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Abstract: This study is on the effects of land-induced homicide on conflicting communities in Anambra State; with a focus on the most affected group of such violence and also on any other conflict regarding land that has caused the death of people in the State. Land dispute between individuals and communities has been a recurrent risk factor between individuals and communities, as well as in many areas a struggle between pastoralists and farmers. Anambra State has records of inter/intra-communal conflicts and violence arising from land, and from land-related issues. A population size of 530 adult respondents was used for the study. The population size was selected through the process of categorising the communities of the study into six social sub-groups. The quantitative data collected from the field were processed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Land conflicts can lead to loss of property for one or several conflict parties, loss of homeland, physical injury or death, high costs for attempt at conflict resolution, delayed land development, reduced investment, and increase mistrust between conflicting parties, social and political instability among other consequences. The study showed that anybody not minding the class could be a victim of violence over land. The study further showed that market places within the disputed land could be a factor of conflict besides land itself.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The first article on the “Effects of Land-induced Homicide on Conflicting Communities in Anambra State” published in International Journal of Religion and Human Relations, dwelt on how land conflict leads to homicide in Anambra State and on how land dispute affects the economic and sustainable development in the State. In the present article which is a continuation of the same topic, the effects of land-induced homicide on conflicting communities in Anambra State, the focus is on who is the most affected group in land-induced homicide in Anambra State and what other conflicts regarding land have caused death of people in the State.

US Agency for International Development (USAID), (2004), noted that land is a very strategic socio-economic asset, particularly in poor societies where wealth and survival are measured by its control and access. It is also seen as a central element in the varied and complex social relations of production and reproduction within which conflict between individuals and groups are bred. Land is an asset which every human being treasures and seeks to acquire. Land therefore creates tremendous problems among human beings who quest immensely to possess and own land. Today the problem land creates is aggravated due to some factors. United States Institute of Peace (2007), observed that the problem resulting from land is heightened because of population growth and environmental degradation which has led to land that should have been used for personal industrial or agricultural purposes becoming increasingly scarce. The Institute further remarked that possession of land means access to many other resources, such as minerals, timber, and animals, and land therefore often holds a high economic value. Land empowers one who has it, to have access to other valuables on the land. For this very reason, the Institute noted that, it is easy to see why communities often have strong emotional and symbolic attachments to land and resources on it. Hence, land in is a factor of conflict. Land generates conflict among diverse interests in it. Food and Agriculture
Organisation [FAO], (2010), observed that land is a major source of disputes in rural societies worldwide.

Wehrmann (2008), defined land conflict as a social fact in which at least two parties are involved, the roots of which are different interests over the property rights to land: the right to use the land, to manage the land, to generate an income from the land, to exclude others from the land, to transfer it and the right to compensation for it. Wehrmann (2005), had earlier explained that a land conflict, can be understood as a misuse, restriction or dispute over property rights to land. Land conflicts defined as such can be aggravated if the social positions of the parties involved differ greatly. United Nations Interagency Framework Team for Preventive Action (2012), indicated that land conflicts generally involved diverse parties. They may include: members of households, families, clans or ethnic groups; governments and their agencies; or other actors such as investors or corporations. Grievances that lead to violent conflict are usually related to an existing or perceived increase in physical insecurity, threats to livelihoods, political exclusion, institutional discrimination, economic marginalisation or loss of community identity.

Bruce (2013), observed that land so pervasively underpins human activity that it usually plays some role during war and civil violence. Land-related issues figure into many violent disputes around the world. Land therefore, is the object of competition in a number of potentially overlapping ways: as an economic asset, as a connection with identity and social legitimacy, and as political territory. Competition over land and its resources is at the center of the nexus between land and conflict. Competition can occur between any number and type of identity groups, whether based on ethnicity, religion, class, gender, or generation. When that competition involves groups of people, rather than individuals, the risk of larger-scale violence increases (Bruce, 2013).

Land conflict is a natural phenomenon that has always been there. Since the beginning of recorded history, people have always fought over land such that land is a significant factor in widespread violence (USAID, 2005). This could be understood for the singular reason that land, not only that it is a consistent appreciating economic asset, but it is also largely a fixed asset, with enhanced demands upon it, which is generally increasing with corresponding resulting tension (Bruce and Holt, 2011). Yamano & Deininger (2005), noted that as population within a community increases, access to land resources dwindles for the rural dwellers. However, with rapid population increase and a finite land area, available land per individual shrinks continuously. Resource based conflicts, especially over rights of access to land and land use, are therefore increasing in frequency and intensity. Wehrmann (2008), indicated that land conflicts are indeed a widespread phenomenon, and can occur at any time or place. Both need and greed can equally lead to them, and scarcity and increases in land value can make things worse.

