p .198; Bethell, 1984, p .460).

Bethell (1984) “Landholding in the sertao was truly extensive. Although there was legislation limiting the size of sesmarias to three square leagues, this restriction was simply disregarded. The sesmarias on which cattle ranches were established sometimes exceeded hundreds of thousands of acres”

The effect was the expansion of cattle ranches towards the west of Brazil, especially in the Northeastern states. As Fausto et al. (2014, p .41) indicates, the need for large lands to allow cattle to roam free led to the creation of large estates in the area, even bigger than those compared to the coast.<sup>8</sup> That led to a “a clear specialization between the two activities” (Ribeiro, 2012).<sup>9</sup>

(Boxer, 1962, p .)

“Cattle farming was to supply dry beef, leather, and carrying animals to the sugar mills and, later, to the villas that emerged around mining, but was not to mix itself geographically with these other two important export activities from the colonial period, nor with the coffee estates that emerged during the nineteenth century, when Brazil was already independent from Portugal.” (Ribeiro, 2012).

“It was there that farms measuring thousands of hectares emerged, where cattle found favourable environmental conditions for the multiplication of herds.”(Ribeiro, 2012).

Given the nature of this ban, I exploit the cutoff of 80 km to use a regression discontinuity design to measure the effects between the two types of economies in the region.

---

<sup>6</sup>Distribution of the 1872 parishes alongside the municipality boundaries is available at Figure A.1. For the sample used I have 469 municipalities and 968 parishes.

<sup>7</sup>Microcensus data downloaded through the R package *censobr* from Pereira et al. (2023)

<sup>8</sup>An example of this would be the d’Avila family which owned a large estate in the state of Bahia [...]

<sup>9</sup>An example of the effect can be seen in the Municipality of Ruy Barbosa and the state of Bahia and Caico in the state of Rio Grande do Norte. Both are described and being created by the cattle expansion that happened because of the 1701 Royal Decree. (IBGE n.d.)

In the first-stage I check whether post-1701 we see an increasing number of land grants dedicated to livestock in municipalities farther than 80 km from the coast.

Secondly, using the 1872 I analyze whether or not there were any effects of the coastal livestock ban on the demographics and economic activities at that time.

Historically livestock-raising areas were [...]

$$Y_{i,m,s} = \tag{1}$$

Provision of Public goods is the cause for the effects on literacy in 1970 and onwards (?).

Other links:

[http://historialuso.an.gov.br/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=6191:escravos-de-ganho&catid=2073&Itemid=121](http://historialuso.an.gov.br/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=6191:escravos-de-ganho&catid=2073&Itemid=121)

<https://www.nexojornal.com.br/especial/2017/07/07/censo-de-1872-o-retrato-do-brasil-da-escravidao>

“Quando o senhor não tinha uma função para o escravo, ele deixava o escravo ao ganho”, explica o historiador Diego Bissigo. “Ele ia para cidade buscar emprego e o senhor ficava com o salário que o escravo recebesse. É uma forma de uso para o escravo. Assim, ou alugando para outro senhor também.”

([Oliveira Andrade, 1980](#), p. 142)

## 5.2. Treaty of Tordesillas

## 5.3. Instrumental Variable

# 6. Results

# 7. Robustness


## 7.1. Donut RDD

## References

- Bethell, Leslie** (1984). *The Cambridge history of Latin America*. eng. Cambridge, England ; Cambridge University Press.
- Boxer, C R** (1962). *The Golden Age of Brazil 1695-1750: Growing Pains of a Colonial Society*. 1st ed. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Dean, Werren** (Nov. 1971). “Latifundia and land policy in nineteenth-century Brazil”. en. In: *Hisp. Am. Hist. Rev.* 51.4, pp. 606–625.
- Dell, Melissa** (2010). “THE PERSISTENT EFFECTS OF PERU’S MINING “MITA””. In: *Econometrica* 78.6, pp. 1863–1903.
- Fausto, Boris and Sergio Fausto** (Aug. 2014). *A Concise History of Brazil*. en. Cambridge University Press.
- IBGE** (n.d.). <https://cidades.ibge.gov.br/brasil/ba/ruy-barbosa/historico>. Accessed: 2024-1-24.
- Lowes, Sara and Eduardo Montero** (Oct. 2021). “Concessions, Violence, and Indirect Rule: Evidence from the Congo Free State”. In: *Q. J. Econ.* 136.4, pp. 2047–2091.
- Oliveira Andrade, Manuel Correia de** (1980). *The Land and People of Northeast Brazil*. en. University of New Mexico Press.
- Pereira, Rafael H M and Rogério J Barbosa** (2023). *censobr: Download Data from Brazil’s Population Census*. Version v0.2.0.
- Ratnoo, Vigyan D** (Dec. 2023). “Persistent effects of colonial land tenure institutions: Village-level evidence from India”. en. In: *J. Dev. Econ.* 103247, p. 103247.
- Ribeiro, Ricardo Ferreira** (Dec. 2012). “The ox from the Four Corners of the world: The historic origins of the Brazilian beef industry”. en. In: *Agrar. S. J. Polit. Econ.* 1.3, pp. 315–340.
- Simonsen, Roberto Cochrane** (2005). *História econômica do Brasil : 1500-1820*. Edições do Senado Federal ; v. 34. Brasília : Senado Federal, Conselho Editorial.
- Sokoloff, Kenneth L and Stanley L Engerman** (Sept. 2000). “Institutions, Factor Endowments, and Paths of Development in the New World”. In: *J. Econ. Perspect.* 14.3, pp. 217–232.
- Souza, Carlos M et al.** (Aug. 2020). “Reconstructing Three Decades of Land Use and Land Cover Changes in Brazilian Biomes with Landsat Archive and Earth Engine”. en. In: *Remote Sensing* 12.17, p. 2735.
- Sparovek, Gerd et al.** (Sept. 2019). “Who owns Brazilian lands?” en. In: *Land use policy* 87.104062, p. 104062.


