Causes and Management of Land Conflicts in Tanzania: A Case of Farmers versus Pastoralists

Goodluck Dastan Massawe
College of Social Sciences and Humanities
Sokoine University of Agriculture, Morogoro - Tanzania

&

Justin Kalisti Urassa
College of Social Sciences and Humanities
Sokoine University of Agriculture, Morogoro – *Tanzania*

Abstract

Land conflicts are on the increase in many parts of Tanzania. Though the same existed even in the planned economy era 1961 to 1985, there has been an escalation of the same since Tanzania opted for the free market economy in the mid-1980s. While land conflicts are experienced by all walks of life and people engaged in different economic activities, those between farmers and pastoralists have been more dreadful leading to loss of life and property in many instances. The aim of this paper is twofold: firstly, to examine the factors that have contributed to the causes and persistence of farmer-pastoralist conflicts in Tanzania; and secondly, to examine the strategies that have been applied in managing farmer-pastoralist conflicts. The paper contains a review that is organised into three fundamental sections. After introduction, Section Two discusses the literature that analyses the conflict by drawing on the social, historical and economic causes. In Section Three, the paper introduces some of the key frameworks used within the peace and conflict literature, particularly in reference to the differing notions of conflict management, conflict resolution and conflict transformation that could be applied in solving or managing conflicts between farmers and pastoralists in Tanzania for the good of both groups. The paper makes two conclusions: firstly, the farmer-pastoralist conflict tends to be best explained

through an interpretive lens that sees many processes impacting on the highlighted issue. While farmer-pastoralist coriflicts have been produced by social, historical, economic and discursive factors; the former three factors have dominated most of the analysis within the literature. Secondly, there is no single solution for managing the conflicts. However, to effectively manage the conflicts communities need to adopt a multidimensional approach that takes into account a range of the contributing factors.

Key words: *Farmers, pastoralists, land conflict, conflict management*

1.0 Introduction

Land conflicts are on the increase in many parts of Tanzania. Though the same existed even in the planned economy era 1961 to 1985, there has been an escalation of the same since Tanzania opted for the free market economy in the mid-1980s. While land conflicts are experienced by people of all walks of life and those engaged in different economic activities, those between farmers and pastoralists have been more dreadful leading to loss of life and property in many instances. The debate on what constitutes the fanner-pastoralist conflict continues to capture the attention of many scholars and researchers. Some argue that competition over land and water resources is the major reason for the endless tension between these groups (Baba, Attito, Axwesso, Luhwago, and Charles, 2008; Hussein, Sumberg, and Seddon, 1999; Moritz, 2006). Others suggest that the long history of modernisation in. anznian policies, which have undermined pastoralists by pnv1legmg farmers, is the cause of these conflicts (Benjaminsen, Maganga, and Abdallah, 2009; Odgaard and Maganga, 2007). While these types of arguments attempt to explain farmer-pastoralist conflicts, this review suggests that the conflicts are better explained as a result of a variety of dynamic processes that involve a number of factors. Indeed, this review centres on the argument that farmer-pastoralist

conflicts have been produced by social, historical, economic and discursive factors. The review argues that the former three factors have dominated most of the analysis within the literature. In tum, little attention has been given to the discursive construction of the conflict.

The aim of this paper is twofold: firstly, to examine the factors that have contributed to the causes and persistence of farmer-pastoralist conflicts in Tanzania; and secondly, to examine the strategies that have been applied in managing farmer-pastoralist conflicts through a review of literature and use of empirical evidence covering both the pre- and the post-independence periods. Section Two discusses the literature that analyses the conflict by drawing on the social, historical and economic causes. Although these arguments stand, the farmer-pastoralist conflict tends to be best explained through an interpretive lens that sees many processes affecting the highlighted issue. Section Three introduces some of the key frameworks used within the peace and conflict literature, particularly in reference to the differing notions of conflict management, conflict resolution and conflict transformation. This introduction demonstrates that resolution, management and transformation of conflicts require a holistic approach that takes into account social, historical and economic factors. In addition, a holistic approach will contribute to understanding the intricacies upon which conflicts emerge and escalate. Finally, it is argued that a discursive analysis is needed to capture an alternative framework of meaning that has been silenced within mainstream literature.

