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INTRODUCTION

There is a long historical record of fluctuating conflict, competition and co-operation between settled farmers and pastoral or transhumant herders. This includes periods of violent herder domination over settled farming production systems and the conversion of former pastoral lands to cultivation. The current levels of conflict that occur in some locations are clearly intolerable for farmers, herders and also for the environment. The need for local communities to resort to such violence is indicative of a lack of policies, or that existing policies are not working to the benefit of these communities as a whole (Baha et al., 2013). Evidence was presented of conflict between farmers and herders in the pre-colonial period. There is also considerable body of evidence for an increase of conflict within living memory and especially during the post-independence period. This evidence includes farmer and herder testimonies (Birch and Grahn, 2011). A significant number of researchers do not sense a dramatic increase in the incidence or gravity of farmer/herder conflicts. There was, however, a dearth of empirical data and it was difficult either to confirm or deny the hypothesis of increasing violent conflict. Those who argue that conflicts are not increasing, nevertheless feel that the causes of conflicts are changing and acknowledge that the visibility and perhaps intensity of such conflict is increasing. An important aspect of the changed nature of conflict has been the increasing availability of modern weapons, particularly in eastern Africa (Butter and Ghatas, 2012).

Farmer-herder conflict still occurs throughout the world. Deaths associated with such violence occur with regularity in Cameroon (Moritz, 2006); Ethiopia (Hagmann and Mulugeta, 2008); Ghana (Touré, 2011); the Ivory Coast (Barrena, 2010); and Tonah, 2003); Kenya (Karen and Roba, 2007; Karen and Adano, 2009); Mali (Benjaminsen and Espen, 2008; Benjaminsen and Ba, 2009); Niger (Turner, 2004); and northern Nigeria (Bello, 2013) to name but a few. In Tanzania, small-scale cultivation and livestock keeping are the two major production systems and livelihood endeavors practiced by many rural people in Tanzania. The two sectors contribute to approximately half the national income and around 80% of employment opportunities. It is estimated that the overall agricultural sector contribution to the national Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is approximately 40.7% (FAO, 2005). As opposed to estate cultivation, small-scale cultivation remains predominant in Tanzania. About 70% of small-scale crop farmers use traditional hand hoes to cultivate their farms, which are relatively small. In addition, they depend on rain-fed agriculture to raise a variety of food and cash crops. On the other hand, livestock keeping as a sub-sector in the large agriculture sector has significantly contributed to the food supply and national economy. Livestock converts rangeland resources into valuable products that are consumable by human beings. The proportion of livestock contribution to the agriculture GDP is approximately 29.5% (FAO, 2005). Livestock production falls under three sub-systems namely: commercial ranching, pastoralist and agro-pastoralist. Commercial ranching constitutes around 2% percent of all livestock activities in Tanzania. The remaining proportion is occupied by either pastoralist or agro-pastoralist. Pastoralist is practiced in the areas characterized by
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ABSTRACT

This article analyzes the drivers of conflicts between farmers and herders in Mvomero district which is found in Morogoro region in Tanzania. Data were collected from ten villages sampled from four wards in the district. Data were obtained through qualitative procedures, i.e. focus group discussion, face-to-face interviews and observation. Data were analysed using both content analysis and SPSS analysis tool. The study found that the conflict between farmers and herders is fueled by ethnic discriminations, corruption, political interests and lack of awareness among others. It is, therefore, recommended in this study that the Government should make early interventions to prevent indicators of the conflict rather than making post interventions to address actual conflict which could leave harm to communities. The information in the article would help policy makers, politicians, decision makers and implementers to come out with fruitful actions and strategies to improve the social economic well-being of the people living in Tanzania, especially in areas/regions with conflicts evolving farmers and herders.
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poor soils and insufficient rainfall. These areas are normally unfit for crop cultivation. Therefore, livestock are mainly kept for subsistence, storage of wealth and cash earnings. The most popular livestock are cattle, goat, sheep, poultry and pigs. The integration of crop management and livestock keeping (agro-pastoralism) is rapidly progressing in Tanzania, with rural people carrying out both cultivation and livestock keeping as a livelihood strategy. This integration of pastoral and cultivation systems is complementary to one another. For example, livestock support crop production by supplying draft power, manuring farms and providing household income through the sale of milk and meat. Additionally, crop residue and crop by-products provide important nutrition for the animals. However, the two systems are associated with considerable problems including drought, population growth, migration, environmental degradation and conflicts. These problems have exerted pressure on the historical relations between farmers and pastoralists. This paper analyzes the drivers of conflicts with the aim of developing sustainable strategies for peace amongst farmers and pastoralists in Mvomero district in Tanzania.