Conflicts resulting from land have their consequences and effects on the victims who often are the dwellers or the owners of the land. Land conflicts in general have negative effects on individual households, as well as to the national economy. Such conflicts increase costs, slow down investment, and can result in the loss of property for a conflict party, and thereby reduce income tax for the state or municipality (Wehrmann, 2008). They affect the livelihood of the victims in one way or another. Land conflicts have direct impact on the lives and livelihoods of those involved in it. Such conflicts reinforce circles of extreme poverty and hunger, and destroy social status, food security and affect mostly the most marginalised groups that include women and children (Akujobi, Ebitari & Amuzie, 2016). Land conflicts may either decrease quality of life for parts of society or, if they are addressed and ameliorated, contribute to additional state expenditures and therefore have an impact on the national wealth (Wehrmann, 2008).

Writing further on consequences of land conflict, Wehrmann (2017), showed that consequences of land conflicts vary tremendously – ranging from disturbed inter-personal relationships to the total destruction of one’s livelihood. Many land conflicts affect people’s human rights as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, such as the right to own property alone as well as in association with others, the right to an adequate standard of living, the right to freedom to choose one’s residence, the right to adequate housing, the right to adequate food and the right to freedom from discrimination. UN HABITAT/OHCHR (2005), noted that in many countries, indigenous people have been dispossessed, or live at risk of being dispossessed, due to either failure to recognise their rights to land or invalidation of those rights by the state, or through expropriation or privatisation of their lands by the state.

In some situations, people lose their lives due to land fight and some incidences of land conflict creates hatreds among the parties involved which goes on from one generation to another (Amonyah, Chikaire, Ogueru, Utazi & Godson, 2018). Moreover, individuals and communities who lose their rights to land due to conflict find themselves in deep and excessive poverty, due to decline in productivity, food insecurity and enhanced food scarcity; and a fall on the income level, health challenges and retarded growth and development of communities. Land disputes often result in several deaths and severe injuries during conflicts especially in situations where it is a communal land dispute (Fischer, 2012). Kelsey & Abdalla (1997), cited in Alawode, (2013), concluded that poor households bear the heaviest burdens of land-related conflicts for the simple reason that their daily needs and livelihoods are directly tied to their property rights, that is, the use of land.

Besides land being a factor of conflict between communities and groups, is there any other thing that generate conflict between communities and groups? The regular clashes between farmers and herdsmen are related to land, and directly on the land itself. Akujobi, Ebitari & Amuzie (2016), indicated that control of arable land resources besides land itself, invariably results in conflicts. They further observed that mutual fear of deep-rooted hostility exists among the Fulani herdsmen and host farmers. The conflicts occur when Fulani herders move into non-Fulani homelands with their cattle. This usually leads to the destruction of farm crops. Thus, the herdsmen provoke their victims to acts of communal and individual resistance (preventing entry into farms, killing or stealing cattle, or poisoning fields and water source). In
response, the herders wage deadly attacks on host communities. It is obvious therefore, that the conflict between the two groups is not about the land but the resources from the land.

In this study, the effort is to identify the particular group that usually fall victim of land conflicts. Previous studies have fingered the poor or the low income group in the society as being the victims of land dispute. Is it likely that in communal land conflicts, the rich and well to do to in the society are eschewed from the impact of the violence when they live in the midst of the poor in the conflicting society? Is it possible that when properties are destroyed in the conflicting community, those of the rich are not affected? When violent conflict ensues between the farmers or hosting communities and the herdsmen, could it be only one group that fall victim of such violence? The question therefore is who are the most effected group in land-induced violence/homicide?

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To investigate the most affected group in land-induced homicide in Anambra State
- To find out any other conflict regarding land that has caused death of people in Anambra State.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

CLASS OF PEOPLE MOSTLY AFFECTED BY LAND CONFLICT

Land has always been a factor generating conflict over the ages. USAID (2005), observed that people have always fought over land since the beginning of recorded history. Population growth and environmental stresses have exacerbated the perception of land as a dwindling resource, tightening the connection between land and violent conflict. Land is often a significant factor in widespread violence and is also a critical element in peace-building and economic reconstruction in post-conflict situations. In every land conflict, there are always ill-effects especially when it is violent. Land dispute affects members of a given society in different ways. Wehmann (2008), noted that land conflicts often have extensive negative effects on economic, social, spatial and ecological development. Land conflicts can have disastrous effects on individuals as well as on groups and even entire nations. Wehremann (2017), further established that land conflicts affect different groups in different ways. The less privileged class in the society often experiences the effects of land dispute more painfully than the rich and upper class in the society.