2.0 Causes of Land Conflicts

Most land conflicts in Tanzania are resource based conflicts, i.e. parties compete over resources like land, water, grazing pastures, etc. in rural and per-urban areas. Likewise, most land related conflicts involve power relations between those wijo have access and control means to resources and those who are struggling to snatch the opportunities. The review of farmer-pastoralist conflicts

literature shows that the causes of land conflicts are entangled within seven key factors namely: colonialism; post colonial state governance and associated policies; governance, political leadership and development planning; modernisation discourse; economic reform and liberalisation; environment scarcity; and public narratives and language usage. Each of these factors is now discussed in turn.

Several studies suggest that colonial interference in Tanzania is one of contributing factors of deteriorating farmer-pastoralist relations. The following arguments are laid down to support the narrati ve of colonialism-causes-conflict. Firstly, new entities of land management were ascertained during colonialism, followed by the demarcation of tribal boundaries (Hussein *et al.*, 1999; Odgaard and Maganga, 2007). The newly established boundaries conflicted with traditional land use strategies by controlling the fluidic movement of people and animals, which had existed for centuries. The outcome was a breakdown of traditional relations between the two groups, which fuelled the conflicts. Secondly, the colonial establishment of a cash crop economy in the region is understood to be another cause of farmer-pastoralist conflict (Odgaard and Maganga, 2007). It resulted in alienation and encroachment of the pastoral land. For example, Benjaminsen *et al.* (2009) have argued that the conflict between Maasai pastoralists and farmers in Kilosa district of Tanzania is an outcome of sugarcane and sisal plantations established by colonial governments. They argue that apart from land alienation and encroachment, these plantations led to migration influx causing population growth, which exerted extra pressure on land resources.

Thirdly, the colonial government came with external forms of legislation, which claimed land from indigenous people. Indeed, the colonial governments and their associated policies viewed the pastoral land as a reserve waiting for repositioning and development. Homewood, Coast, and Thompson (2004) have argued that in Tanzania, the British government placed all the land

under the uovernor 's control. This establishment was aimed at clearing th land for the settlers. For example, Maasai pastoralists who inhabited the Ngorongoro highlands since the seventeenth century could see their land bei ng taken by settlers or allocated for conservation or game reserves (Homewood *et al.*, 2004). The decline in farmer-pastoralist relations did not end during the colonial period.

The trajectory of colonial development continued.uabate durig the post-colonial era. In most cases, many policies durmg th:s time promoted modernisation that has, in many cases, resulted m misconceptions about pastoralists' and other indigenous people's ways oflife. For example, Sendalo (2009) ?as argud.that a wll-known *Ujamaa* (the Swahili word for Afncan socialism) pohcy, introduced in 1967 by the first Tanzanian president Julius Nyerere, is exemplary of the policies, which shaped the country's mainsteam development paradigm. Nyerere's philosophy of *amaa* a ed to promote traditional African values through mphasi m familyhood and the communalism of traditional Afnan society including equity, freedom and unity (Ibhawoh and Dibua, 2003). Villagers from remote areas were concentrated i l ge *UJ maa* villages created in locations with greater ccssibihty to mput and output markets. *Ujamaa* ideology was justified partly on the theoretical argument that it would make it possible or econmies of scale to be reaped in the provision of social services and m.the organisation of agricultural production and prvsion of tecl mcal services. Accordingly, overall national productivity and efficiency in agricultural production would theoreticaly increae, leading to a rise in per capita income, improved eqmty of national mcome distribution and increased economic welfare. It was further argued that illagisation would enhance polit.ical. oranisation and democratic paiiicipation. Also, greater social JUstice woud be achieved through equitable access to land on t 1e pa ·t of village households and in the case of *ujamaa* (collective) villages, also through a more equal distribt1tion of what was produced through collective labour.