**The paradox on board:** Most of the inhabitants in Mvomero District are engaged in pastoralist and agriculture farming. However, the respective district suffers from conflicts between farmers and pastoralist since after the villagization process in 1967; nevertheless, both pastoralist and farmers blame each other to have instigated the issue associated with the conflicts problem. There have been many efforts to resolve emerging conflicts between pastoralist and farmers by the government, non-governmental organizations and researchers at a different level. For example, the establishment of pastoral villages in the 1990s was one of the government’s efforts in finding a lasting solution to these conflicts (Benjaminsen et al., 2009: 430; Baha et al., 2008). Non-Governmental Organizations also play big role to resolve emerging conflicts as one of example has played their roles in ensure there is a clear survey to show the demarcation of the conservation area so that to eradicate the clashes between farmers and herders. Parallel to that, Arusha-based non-governmental organization, community research and development services initiated 135,000 hectares to conservation area the aim was to conserve part of terrain in the district so that it supports local communities, especially the livestock keepers during the periods of prolonged droughts which are common in the area. Despite these efforts, the conflicts have been persisting, resulting in the loss of lives, insecurity and economic retardation. These land conflicts especially farmers pastoralist conflicts affect farming and lead to decrease productivity due to outburst violence between a pastoralist and agriculturalist villagers. Moreover, insecurity caused by endless land conflicts within a region is likely to have negative impacts. This study, therefore, sought to analyze drivers of conflict and propose an alternative framework of the approach that might have been overlooked in the analysis of the problem of farmer-herder conflicts through a thorough scrutiny of the dimensions of the conflicts.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The materials used in this paper are both secondary and primary. The qualitative analysis of the articles, books, news papers and journal on similar debates forms the bases for a key argument in this article. The primary data reinforced qualitative information obtained in scholarly documentations on the drivers of Conflict between Pastoralists and Smallholder Crop in Mvomero district Tanzania. In this case it is a mixed methodology that intended to capture the whole information on the drivers of Conflict between Pastoralists and Smallholder Crop.

**THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL DEBATE**

**Theoretical Debate**

**Marxism theory of class struggle and competition:** The Dependency and neo-Marxist theories which argue that, in a situation of scarcity of natural resources, there must be a strong competition to grab those resources. And always, a strong class win by whatever means legal or illegal (Mpangala, 2000). On their part, the radical structural or Marxist perspective argued that capitalism produces poverty due to its exploitative syndrome. Also, Marx was himself capable on occasion of the severest denunciation of the conditions of the capitalism to which he was exposed. He was convinced, moreover, that the dialectic process inevitably involves tragic conflicts, wars, and revolutions. He saw in history the deep tension between forces that are, in the last analysis, incompatible, each exerting its power to overcome the other (Stumpf, 1999). The point here to jot down in relation to our discussion is that in any society with classes of people, (have and have not), segregation and marginalization based on the ethnic line conflicts are indispensable at all. This situation always is caused by the poor leadership and weak administrative Institutions. When a state fails to enforce its coercive power its citizens use that loop-hole to take illegal actions into their hands. This theory is relevant to this study area because pastoralists and smallholder crop farmers on one hand and foreigner investors on other hand are competing to grab the natural resource (land). This situation resulted because of the exploitative nature of capitalism which emphasizes free trade and investments. However, this theory falls short of giving exhaustive causes of the conflict between herders and farmers; instead, the main argument raised by the theory to be the cause of the conflict is inequalities existing between the two parties which give them different abilities to influence public officials to favor one of the parties involved in the conflict. It is this shortfall of the Marxist theory that the researcher thought to supplement the theory with other two theories namely the Instrumentalism Theory of Ethnic Competition for Power and Resources and the Actor Oriented Theory.