In Acholiland (2011), in Uganda, when land dispute is violent, youth members of the community involved in it may be injured or imprisoned in the cause of the situation. Women who are involved, either widows or divorced may lose access to their husband’s land due to limited awareness of formal land rights and the primacy of customary law. Poor members of the community may lose their land to more wealthy or influential community members, who have the resources to bring land disputes to court or to offer bribes for the resolution of land disputes in their favour. When the land dispute is violent, the youth members of the community and the poor may usually lose their lives because they participate in the violent dispute (Acholiland, 2011). The poor bear the heaviest burdens of land-related conflicts for the simple reason that their daily needs and livelihoods are directly tied to their property rights, that is, the use of land (Kelsey & Abdalla, 1997, cited in Alawode, 2013).

Most difficult land conflict involves a powerful person against one or more poor people. In many countries or situations, the poor hesitate and often do not dare to resist the powerful, not least in court. If they do, or if the powerful sue them instead, the chances are very low that the poor will win the case. Resolution in these cases tends to favour the powerful. In many cases bribery plays a major role. In other cases, the richer party simply can afford the better lawyer (Wehmann, 2008). The poor are so handicapped when it comes to land dispute matters. Lombard (2016), indicated that in land dispute in Mexico, low-income residents often suffer multiple and overlapping vulnerabilities, which may be legal, political, economic, and social. Low-income residents’ lack of titles and often insecure tenure, combined with their lack of access channels to local decision-makers, may constitute a double vulnerability to eviction and aggression by the state, as well as from other actors (Lombard, 2016).

In many developing nations, the poor have always been victims of land grabbing, mining operations, corruption over land transactions and industrial timber trade. Global Witness Limited (2014), observed that many of those facing threats over these issues relating to land are ordinary people opposing land grabs, mining operations and the industrial timber trade, often forced from their homes and severely threatened by environmental devastation. Global Witness Limited (2015), further observed that because the demand for products like timber, minerals and palm oil continues, governments, companies and criminal gangs are exploiting land with little regard for the people (usually the poor) who live on it. Increasingly, communities that take a stand are finding themselves in the firing line of companies’ private security, state forces and a thriving market for contract killers. The same situation is obtainable in Brazil where poor residents are often at the receiving end or victimised over land conflict with the wealthy class in the society. The highly skewed land distribution and government expropriation and redistribution policies are a major source of conflict in Brazil, taking the form of forced evictions or assassinations of rural workers and peasants (USAID, n.d).

In African countries, as it is in most other developing countries of the world, the low-income groups have been at the receiving ends of land disputes. Sekeris (2010), and Zwan (2011), noted that social and economic development for most of the African population is relied on the access to land, since majority of the population depends on land and land-based resources for their livelihoods. Bob (2010), observed that land in Sub-Saharan Africa is vulnerable to different conflicts, contest, disagreements, conquest and exploitation that have an adverse negative impact on the socio-economic and political conditions of many groups of people. Zwan (2011), concluded that many African countries are experiencing violent conflicts
because of competition for access, control and the use of land resources.

Nigeria has experienced many decades of land conflicts, and the number of people dying because of them continues to grow each year (Conroy, 2017). In Nigeria, there is dearth of literature on who are mostly affected by violent land conflict. Available literature gives ample attention on the conflict between herdsmen and farmers. The herdsman and farmers’ conflict over access to land are generally considered as a negative phenomenon which often led to loss of many lives and properties which invariably impact negatively on the Nigeria political system (Anyabe, Atelhe & Sunday, 2017). Ilo, Ichaver & Adamolekun (2019), observed that the world’s deadliest conflict is one that many people don’t know exists. Its battleground is the lush, fertile region that stretches across the centre of Nigeria. Clashes between the two groups there have killed more than 10,000 people in the last decade. Many farmers do not have the courage to keep fighting with the herdsman every year round and as such have deserted their farm lands and relocated to a safer place to sojourn. For many farming communities of Benue, Nasarawa, Taraba and others farming is no longer a business as usual. Several farmers have been displaced and dispossessed of their farms by armed men believed to be herdsmen (Ijirshar, Ker & Terlumun, 2015).