Opponents of yerere's ideology have argued that by forcing people t hve m sedentary villages implies that *Ujamaa* was trapped. m the modernisation ideology. It is argued that the populat10n m?vement to sedentary villages emphasises an 1mprovemen m p ple's livelihoods by encouraging them to renounce their rad1t10nal, cultural and social practices, in favour of economy-dnve Western alues (Ibhawoh and Dibua, 2003). Moreover, the *U;amaa* policy carried a preference towards agnculture and sedentary practises (StOger-Eising, 2000). This preerenc reflected the policy 's disregard for some groups' way of hfe, pastoralist.s being one of them, as they solely promoted a transhumant existence. *ln* addition, Homewood *et al.* (2004) hav argued that under *Ujamaa* villagisation the land was made a:ailable to everyone to use although, it was not for individual disposal. Whil ffering land for public use was seen as a positive development, t ignored other factors that contributed to conflict. For_example, smce walking remained the major means of transport dunng the *[ijamaa* era, pressure on land, water and firewood resources was exrted only _within a five kilometre radius of village settlemet, leadmg to environmental deterioration and decline in land _fert1hty and thereby crop yields. Hence, it perpetuated the conflicts between resource users.

Coser:ation policies are another example of controversial leg1slat10n that was implemented by the colonial government and later perpetuated by post-colonial states. These policies have been acused of worsening the relations between farmers and pastorahsts. Odgaard and Maganga (2007) and Sendalo (2009) h ave argue t atJUSt s m the colonial era, national policies continue to favour the establishment of national parks, conservation areas and game resr es at the expense of farming (cropping and herding); these .policies have lead to land alienation. In addition the estabhshm_ent of I_egislation that favours conservation and re erve areas has mreasmgly restricted access to natural resources for rural populat10ns (Homewood *et al*., 2004) Th, d is es1gnat10n of

open land resulted in land scarcity, forced pastoral migration from north of Tanzania to south leading to increased farmer-pastoralist tension in destination areas (Sendalo, 2009). Thus, pastoralists, unlike farmers, have been the victims of protected areas and conservation policies that do not recognise the transhumant way of life in many communities living near wildlife zones and other protected areas.

Farmer-pastoralist conflicts are further explained as a failure of national policies on agriculture. These policies, which favour expansion of cultivation agriculture, erode the open access land which is primarily used by smallholder farmers and pastoralists(Hussein *et al.*, 1999; McCabe, Smith, Leslie, and Telligman, 2014). For instance, the National Land Policy does not guarantee enough security of tenure to smallholder farmers and pastoralists. As a result, large areas ofland have been redistributed directly to investors, believing that it is an economically rational policy and, consequently, this has ended up marginalising smallholder farmers and pastoralists production activities (James, 2015).

James (2015) highlights some misalignment between the National Land Policy and the Livestock Policy (of 2006). For example, the National Land Policy discourages nomadism and all its different f01ms. In contrast, the Livestock Policy recognises seasonal migration of herders and their livestock as an important characteristic of pastoralism. The Livestock Policy has gone further and facilitated modalities for new settlements for pastoralists. This kind of misalignment helps to sow of hostilities among different users of land resource and between land resource users and policy implementers. Likewise, policy deficiencies are also revealed in the Grazing Land and Animal Feed Resources Act No 13 (2010) which is meant to translate the National Livestock Policy of 2006 (Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development, 2010). One of the problems associated with the Act is the interpretation of the terms. For instance, the term 'communal grazing land' is considered

by the Act, as a grazing land owned by a livestock keeper. This conceptualisation by the Act seems to offer little protection to pastoralist and instead focuses at protecting commercial livestock farming (i.e. production purposes). Hence, it can be argued that the failure of government to strike a balance between the land access interests of smallholder farmers/ pastoralists and the promotion of investment is one of the reasons for escalating conflicts between pastoralist and farmers in the country. The national policies also place emphasis on de-specialisation of herding and farming into agro-pastoralism . The outcome has been increased competition for space, reduced pastoralists and farmers' reliance on each other and increased conflicts (Sendalo, 2009).

Concepts of good governance, political leadership and representation are still widely used in many areas of development practice in developing countries. Good governance is defined as "competent management of a country's resources and affairs in a manner that is open, transparent, accountable, equitable and responsive to people's needs (AUSAID, 2000:3)". Growing concern is evident within the literature that most economic and social problems are hard to negotiate in areas where good governance is problematic (Kakonge, l998).

The same principles of good governance are equally important in the analysis of farmer-pastoralist conflicts. For instance, it is purported that bad governance, which is associated with corruption, leads to loss of trust in the authorities (Benjaminsen *et al.*, 2009). This in turn forces the population to solve problems through other means such as fighting. Alternatively, it has also been argued that corruption actually increases the tension between the resource users (Le Billon, 2001).