**Instrumentalism theory of ethnic competition for power and resources:** The theory was propounded by Anthony Smith, which explains ethnic conflicts is a result of the actions of community leaders who used their cultural groups as sites of mass mobilization and as constituencies in their competition for power and resources because they found them more effective than social classes. The notion of manipulation is an inherent component of the instrumentalist school of thought. This theoretical approach asserts that ethnic identities are defined within the political process and are manipulated by political and ethnic elites. As a means to collective ends, it is used “defensively to thwart the ambitions of others or offensively to
achieve an end of one’s own ethnicity which is primarily a label or set of symbolic ties that is used for political advantage much like interest group membership or political party affiliation (Lake and Rothchild, 1998). Placed within a larger process of conflict escalation the instrumentalist view makes it possible to draw parallel line between conflicts with similar societal cleavages. One approach of the instrumentalist school focus on elite manipulation of ethnic identities: to “create greater internal cohesion and to press more effectively ethnic demands against rival groups, ethnic and nationalist elites increasingly stress the variety of ways in which the members of the group are similar to each other and collectively different from others (Brass, 1991).

The actor oriented theory: The Actor oriented theory, as developed by Long (2001), is the best theory suited to explain the causes of the conflict between farmers and herders in Mvomelo and elsewhere where there are such conflicts. According to Long, the differences in a society emerge from the diverse interests among individuals over a certain aspect of interest. Thus, the actors, with this respect, are different people who are in need and use land in Mvomelo District. From Long’s theorization, when actors interact, their interactions begin with an interest in something and then they give different responses to similar structural circumstances, even if the conditions appear relatively homogeneous. This is to say that the conflict between farmers and herders is a result of different reactions to a problem that might have a different response when it occurs in another area. This shows that in development interventions, different actors with dissimilar interests interact in the arena; for example, in the conservation interventions there are local communities, practitioners from different level ranging from local government institutions, higher and international agents. Certainly, they are composed of different background, understanding and interest. For example, there are agriculturalist, natural resource officers, land use planners, conservationists and local communities and investors. This is to say that the conflict between farmers and herders should be eyed beyond the two presumed actors, i.e. farmers and herders since the conflict and fights between the two may not be caused by the two but fuelled by third parties. In the similar note, this research examined the causes of the conflicts from and beyond the two actors – farmers and herders – and the strategies to address the conflict was also sought from and beyond the two actors.