Adepoju, Ewolor & Obayelu (2017), observed that the farmers in Nigeria are among the low-income group and yet they constitute about 70 percent of the active labour force and produce more than 60 percent of the food consumed. The farmers are typically among the poorest and the most neglected in development support and investment terms owing among other factors to a considerable loss of fertile agricultural land over the years to land grabs which is a process where local communities are displaced from their land and lose their ability to grow food and maintain their livelihoods. In most cases, rural households are displaced from their lands without any plan in place to resettle or compensate them, for a promise of improvement in their living standards through the promotion of agricultural investment, provision of housing and building of industries in their communities. Indeed, displacement of farmers has resulted both in a decline in the living standard of the rural populace in terms of loss of land and livelihood; and in the marginalisation and impoverishment of poor farmers (Grain, 2015, and Ghatak & Mookherjee, 2013).

CONFLICT RESULTING FROM OTHER ISSUES RELATED TO LAND

Land is a great economic asset from which a lot of treasures like crude oil, natural gas, solid minerals, agricultural products and others, which are vital natural resources that meet crucial human needs, can be derived. Human beings depend on the resources they derive from land and their environment for their well-being and their very survival. Warfare is a prominent human activity used in most cases to gain access to these resources. Modern civilisation would struggle to survive without readily available access to these resources at reasonable and affordable prices. It is for these reasons, that these resources are considered to be strategic resources; critical for national and global well-being and prosperity; and hence generate a lot of conflict globally especially in Africa (Nwankwo, 2015). There is an obvious linkage between natural resources and conflict in Africa (Abiodun, 2007).

Abiodun (2007), gave clue to some of the conflict issues which natural resources generate within various countries of Africa where they exist; namely violent ethno-nationalism, acrimonious intergroup relations, youth revolts, small arms and light weapons proliferation, corruption, money laundering and the others. Among the natural resources that may be relevant for our discussion within the scope of this paper, are agricultural products and animal resources.

Within the agricultural products and animal resources, are found two perpetually conflicting groups namely the pastoralists and the agriculturists; otherwise known as herdsman and farmers. Abiodun (2007), remarked that across Africa, pastoralists are perhaps some of the most misunderstood participants of the natural resource sector. Abiodun (2007), explained that agriculturists perceive pastoralists as people who have no respect for crops, and who place the interests of their livestock ahead of all else. Pastoralists themselves see agriculturists as an ally of the government in its various attempts to force them into conformity. Both pastoralists and agriculturists have different attitudes to land tenure, and this has further intensified problems in the ways they comprehend each other. All across Africa, agriculturists have a more “settled” perception of land. It is seen as a place of abode and a source of livelihood. The pastoralists themselves see the functionality of land as transient, due to their nomadic lifestyle. They therefore do not have the kind of ownership mentality that agriculturists have. Land is seen as a place where the animals can graze as they proceed on their journey (Abiodun, 2007).

Breuser, Nederlof, & Vanheuven (1998), reasoned that the factors accounting for the increasing farmer-herder conflict include the southward movement of pastoral herds into the humid and sub-humid zones, promoted by the successful control of the menace posed by disease, the widespread availability of veterinary medicine and the expansion of farming activities into areas that hitherto served as pastureland. In the course of movement of the herds across the farm lands, many agricultural resources are destroyed; and this always generates so much violent conflict between herders and farmers. In Nigeria today, the southward movement of herdsmen with their cattle has resulted in the loss of innumerable human lives in the Central Northern region as well as in the whole of Southern regions. The violent conflicts in the South are caused both by the actual destruction of resources and displacement of dwellers from their land, and destruction of agricultural resources by outside actors (Conroy, 2011).

THEORETICAL FRAME WORK

This study shall employ conflict theory as the theoretical framework to guide the study. Conflict theory explains the basis of violence in any sector be it an organised sector or unorganised sector. Conflict theory generally surrounds the idea that most struggles in society happen because of conflicts between different social classes or groups. Each group
struggles to attain more resources and because the resources are scarce, they must struggle with the opponents even to the point of committing homicide. Groups try to protect their own interests, therefore blocking the progress of other groups. Individuals and groups have aggressive impulses when it comes to vying for that which they desire; and these impulses are expressed in all relationships (Idowu, 2017). The aggressive impulses could be seen in what Collins (1993), identified as emotional resources. It is the emotional resources which propel one to struggle in order to come into possession of the material resources.