The analysis of farmer-pastoralist conflicts in Kilosa, Tanzania reveals that corruption is partly the root and accelerator of conflicts between these groups (Baha *et al.*, 2008; Benjaminsen *et al.*, 2009; Odgaard and Maganga , 2007). For example, Baha *et al.* (2008) found that there is a wi?espread belif ad legation that Kilosa district departments mamly land, pohce, Judiciary ad local government department offices, were seriously involve m corrupt practices . It is noted that farmers have accused pstoahsts of bribing the government officials in these offices. This kmd _of mistrust is believed to create a conducive environment for conflict in the area.

Political leadership is paramount for explaining _ t?e causes of farmer-pastoralist conflicts and is one of the cnttcal areas .of good governance. In arguing in fav?ur of the need for .effective representation in political leadership, Alonso and Rutz-Rufino (2007: 1) claimed;

> *[political] representation gives ethnic m:inorities a voice in decision-making processes. This allows their participation in the political ga"!e an, as a consequence, offers the ethnic group mcntives to abandon extra-institutional action strateg1es.*

The analyses of farmers-pastoralist elaions in te. literture suggest a poor representation of pastorahsts m local pohttcs . ilbert (2014) outlines some of the reasons fo under-repr sentat10n. of pastoralists in local politics as: percept10n that hetr populat on is generally low as opposed to national populat10n; pastora 1sts are scattered across different part of the country and. oten hves in the fringes of the villages to secure pasture for ter hvestck'. a situation which put them far from the areas of delSlon makm , and perception that their use of land is of margmal economic potential. For example , Odgaard and Maganga (2007) noted n imbalance of political power between farme:s and pastorahsts m Kilosa District of Tanzania with farmers be1g over-represented in village governments. The literature contmues to argue that pastoralists in this area have been excluded in developent planning due to a lack of political power and poor representation.

Over the last 100 years, pastoralism was at the centre of the political economy with cattle equating to wealth (Birch and Grahn, 007). However, the situation has now changed as the emphasis is on export agriculture, leaving pastoralism as a marginal priority. Many policies put pastoral concerns at the periphery of policymaking (Sendalo, 2009). The issue of excluding some groups in development planning is problematic as it results in unfair tenure security among resource users, which has in many cases, led to a rise in tension (Baha *et al.*, 2008; Le Billon, 200I). Additionally, conflicts have been explained as the result of divisive politics. In some places (e.g. in Kenya) conflicts have occurred because of political manipulation for electoral purposes (Homewood *et al.*, 2004). Benjaminsen *et al.* (2009) reports the same situation in their analysis of Kilosa conflicts.

The question of modernisation is still contentious among political and social scientists. For example, Banuri 1990:66) has argued that;

> *The project of modernisation has been deleterious to the we[fare of the third world population not because of bad policy advice or malicious intent of the advisers, nor because of the disregard of neoclassical wisdom, but rather because the project has constantlyforced the indigenous people to divert their energies from positive pursuit of indigenously defined social change, to the negative goal of resisting cultural, political and economic domination by the West.*

The language of modernisation has continuously been used to leitimize the intervention on the lives of pastoralists . For instance, Birch and Grahn (2007) argued that modernisation discourse pursued by both colonial and post-colonial governments has set the spatial barriers to pastoralist life options through the promotion of development models, which neglect the actual experience of

dry land farmers and pastoralists. In supporting this argument, Sendalo (2009:20) argues;

> *...many people have never understood the rationale of customary pastoral livelihood systems. Ever since colonial time policy makers have seen them as archaic, unproductive, and environmentally damaging relic of the past , which need to be "modernised" and brought into line with 'progressive and modern " development. Policies have consistently focused on settling pastoralist as the way to bring them improved services and economic opportunities.*

The answer from the government and development agencies has been that pastoralists need to be more modem. The result has generally been top-down technocratic solutions that have in many cases proved unsuccessful and resulted in heightened tension with the farmers.