Empirical literature review: The conflict between herders and farmers dates back to the dawn of history. Herodutus writing in the Fourth Century B.C. in Ancient Greece described Scythian nomadic depredations. Even earlier conflict is recorded in Ancient Mesopotamia (Kuznar and Robert, 2005). The endless struggles between the nomadic Bedouin and the fellahin (or peasants) of Arab societies have shaped the history of the Mideast (Smith, 1969). Much of rural Sub-Saharan Africa experiences such conflict today, from Namibia to Tanzania, to Burkina Faso, to the Sudan (Derman and Sjaastad, 2007). Indeed, an important element of the conflict in Darfur is one between pastoralists and sedentary agriculturists (Kuznar and Sedlmeier, 2005). The essential problem is that pastoralists require access to relatively large areas of land and tend to move their herds according to the seasons, ecology and weather changes. Such activities almost inevitably mean that they and sedentary agriculturists come into the competition over land and water. It is this competition that serves as the basis for armed violence between the two groups’ farmers and herders in communities. Today in East Africa and the Sahel, in Kenya, Tanzania, and Sudan, as well as Mali, Niger, and the Ivory Coast, violent low-intensity conflict occurs with regularity (Turner 2004, Benjaminsen and Boubacar Ba, 2009). Violence typically erupts as herders move their cattle into areas predominated by farmers. The farmers complain of trampled or eaten crops. The herders express frustration with fenced off land and watering holes drained for irrigation. The sequence of events that precipitate the violence varies. It may be herders retaliating after farmers seize some of the trespassing cattle, or it may be farmers defending their land against encroachment. Typically, though, the violence comes after a long history of conflict and escalating disputes over rights of access to water or land. Despite such any many scholarly writing a detailed documentation of drivers of farmers verses herders conflict emains a gap that this paper propounds.

Conceptual Framework
Agriculture (pastoralist and crop farming; our concern) uses inputs to transform it into final products and thus yield more and good products). Pastoralist plays an important role in the economy of Tanzania. Apart from the supply of meat and other animal products, pastoralist makes productive use of a large percentage of the available dry lands where the scarcity and variability of its natural resources have few alternative uses. On the other hand, crop farming plays an important role to the economy of Tanzania. In order for the two agricultural sectors yield maximum products and move in a harmonious and mutual way they need support/inputs like good governance, good development planning, good land policies, environmental conservation knowledge; to mention a few. Tanzania has been experiencing conflicts and chaos between pastoralists and crop farmers in some parts of is; for instance in Mvomero District in, Morogoro region. That means, beside the country’s poor governance, poor political leadership and development planning, public narratives; other factors like colonialism, post colonial state governance and associated policies, modernization discourse, economic reform and liberalization has been driving force of these conflicts. The government of Tanzania has done little in solving the conflicts between pastoralists and crop farmers in Mvomero district hence; there have been many repercussions (output) like high poverty, reduced livelihoods, insecurity, instability and sufferings among the host communities in the areas. This article was then proposed to expose the discourses upon which both the pastoralists and their conflicts with crop farmers have been constructed, and the way this construction influences the solutions to these conflicts.

Findings
The drivers of the conflicts between pastoralist and small scale crop farmers: To come up with realistic and comprehensive answers, the article examined a number of issues, including leaders’ behavior, the characteristics of the activities conducted by both farmers and herders, characteristics of the environment and the impacts of technology on the people’s life. A close analysis was made to see if these aspects contribute to the conflict between the two groups in Mvomero district in Tanzania.
Corruption by public officials: Through the questionnaire distributed to the VEOs, councilors and VCs, it was revealed that corruption is the leading cause of the conflict between herders and farmers whereby public officials are alleged to be receiving corruptions from each of the two parties in conflict in order to favour another in terms of land distribution or in solving the conflicts between farmers and herders when some cases about damages are reported in their offices. As presented in the table below, 90% of all twenty (20) VEOs, VCs and councilors said that the conflict is fueled by bribes received by public officials in Mvomero District.

Table 1. Corruption among public officials is the source of the conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses by the officials as presented above are consistent with the arguments raised during the interviews with both farmers and herders though these two groups blamed each other for seeking favour from the public officials by either bribing them or by getting natural favour from the public officials. This argument is confirmed by the following quotes from the interviews with both the farmers and herders:

We are being mistreated by officials because they get paid by the herders. Herders are rich, and they quickly pay the officials when we report herder’s violence. Because they have money to pay, they keep grazing their animals in our crop fields… these people get arrested but, in a few days, you will find them around streets (FGD with farmers on 13th March 2018, at Kikeo Ward).