III. METHODOLOGY

The study employed a mixed methods research approach which Johnson & Onwuegbuzie (2006), defined as the class of research where the researcher mixes or combines quantitative and qualitative research techniques, methods, approaches, ... into a single study or set of related studies. The mixed methods research requires the researcher to collect the qualitative and quantitative data either in phases (that is, sequentially) or at the same time (that is, concurrently). This study employed the concurrent mixed method approach in collecting the data.

Anambra State is selected for the study for two key reasons: one, it is a State most convenient to the researcher, and two, it is one of the States in the country that have records of land disputes resulting in homicide cases, at least the age long land dispute between Aguleri and Umuleri is of national records (Onwuzurigbo, 2011). The choice of the study locations was purposive because of the pronounced violent land conflicts witnessed in the locations and their effects on the social well being of the communities. Two Local Government Areas of the State namely Anambra East and Oyi Local Government Areas met the requirement for the study. The choice of the four local communities in the two selected Local Government Areas namely; Aguleri, Umuleri, Ogbonike and Nkwelle-Ezunaka was equally purposive for the same reason of meeting the requirement for the study. From the four communities, six population categories were identified, namely town union, elders’ forum, women’s wing, youth wing, age grades, and vigilante group, for inclusiveness of relevant respondents and to help the researcher get the targeted individuals who were able to provide the required information. Membership of the categorised groups is on representative capacity except the age grades. The target population obtained from the categorised groups was twenty-seven thousand, two hundred and seventy-seven (27,277). The Sample size of the study which comprised 530 respondents was determined using Yamane’s (1967) formula.

Four sessions of Focused Group Discussions (FGDs) were conducted in the four communities of the study comprising of relevant and knowledgeable individuals namely lawyers, civil servants, LG staff, school teachers and others. Nineteen (19) Key Informant Interviews (KIIIs) were also conducted through snowball and purposive sampling techniques, with some families who were direct victims of homicide and violence that resulted from land dispute in the communities. The researcher got the consent of the participants in both FGDs and KIIIs to record their voices in the course of the discussions. The analysis of the data for the study was mixed analysis which involved the concurrent order of analysis since the data were gathered by mixed research methods. The quantitative data collected from the field were processed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23. The Qualitative Data Analysis (QDA) Miner software was used in the analysis of the qualitative data derived from both FGD and KII discussion and interview transcripts.

ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The thematic issues of the study which are: most affected group in land-induced violence/homicide in Anambra State and any other conflict regarding land that has caused death of people in Anambra State are discussed below.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVE 1: To investigate the most affected group in land-induced homicide in Anambra State
Nobody went to sleep and felt relaxed... Structures, both private and public were demolished in very great numbers. Blood flowed like water in the two communities. Human lives were indeed wasted as that of animals... Nobody who witnessed what happened in this land within the period would wish to have a repeat of such experience... The heat of it was indeed felt beyond the State. It was a battle that grounded every economic sector within the region for the period it lasted (Male, 68 years, retired court clerk, rural clerk).

The study further disclosed that there were much records of homicide that resulted from the violent land conflict between the conflicting communities. The KII participant in Umueri supported the finding when he gave a brief account of the 1995 and 1999 battle in the region, which left death records behind in the communities, even among Umueraba-Anam community that has boundary with Aguleri and Umueri. According to the participant:

The violence of 1995 and 1999 left trails of sorrow, pain and agony in the hearts of so many people within the region. The events of the two periods were known in history as "violence/battle between Aguleri and Umueri". But the three communities namely; Aguleri, Umueri and Umوءba-anam were badly affected by the effects of the crisis. Indigenes of the three communities were victims in one way or another of the violence. Lives of some members of the three communities were wasted during the battle (Male, 57 years, trader, rural dweller).

The study equally disclosed that victims of violent land dispute are not usually only those who are directly involved in the violence. It showed that anybody could full victim of such violence. A Participant in KII in Aguleri observed that the battle of 1999 in the region affected the region so adversely, and of course it did not affect only those who were involved in the battle. In his words,

...in 1999, a more severe and very prolonged battle over the same claim erupted, raising much dust on the land and sending thunder storm across the nation. The civilian government in power then was weak and could not do anything to prevent the much shading of innocent blood. The violence the whole tension generated crumbled the wheel of economic progress that was going on in the region. The battle sent a wave of destruction across the entire Otu-ocha region. Transport business was totally shot down. Commercial activities were completely grounded; and industries and companies that were springing up in the region and making the region so attractive to investors, were all forced to relocate after the violence. A good number of buildings were razed down; and schools and church buildings were equally ruined. Not even the General Hospital in Otu-ocha was spared (Male, 65 years, retired civil servant, rural dweller).