In the 1980s, economic reforms and trade liberalisation aligned with modernisation ideologies, which had a profound and uneven impact on people's livelihoods . In the rural sector of Africa , economic reforms and liberalisation took the form rural land f01malisation. This formalisation of rural land was closely associated with de facto privatisation (Sjaastad, Kaarhus, Vedeld, and Wold, 2007). The main argument in favour of this privatisation was that private rights would put the land into the hands of more efficient producers . Contrary to this belief, privatisation has ha a serious effect on pastoralist communities with much of their land being taken and made open to external forces (Sendalo, 2009). Homewood *et al.* (2004) added that privatisat on promotes the expansion of modem agriculture by focusing on cash crops production , which overrides the customary right for resource usability. Thus, governments have oversimplified the process of

allocating the land rights by looking at the procedures that permit easy integration while ignoring communal access mechanisms. This has resulted in expanding tension and conflict as pastoralists and rural populations started to resist.

Recently, environmental scarcity has been one of the most blamed factors for farmer- pastoralist conflicts in Sub Saharan Africa. For instance, many scholars and researchers have argued that environmental scarcity (water and land) is the main cause of the endless conflict between these groups (Benjaminsen *et al.,* 2009; Birch and Grahn, 2007 ; Hussein *et al.,* 1999; Omosa, 2005; Rogers, 1992). The increase in drought is mostly named as being a crisis to range land inhabitants as it has generated competition over the scarce resource. Denying the aforesaid paradigm, Witsenburg and Adano (2007) argue that it is the current changes in the livelihoods patterns of pastoralists, which have created an environment conducive to conflicts. For instance, their case study on the relationship between water scarcity and conflict in northern Kenya has revealed that migration to the area and the current shift from nomadic pastoralism to a more sedentary way of life has had consequences for traditions, norms and values. These consequences have in tum undermined family ties and social control which are critical factors in the proliferation of hostility. However, they found that people in the area had developed the ability to cope with the increasing resource scarcity in both the short and long term, rather than indulge in violence.

Language usage that marginalises one group can reflect tragic outcomes. Odgaard and Maganga (2007) argue that pastoralists are stigmatised by a number of myths that disregard their lifestyle. Moreover, there are negative State perspectives on pastoralists' culture, way of life, values and economic activity. For example, in the analysis of policy implication on pastoralism in Tanzania, Sendalo (2009) revealed the negative stereotypes, which considered pastoralists as invaders, unfriendly to the environment, low producers and disseminators of livestock pests and diseases. The

use of the above and other stereotypes creates social differentiation within the community. As a result, there is a loosening of community ties as well as a weakening of social cohesion and control, important accelerators of conflicts (Witsenburg and Roba, 2007). Indeed, these "narrative(s] constitute the crucial means of generating, sustaining, mediating and representing conflicts at all level of social organisation (Dinwoodie, 1998).

3.1 Conflict Management, Resolution and Transformation

There is widespread agreement among scholars and researchers of conflict studies that most of today's violent and non-violent conflicts are entangled in a host of issues, factors and motives (Bloomfield, 1995; Boege, 2006; Fischer, 2006; Mitchell, 2005). In particular, Boege (2006:3) argues,

> *Many contemporary violent conflicts are hybrids of social-political exchange in which modern state-centric as well as pre-modern traditional and post-modernfactors mix and overlap.*

With this view in mind, Bloomfield (1995) went further by arguing that this social conflict has complexities and demands a high degree of sophistication that can embrace conflict typologies, causes, contexts and stakeholders. In addition, this sophistication needs to focus on the shifting temporal and spatial dynamics of the conflict. In this lens, the three differing notions of *conflict management, conflict resolution* and *conflict transformation* have been the focus of many studies.

In tum, conflict management refers to the "settlement and containment of violent conflicts"; it focuses on conflict regulation (Miall, Ramsbotham, and Woodhouse, 1999).Conflict management approaches see violent conflicts as an engrained consequence of power inequalities within society caused by existing institutions and historical relationships. Thus, resolving the conflict is seen

as unrealistic (Miall, 2004). Therefore, conflict management brings the conflicting sides together, plans the constructive management of the conflicts and reaches a historical compromise that can contain and settle the hostility. On the other hand, conflict resolutions encompass approaches that address and transform the deep-rooted sources of conflicts (Bloomfield, 1995). The focus is on the process and the intension of making behavioural attitudinal, and structural changes (Miall *et al.*, 1999). Moreover; it is about fostering new thoughts and relationships, looking at the root of conflicts and establishing creative solutions (Miall, 2004).