While farmers complained that herders get favoured by the public officials, herders also had the similar blames, but arguing than farmers are favoured by the public officials with an argument that agriculture is the main source of livelihood in Tanzania and that it absorbs a majority of unemployed people. In the herders’ view, the public officials shouldn’t be giving such arguments because they marginalize herders while almost every person in Tanzania eats meat which is largely from the herders’ animals. For example, the following quotes were taken from the interviews with herders during data collection for this study.

The government’s eye is on farmers only; we herders are taken as alien people in our land. They keep moving us from here to there while we had our own places. They keep moving us in areas when our animals will die. Just think why are herders being moved from here and there? (FGD with herders 16th March 2018, at Kikeo Ward).

While the farmers and herders blame the public officials for favouring one of the parties in using the available land, there is another throw of blame between public officials and politicians. During interviews with councilors from the sampled wards, it was argued that public officials have been intentionally favouring one of the parties in need of the use of land when it comes to the allocation of land for either grazing or crop fields.
The following quotes were taken from some of the interview responses with the councilors involved in the study:

… These officials are corrupt; they are the root cause of the problem because they are bribed. Most often, they receive bribes from the herders because herders have immediate money to give them. This is why these conflicts are not ending… (interview with one of the councilors 24th March 2018, at Kikeo ward).

There is a hand of public officials in these conflict, they do not take enough initiatives to solve the conflicts because they do benefit from the conflicts. They get bribed when the parties in conflict in order to be favoured when resolving the conflict.

The problems fueled by politicians: The politicians are also blamed by public officials for being a source of the conflict because, at different times, they promise each of the parties in conflict to get rid of the other party from the land they own. From the questionnaire responses by the VEOs and VCs (see the Table 6 below), it was argued by all ten (10) VEOs and five (5) VCs that the politicians do give promises especially during political campaigns for elections, the promises which make the parties in conflict to believe that the promised land belongs to them and soon after the election they start invading the areas.

Table 2. Politicians are the source of the conflict?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same claims were advanced by both farmers and herders during the interviews with them. The following are some of the quotes taken from the interviews with both the farmers and herders.

During political campaigns, some politicians promised farmers that they will evict us from the land we own so that farmers can cultivate on the land… just see how we are being ridiculed! (FGD with herders 15th April 2018, at Maskati Ward).

There is one politician who was asking herders to vote him during the election so that he protect them from being returned to their original land of grazing animals (FGD with herders 15th April 2018, at Maskati Ward).

Lack of awareness about land policies: Along with the blames thrown to the public officials and politicians, the findings of the study also show that there is a general lack of awareness of land policies by both the farmers and herders. For example, each of the two groups involved in the conflict claims to own the land because their elders have been there since long forgetting that the land is the government’s property. All the VEOs (10 respondents) and VCs (10 respondents) who responded to the questionnaire held that the community lacks awareness about the land policies. The same argument was raised by all the four interviewed ward executive officers who argued that each of the parties tend to claim ownership of certain land without knowing that the land had earlier planned for other uses by the government. It was also realized through interviews with farmers that herders sometimes graze their animals in crop fields after the crops have been harvested for their animals to eat some of the crops and grasses left after harvesting with an argument that farmers have already harvested and so there are no any destructions caused by the animals. According to the farmers, their fields get destructed by the large stock of animals entered in the fields and that the grasses left in the field are intended to be manure after they decompose that is why they end up fighting. The following quotes substantiate some of the interview responses from the ward executive officers.

… some people come in my office arguing “that is our family land, we have been tilling the land for over ten years and nobody said that it is the Government’s land. You have seen that the land is becoming valuable after our efforts and then you come to claim that it is the Government’s land…” (Interview with WEO 27th April 2018, at Maskati Ward).

… when we have harvested we do leave the husks and grasses in the fields for them to decompose and become manure. This improves our productions in the next season, but herders tend to graze in our fields after we have harvested and when we tell them not to get in our fields they do say that there is nothing in the fields to be destroyed by their animals (FGD with farmers 29th April 2018, at Maskati Ward).