Figure 2 is on the respondents’ views on who the likeliest victims of homicide from violent land dispute are. The Figure shows that, 15.68% of the respondents have the opinion that the rich were the victims of violent land dispute, 77.06% have the opinion that the people with lower income earnings/the poor were the victims of violent land dispute, 2.10% of the respondents have the opinion that the middle class people were the victims of violent land dispute, while 5.16% of the respondents hold the opinion that the business class were the victims of the violent land dispute. This finding implies that the position of the majority of the respondents is true. There is however a disagreement between the finding and the qualitative finding of the research. The KIHs identified different classes of people as being victims of homicide resulting from violent land dispute. A participant in KII at Aguleri gave account of the death of her brother who was ambushed and killed while he was going back to Asaba at the early stage of the battle of 1995. The account indicated that the brother was a personality in the community, being a successful businessman and a community leader. In her own words:

...the battle of 1995 though not regarded as being so severe but it did the greatest injury and damage to my family. It was in that battle that my family lost the brightest star and the bread winner of the family. My elder brother who was living with his family at Asaba was killed in that year as he was going back to Asaba after returning home to see our sick mother. He was the chairman of his age grade and strong and reputable personality in the community... (Female, 54 years, trader, rural dweller)

Another participant at Umueri gave account of the death of her husband whom she said was a furniture maker; so it could not be said he was a wealthy man. The participant indicated that the husband was not in the class of those who could be said to be rich. According to the participant;

The battle of 1999 cost my family everything... My husband was killed in the battle and our house was completely destroyed. My husband was not a big man, being just a furniture maker… When the battle was beginning, I suggested to my husband that we all should go to my parents’ place which was far removed from the crisis zone, he agreed. But later he changed his mind and told me that there was need for surveillance to be kept in the house… I left with the children and we never saw him again either alive or dead. He was killed in the cause of the battle and our house was burnt down... (Female, 58 years, trader, rural dweller)

From the findings of the KIHs, it can be seen that the qualitative findings of the study do corroborate the opinion of the majority of the quantitative data which indicated that the likeliest victims of homicide resulting from violent land dispute are the people with lower income earnings, that is, the poor people. What this actually means is that the victims of homicide resulting from violent land dispute could be anybody of any category.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVE 2: To find out any other conflict regarding land that has caused death of people in Anambra State
In almost every family you may see one or two of different types of economic trees on their land both in their compounds and in their farm lands. Do I talk of palm trees, guava, orange, coconut, pear both avocado and ordinary pear everywhere in our compounds and in our farm lands. You see mango trees, yam, cocoyam and cassava locally. We produce also a lot of potatoes, corn and groundnut. There are also a lot of economic trees like mango, coconut and palm trees on our land. In every family you may see one economic tree or another. In every family you may see banana or plantain not to mention pawpaw and pear. Besides the already mentioned treasures, we also have Major River (Anambra River) on our land from which we derive fish in very great quantity. We also have solid minerals at different locations on our land (Male, 53 year, secondary school teacher, rural dweller).

The study disclosed that there are other economic treasures on the land besides land itself. In the FGD at Ogbunike, it was disclosed that almost every family has one or two of different types of economic trees on their land both in their compounds and in their farm lands. A participant in the discussion stated that;

...our land is rich in agricultural produce, being very fertile naturally. Our people ... produce much stable food of yam, cocoyam and cassava locally. We produce also a lot of potatoes, corn and groundnut. There are also a lot of economic trees like mango, coconut and palm trees on our land. In every farm land you may see one economic tree or another. In every family you may see banana or plantain not to mention pawpaw and pear. Besides the already mentioned treasures, we also have Major River (Anambra River) on our land from which we derive fish in very great quantity. We also have solid minerals at different locations on our land (Male, 47 years, secondary school teacher, rural dweller).

The study disclosed that there are other economic treasures on the land besides land itself. In the FGD at Ogbunike, it was disclosed that almost every family has one or two of different types of economic trees on their land both in their compounds and in their farm lands. A participant in the discussion stated that;

...in our community we have a lot of economic trees both in our compounds and in our farm lands. You see mango trees, pear both avocado and ordinary pear everywhere in our community. Do I talk of palm trees, guava, orange, coconut tree? In almost every family you may see one or two of these economic trees (Male, 60 years, trader, rural dweller).