Opponen i:s of conflict management and resolution approaches have_ challenged the power-political view of conflict, by arguing that m communal and identity natured conflicts, "people cannot compromise on their fundamental needs" (Miall, 2004:3). Therefore, they called for an additional approach, conflict tanformation. Conflict transfonnation implies undertaking s1gmficant. steps beyond conflict resolution to bring deeper understanding and transformation in institutions and discourses upon which the conflict is reproduced (Miall *et al.*, 1999). It centres at "transforming the relationships, interests, discourses and, if necessary, the very constitution of society that supports the continuation of violent conflict (Miall, 2004:4)". Miall maintains that conflict transfo1mation cannot be a radical event; rather, it is a grad ual series of smaller and larger changes that encompass a wide range of approaches that include multiple actors. Boege (2006: 19) suggests that due to the 'hybrid ity' or 'complexity' of the conflicts, the management, resolution, and transformation strategies have to become hybrid in nature. They should blend traditional and State institutions as well as civil society approaches (Fischer, 2006).

In the study of *'Conflict, Social Change and Conflict Resolution,· an nquil!'*, Mitchell (2005) went deeper by exploring the relat10nsh1p between change and conflict. Mitchell argued that for effective conflict resolution, management and transformation there needs to be a focus on the following types of changes that

are required in the analysis of conflict; (i) changes that create conflicts, (ii) changes that intensify conflicts, (iii) changes that reduce conflicts (changes for conflict mitigation) and (iv) changes that produce solutions.

Conversely, the analyses of pastoralist-farmer conflicts reveal this hyb1idity and complexity. Thus, the management, resolution, and transformation of these conflicts require an integrated approach. Indeed, there is a need to ask questions such as: (i) what sorts of social change creatthe farmer-pastoralist conflicts in a particular area? (ii) What sorts of social change intensify the farmer-pastoral conflict? (iii) What changes may reduce the intensity of the farmer-pastoralist conflict and finally, (iv) What changes may bring about a genuine conflict management, resolution and transformation? Fischer (2006) argues that the use of an integrated approach to conflict resolution, management and transformation will bring about versatile solutions.

A number of arguments emerging from the literature of farmer-pastoralist conflicts suggest that most strategies have been geared toward resettlement and containment (conflict management). In most cases, these strategies have involved peace enforcement through the use of police forces and modem courts in order to resolve the situation and reach a compromise (Baha *et al.*, 2008; Benjaminsen *et al.*, 2009). Unfortunately, these strategies have generally been ineffective causing conflicts to escalate. This is because the strategies are seen as being driven by external forces who superimpose judgements that people do not understand, due to their ignorance of modem laws (Baha *et al.*, 2008).

In addition, several studies from parts of sub-Saharan Africa suggest that the use of formal approaches to manage the natural conflict worsens rather than improves the relationship between farmers and pastoralists (Adebayo and Olaniyi, 2008; Mlekwa, 1996; Oyerinde, 2002; Tesfay and Tafere, 2004). People prefer inf01mal methods for dispute management rather than formal

methods conducted by police and modem courts. There is now also a growing- emphasis on conflict resolution approaches with more calls to adopt indigenous institutions of conflict resolution (Hussein *et al.*, 1999; Odgaard and Maganga, 2007). The involvement of these institutions is believed to bring about a deeper understanding of the indigenous social-cultural, political and economic processes at the grassroots level upon which the fanner-pastoralist conflicts emerge. This in tum will help the conflicting sides to come together, plan and enforce strategies that address the micro processes within and between their communities (Tesfay and Tafere, 2004).

On the other hand, transformation of farmer-pastoralist conflicts is of paramount importance if the management and success of post conflict reconstrnction is expected. Current studies suggest possible strategies for dealing with farmer-pastoralist conflicts. For example, Birch and Grahn (2007) and Hussein *et al.* (1999) call for new policies that promote sustainable livelihoods in the context of multiple land use. In addition, they call for government investment in drought management systems by establishing income-generating activities that complement current pastoral production systems. Failure to do this will undem1ine the health of pastoralists and their ability to pursue an alternative life strategy, whether it is through education or any other diversification of livelihoods (Hussein *et al.*, 1999).

Another suggestion for transforming the conflict is to establish new structures (local and inter-village institutions), which are responsible for negotiating the use of land and water resources (Benjaminsen *et al.*, 2009; Odgaard and Maganga, 2007; Rogers, 1992). Others call for necessary infrastructure development and social services provision to allow pastora1ists to pursue their livelihood (Benjaminsen *et al.*, 2009; Birch and Grahn, 2007). They argue that there must be a commitment to enhance pastoralist mobility by protecting and maintaining their migration routes as well as facilitating smooth cross-border migration. Moreover,

investment in necessary infrastrncture is critical for roads, rail and market routes.