## 8. Figures

Figure 1: Distribution of Land Grants pre- and post- 1701



*Notes:* This figure considers whether or not any part of the municipality was within 80km of the coast.


Figure 2: 1970 Municipalities and Sharecropping



*Notes:* This figure considers whether or not any part of the municipality was within 80km of the coast.




Figure 3: 1970 Municipalities and Sharecropping




*Notes:* This figure considers whether or not any part of the municipality was within 80km of the coast.

Figure 4: 1970 Municipalities and Sharecropping




*Notes:* This figure considers whether or not any part of the municipality was within 80km of the coast.

Figure 5: 1970 Municipalities and Sharecropping




*Notes:* This figure considers whether or not any part of the municipality was within 80km of the coast.

Figure 6: 1970 Municipalities and Sharecropping




*Notes:* This figure considers whether or not any part of the municipality was within 80km of the coast.

Figure 7: 1970 Municipalities and Land Ownership




*Notes:* This figure considers whether or not any part of the municipality was within 80km of the coast.

Figure 8: 1970 Municipalities and Sugarcane




*Notes:* This figure considers whether or not any part of the municipality was within 80km of the coast.

Figure 9: 1872 Municipalities and Proximity to the Coast



*Notes:* This figure considers whether or not any part of the municipality was within 80km of the coast.


Figure 10: 1872 Municipalities and Proximity to the Coast



*Notes:* This figure considers whether or not any part of the municipality was within 80km of the coast.



Figure 11: 1872 Municipalities and Proximity to the Coast



*Notes:* This figure considers whether or not any part of the municipality was within 80km of the coast.

## 9. Tables

### 9.1. Coastal RDD - 1872

Table 1: Effects on Proportion of Slaves to Total Population (%)

	Optimal Bandwidth		[10, 150]	[20, 140]	[30, 130]
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Estimate	5.168** (2.270)	5.698* (3.414)	6.397** (3.202)	5.666 (3.550)	4.842 (3.961)
Polynomial Order	1	2	1	1	1
N	239	239	123	105	91
$R^2$	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.08	0.08

\*  $p < 0.1$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$

<sup>a</sup> Mean of the dependent variable is 14.2%

Table 2: Effects on Proportion of Slaves Working in Farming (%)

	Optimal Bandwidth		[10, 150]	[20, 140]	[30, 130]
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Estimate	-8.993 (6.356)	-6.887 (9.516)	-8.619 (6.314)	-7.263 (6.936)	-5.337 (7.237)
Polynomial Order	1	2	1	1	1
N	122	122	123	105	91
$R^2$	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.07	0.08

\*  $p < 0.1$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ <sup>a</sup> Mean of the dependent variable is 40.7%

Table 3: Effects on Proportion of Male Slaves Working in Farming (%)

	Optimal Bandwidth		[10, 150]	[20, 140]	[30, 130]
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Estimate	-11.232* (6.792)	-4.727 (10.085)	-8.586 (6.871)	-7.334 (7.529)	-5.358 (7.887)
Polynomial Order	1	2	1	1	1
N	182	182	123	105	91
$R^2$	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.05

\*  $p < 0.1$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ <sup>a</sup> Mean of the dependent variable is 50.1%

Table 4: Effects on Proportion of Female Slaves Working in Farming (%)

	Optimal Bandwidth		[10, 150]	[20, 140]	[30, 130]
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Estimate	-9.622 (6.936)	-12.641 (10.367)	-10.360 (6.575)	-9.083 (7.161)	-6.989 (7.495)
Polynomial Order	1	2	1	1	1
N	114	114	123	105	91
$R^2$	0.08	0.11	0.09	0.10	0.12

\*  $p < 0.1$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ <sup>a</sup> Mean of the dependent variable is 30.1%

Table 5: Effects on Proportion of Slaves in Domestic Work (%)

	Optimal Bandwidth		[10, 150]	[20, 140]	[30, 130]
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Estimate	9.806*** (3.727)	2.745 (5.484)	9.608** (3.828)	6.669 (4.213)	5.629 (4.518)
Polynomial Order	1	2	1	1	1
N	130	130	123	105	91
$R^2$	0.10	0.12	0.10	0.14	0.14