Table 1: Respondents’ views on whether their Community has Land with other Economic Treasure besides Land itself

Table 1 shows the respondents’ view on whether their community has land with other economic treasures besides land itself. It is seen in the Table that 95.4% of the respondents affirmed that in their community, there are other economic treasures besides land itself; and 2.1% of the respondents have contrary opinion indicating that in their community, there are no other economic treasures besides land while 2.5% of respondent do not know whether there is or there is not such in their community. This finding is corroborated by the findings of the qualitative data of the research. In a FGD at Aguleri, a participant in the discussion observed that;

...the community therefore often times resorted to self help in dealing with the herdsmen which often results in the death of the herdsmen. It however does not go without saying, that the herdsmen often rape our women and maim our farmers in their relationships with the herdsmen... The community therefore often times resorted to self help in dealing with the herdsmen which often results in the death of the herdsmen.

Table 2: Respondents’ views on any other Thing that Generates Conflict besides Land

Table 2 shows respondents’ views on any other thing that generates conflict besides land. The views are shown to be: location of the market on the land (72.1%); Government hospital built on the land (3.4%); Government school located on the land (2.1%); and finally no other thing besides land

Field Survey, 2019

Table 2: Respondents’ views on whether the Community Land is Rich in Foliage, attracting Herdsmen to the Community

Figure 3 shows respondents’ views on whether the community land is rich in foliage, attracting herdsmen to the community. 97.13% of the respondents were of the view that their communities have rich foliage that may attract herdsmen to the community, while 2.87% of the respondents hold a contrary view. The opinion of the majority is implied to be true; and it has agreement with the findings of the qualitative data of the research. In a FGD at Aguleri, a participant in the
the land is a source of livelihood for the people hence the excessive attachment they have on the market. In Aguleri, a participant observed that;

There is again conflict between Aguleri and Umuleri and this time, Umuoba-Anam over the ownership of the market popularly known as Otu-ocha market. That market is the commercial centre of the whole of Otu-ocha and like land is at the centre of the people’s existence, hence the great attachment our people have on the market. The three communities who have their roots in the area vie for the ownership of the market. During the 1999 battle, the market was the biggest bone of contention in the battle and most of the battle was centred on the market. Oftentimes a member of this community puts up a sign post, writing on it a nomenclature after their own name and the other communities would remove the sign post or defame it with black paint. This scenario has been causing much tension and anxiety in the area among the communities until the State government intervened ordering that what anybody of any community might write on a sign post is “Otu-ocha market” or “Otu-ocha road” without any other appellation (Male, 66 years, retired civil servant, rural dweller).

HYPOTHESIS

Respondents who reside in rural areas are more likely to perceive poor persons as likely victims of homicide resulting from violent land dispute than those who reside in urban areas.

A cross-tabulation between the place of residence and likely victims of homicide resulting from violent land dispute was carried out (Table 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>The Poor</th>
<th>Well to do Persons</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>83 (75.5%)</td>
<td>27 (24.5%)</td>
<td>110 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>320 (77.1%)</td>
<td>93 (22.5%)</td>
<td>413 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>403 (77.1%)</td>
<td>120 (22.9%)</td>
<td>523 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 0.202, df = 1, P = 0.653, N = 523 \]

Table 3: Respondents’ Place of Residence and their Perception of the Likeliest Victims of Homicide resulting from Violent Land Dispute

The study indicated that once there is violent inter-communal land dispute, there are bound to be casualties resulting from such disputes. Victims in such disputes usually are not only those who are practically involved in the crisis. The study showed that anybody could be a victim of such violence. It was further shown that violent land dispute leaves in its trail casualties in every sector of economy and with a good number of lives lost; and most of the victims were not in any way part of the violence. The findings are consistent with the findings of earlier study which indicate that the effects of violent land dispute cuts across borders and have no limitations. Wehrmann (2008), in his study on the same issue indicated that the problems generated from violent land conflicts are so diverse, affecting both individuals and communities, even in some situations, the entire nation. It is therefore the case that the victims of violent land conflicts are not only the individuals that are involved in it.

On who the likeliest victims of homicide that results from violent land disputes are, the study in its quantitative data identified the class of lower income earning group, otherwise known as the class of poor people as the most likely victims. The qualitative data however generalised the victims of such violence. The findings of both quantitative and qualitative data of the study have agreement in the earlier studies on the issue. The quantitative data find agreement with the findings of the study carried out by Lombard (2016), who in his study indicated that in land dispute in Mexico, low-income residents often suffer multiple and overlapping vulnerabilities, which may be legal, political, economic, and social. Low-income residents’ lack of titles and often insecure tenure, combined with their lack of access channels to local decision-makers, may constitute a double vulnerability to eviction and aggression by the state, as well as from other actors, including social movements, political parties and criminal actors.