This paper does not rank or suggest a preference between conflict management, conflict resolution or conflict transformation ; rather, due to the hybrid nature of factors involved in the farmer-pastoralist conflicts, the three approaches are equally considered to be an integral package of strategies that need a holistic approach in any given context. Indeed, each approach is important depending on the particular stage of the conflict. However, unlike copflict management and resolution where a substantial number of methods have been applied, the practicality of transforming farmer-pastoralist conflicts is still at an infant stage. Poor efforts have undeniably been directed at the transformation of societal institutions (both formal and informal) and discourses (policy, public narratives and languages) upon which conflicts rest. They reflect a continued mishandling of conflicts brought about by a serious gap in knowledge that continues to constrain efforts in finding viable solutions to farmer-pastoralist conflicts

Critical to this review of farmer-pastoralist conflicts in Sub Saharan Africa and Tanzania in particular, lays a set of assumptions and underlying factors that contribute to the rise in hostility. The factors are described as hybrid as they range from colonial to postcolonial government policies, poor governance and political leadership, modernisation to liberalisation, public narratives to language use as well as environmental patterns. Therefore, conflict resolution, management and transformation require a multidimensional approach that takes into account a range of these contributing issues. In this review, we do not automatically accept these as the only assumptions about the generation of conflict, nor prioritise one assumption over another.

4.0 Conclusions

This study adopted a discursive analysis of literature that explains the causes of farmer-pastoralist conflicts and how these conflicts can be managed . This paper makes two general conclusions: Firstly, the farmer-pastoralist conflict tends to be best explained through an interpretive lens that sees many processes impacting on the highlighted issue. While this review has shown that farmer-pastoralist conflicts have been produced by social, historical, economic and discursive factors, the former three factors have dominated most of the analysis within the literature. In tum, little attention has been given to the discursive construction of the conflict. Discourses constitute the crucial means of generating, sustaining and mediating conflicts at all level of social organisation and, therefore, they need to be given proper attention. Social, historical and economic explanations alone are insufficient to capture the nuances of the conflict; primarily relying on these factors to explain the situation will only reduce the conflict into abstract phenomena.

Secondly, as regards how the farmers and pastoralists conflicts can be managed, there is no single solution. The reviewed literature shows that to effectively manage the conflicts communities need to adopt a multidimensional approach that takes into account a range of the contributing factors. Doing contrary to this will only temporarily put the conflicts under control but that may only be short-lived if some important issues that led to the conflict have not been resolved.

REFERENCES

Adebayo, 0.0.,and Olaniyi, 0.A. (2008). Factors associated with pastoral and crop farmers conflict in derived Savannah Zone of Oyo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Human Ecology, 23(1),* 71-74.

Alonso, S., and Ruiz-Rufino, R. (2007). Political representationand ethnic conflict in new democracies. *European Journal of Political Research, 46(2),* 237-267. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.2007.00693.x

AUSAID. (2000). *Good governance: principle of implementation*. Australia: Australian Government's Overseas Aid programme (AUSAID). Retrieved from http://www.ausaid.gov.au/pub lications/pdf/ good_governance. pdf

Baha, B., Attito, T., Axwesso, S., Luhwago, R., and Charles, B.(2008). *The Price of a Malfunctioning Land Management System in Tanzania: A Fact Finding Report on the Dispute between Pastoralists and Peasants in Kilosa District* (p. 29). Dar es Salaam: Oxfam Livelihood Initiative for Tanzania.

Banuri, T. (1990). Development and the politics of knowledge: a critical interpretation of the social role of modernization theories in the development of the Third World. In F. A. Marglin and S. A. Marglin (Eds.), *Dominating Knowledge: Development, Culture and Resistance*. London: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198286943 .001.0001

Benjaminsen, T. A., Maganga, F. P., and Abdallah, J. M. (2009). The Kilosa killings :political ecology ofa farmer-herder conflict in Tanzania. *Development and Change,* 40(3),423445. https://doi.org/10.1lll/j.14677660.2009.01558.x