\*  $p < 0.1$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ <sup>a</sup> Mean of the dependent variable is 18.6%

Table 6: Effects on Proportion of Male Slaves in Domestic Work (%)

	Optimal Bandwidth		[10, 150]	[20, 140]	[30, 130]
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Estimate	5.855* (3.346)	-0.333 (4.923)	5.723 (3.548)	3.001 (3.655)	2.371 (4.074)
Polynomial Order	1	2	1	1	1
N	137	137	123	105	91
$R^2$	0.09	0.11	0.10	0.14	0.13

\*  $p < 0.1$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ <sup>a</sup> Mean of the dependent variable is 10.7%

Table 7: Effects on Proportion of Female Slaves in Domestic Work (%)

	Optimal Bandwidth		[10, 150]	[20, 140]	[30, 130]
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Estimate	15.722*** (5.155)	11.082 (7.625)	14.964*** (5.548)	11.980* (6.271)	10.429 (6.510)
Polynomial Order	1	2	1	1	1
N	184	184	123	105	91
$R^2$	0.05	0.07	0.09	0.11	0.13

\*  $p < 0.1$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ <sup>a</sup> Mean of the dependent variable is 27.3%

Table 8: Effects on Proportion of Farmers (%)

	Optimal Bandwidth		[10, 150]	[20, 140]	[30, 130]
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Estimate	-4.491 (4.714)	-7.025 (7.028)	-4.159 (4.687)	-3.052 (5.119)	-3.602 (5.173)
Polynomial Order	1	2	1	1	1
N	122	122	123	105	91
$R^2$	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.05

\*  $p < 0.1$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ <sup>a</sup> Mean of the dependent variable is 31.4%

Table 9: Effects on Literacy Rate (%)

	Optimal Bandwidth		[10, 150]	[20, 140]	[30, 130]
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Estimate	1.228 (4.063)	2.119 (5.994)	1.303 (4.868)	-2.724 (5.330)	-0.990 (5.699)
Polynomial Order	1	2	1	1	1
N	205	205	123	105	91
$R^2$	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.02

\*  $p < 0.1$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ <sup>a</sup> Mean of the dependent variable is 26.3%

## 9.2. Coastal RDD - 1970

Table 10: Effects on Proportion of People Sharecropping (%)

	Optimal Bandwidth		[10, 150]	[20, 140]	[30, 130]
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Estimate	1.430*** (0.450)	1.385** (0.691)	1.464*** (0.551)	1.478** (0.601)	1.430** (0.670)
Polynomial Order	1	2	1	1	1
N	1202	1202	848	714	608
$R^2$	0.13	0.13	0.08	0.07	0.07

\*  $p < 0.1$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$

<sup>a</sup> Mean of the dependent variable is 3.33%

Table 11: Effects on Proportion of People Working with Livestock (%)

	Optimal Bandwidth		[10, 150]	[20, 140]	[30, 130]
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Estimate	1.397 (1.493)	2.691 (2.337)	1.241 (1.125)	1.650 (1.250)	1.921 (1.394)
Polynomial Order	1	2	1	1	1
N	557	557	848	714	608
$R^2$	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01

\*  $p < 0.1$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$

<sup>a</sup> Mean of the dependent variable is 18.9%

Table 12: Effects on Proportion of People Working with Sugarcane (%)

	Optimal Bandwidth		[10, 150]	[20, 140]	[30, 130]
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Estimate	-0.011 (0.572)	0.277 (0.883)	0.095 (0.569)	-0.116 (0.551)	0.047 (0.574)
Polynomial Order	1	2	1	1	1
N	612	612	848	714	608
$R^2$	0.08	0.08	0.10	0.08	0.08

\*  $p < 0.1$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$

<sup>a</sup> Mean of the dependent variable is 1.4%

Table 13: Effects on Literacy Rate (%)

	Optimal Bandwidth		[10, 150]	[20, 140]	[30, 130]
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Estimate	1.862 (2.499)	0.320 (3.852)	3.077 (2.155)	2.468 (2.399)	0.413 (2.656)
Polynomial Order	1	2	1	1	1
N	670	670	848	714	608
$R^2$	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.07

\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

<sup>a</sup> Mean of the dependent variable is 43.1%

Table 14: Effects on Proportion of People Working with Farming (%)

	Optimal Bandwidth		[10, 150]	[20, 140]	[30, 130]
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Estimate	1.074 (1.472)	2.021 (2.306)	0.848 (1.107)	1.216 (1.229)	1.506 (1.374)
Polynomial Order	1	2	1	1	1
N	557	557	848	714	608
$R^2$	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01


\* p < 0.1, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01

<sup>a</sup> Mean of the dependent variable is 19.5%

## A. Figures



Figure A.1: 1872 Municipalities and Parish Locations



*Notes:* Geographical distribution of 1872 parishes alongside 1872 municipality boundaries.

## B. Description of Letters and Georeferencing