The findings of the qualitative data of the study on the most likely victims of homicide resulting from land dispute, are consistent with the finding of an earlier study by Global Witness Limited (2015), in Brazil, which observed that because the demand for products like timber, minerals and palm oil continues, governments, companies and criminal gangs are exploiting land with little regard for the people who live on it. Increasingly, communities that take a stand to
protect their land are finding themselves in the firing line of companies’ private security, state forces and a thriving market for contract killers. Global Witness Limited (2015), in its study did not distinguish the category of people that suffer for land in the hands of government, companies and criminal gangs who were exploiting the people. However the victims could be all embracing, involving both the rich and the poor people in the community.

Furthermore, the qualitative findings of the study are also in agreement with the findings of the study by Bob (2010), which observed that land in Sub-Saharan Africa is vulnerable to different violent conflicts, contest, disagreements, conquest and exploitation that have an adverse negative impact on the socio-economic and political conditions of many groups of people. Bob (2010), did not categorise which class of people that suffer exploitation and negative impact over land when he said ‘…many groups of people’. From the findings however, it is most obvious that anybody irrespective of the social class can be a victim of violent land dispute in one way or another. It could however be understood why the poor are most likely to be victims of violent land conflicts than the rich because their daily existence is in association with the land.

The hypothesis of the study states that respondents who reside in rural areas are more likely to perceive poor persons as likely victims of homicide resulting from violent land dispute than those who reside in urban areas. The result shows that respondents did not differ significantly (X²=0.202, df=1, P=0.653) across the place of residence and the victims of homicide that results from violent land conflict. This of course is understood because inter-communal land violence cuts across boundaries without being selective of the victims. Anybody could fall a victim of such violence so long as the person is within the vicinity of the violence.

The study further disclosed that rich foliage within a community could attract the herdsmen with their herds to the area; and if the herdsmen do not conduct their herds appropriately there will inevitably be tension between the community members and the herdsmen. The study showed that there is tension in some communities between the host community and the herdsmen while it is not so in other communities. In Aguleri for instance, there were serious crisis between the farmers in the community and the herdsmen in which a number of herdsmen lost their lives. The interface between the community members and the herdsmen could be explained by conflict theory. The conflict between the herdsmen and the community could be motivated by some sense of moral superiority as highlighted by Collins (1993) in his explanation of the theory of conflict. It was reported that the herdsmen traverse the community with some impression that they have right to do so. That gives impression of being superior and the community members frown seriously at such mentality.

On whether there is any other thing that generates conflict within the study area, location of market on the land within the study area was indicated to be generating conflict between the communities. The market in Otu-ocha is the commercial nerve centre of the region, and had always been the biggest bone of contention between the three communities that inhabit the region; namely Aguleri, Umueri and Umunna-Anam, each making claim of being the rightful owners of the market. The battle of 1999 between Aguleri and Umueri was centred on the market. On the other hand, on the land dispute between Ogbunike and Nkwelle-Ezunaka, it was also indicated that the two communities are nursing bitterness against each other over the shoe market the State government built on part of the disputed land even though they were both properly settled by the government before the market was built. The tension over the markets in the communities could be explained by the fact of natural attachment the people have over their basic source of livelihood. The markets stand before the people as the land itself because it is their economic strength and for which they are ready to fight and kill one another. The markets mean to them more or less, what the land itself means to them.

V. CONCLUSION

The study generally interrogated the effects of land induced homicide in Anambra State. Specifically, it inquired into who the most affected group in land induced homicide are, and other conflicts regarding land that has caused deaths in the State. The findings of the study have shown that land is a factor of violence and conflict which often results in homicide of parties involved in the violence. Most likely victims of violent land conflict could obviously be anybody. Both rich and poor people in the society could fall victim of violent land dispute.

Previous studies showed the factors of conflict in relation to land. This study has shown that the market place located on the land is another factor which can generate violence between communities, considering the attachment communities have to markets on their land. Policy makers in government therefore can draw policy that would guard the market wherever it is located as to prevent it from generating violence. The policy as well can be made to indicate market place as a common meeting ground for business purposes for all people that should not necessarily generate conflict.
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