Along with the observations above, both farmers and herders think that investors do not have right to own land and, thus, they start claiming that the people are taking their land or that the government officials have sold their land to the investors, something which is not true.

We, the officials, are always blamed when conflicts arise; people just claim that we sell land to investors but when you ask them to give you evidence for their argument nobody can show you anything. When they see investors around the places here, the only thing that comes to their mind is that we, the officials, sold the land (WEO of Maskati Ward on 30th April, 2018).

Table 3. Unspoken causes of the conflict?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhuman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Poor technology: Through observation and interviews with both farmers and herders, it was revealed that the lack of technology among the farmers themselves and the herders also may be one of the indirect causes of the conflict. For example, most of the farmers practice peasant agriculture where they own several pieces of land which are also scattered. This is due to the low technology they use in their cultivation and, thus, they have to cultivate in several pieces; as a result of this, they end up getting...
into the areas that herders claim ownership. In the same manner, because of the low production they get and also because of the cultural reasons, herders keep a large number of animals to ensure that they get productions. Because herders herd a large number of animals, they often find themselves falling in the shortage of water and pasture to feed their animals and sometimes they have to do whatever means available to rescue their animals from starving, which makes them end up in clashes with farmers. The herders also claimed that they have to keep a number of animals because of uncertainties of their ability to control animals’ diseases and so keeping a large number of animals gives them assurance that they will still remain with some animals when a disease attacks and kills some of the animals they own. In the interviews with herders, the following quotes were taken to substantiate this lack of technology by both farmers and herders.

I own four different pieces of land, one three in this (Taigo) village and one Ndirimbish village, I cannot depend on one piece of land only, if this one does not produce well, then the other one will produce and so I can support my family in that way (interview with a farmer at Mvomero Ward on 14th May, 2018).

In our culture, a real man has to own a good number of animals. He who does not possess a good number of animals cannot confidently talk before other men. The animals may also be attacked by diseases and you may lose a number of your animals, if you kept only a few animals then you will remain poor and if you had a good number of them you will still remain with some animals when others die from a disease (interview with a herder on 15th May, 2018 at Mvomero Ward).

Related to the lack of technology is the continuing change of climate which affects both farmers and herders. As the different areas of the country continue to experience the shortage of rainfall and long droughts, shortage of suitable land for agriculture and shortage of pasture and water for grazing animals also escalates. This then causes both farmers and herders to scramble over the short land that is suitable for both agriculture and herding of animals. The change of climate is also argued to cause immigration of many herders from different areas of the country into Mvomero in search of grazing land which also further intensifies the farmer-herder conflict as it was argued by one of the councilors during an interview with him on 17th May 2018 at Mvomero ward.

... you know, farmers do blame public officials for allowing some herders who migrate from different areas of the country to get in their District as it adds more pressure on land. There are many herders who are not originally from here, they have come here with large groups of animals and claim ownership of land. This causes more hatred by farmers towards herders and public officials.

**Discussion and conclusive remarks**

Reading through the findings presented above, it is clear than the root drivers of conflict between herders and farmers are beyond the presumed two groups, namely farmers and herders. Though there are some of the drivers that originate from the two, such as lack of awareness between the two parties and ethnicity, many of the causes of the conflict are beyond the limit of the two parties. Further, it is important to quickly point out that even the problem of ethnicity is a result of the factors beyond the two and so the two groups find themselves divided in terms of ethnicity as they struggle to survive over the few available resources. This claim is well supported by Max (cited in Mpagala, 2000) that, in a situation of scarcity of natural resources, there must be strong competition to grab those resources. The same is pointed out by Long (2001) that differences [ethnicity, *italics* mine] in the society emerge from the diverse interests of the individuals occur over a certain aspect of interest. Thus, with this information, the article is of the opinion that it is not time yet to blame the two fighting groups until when the problem of shortage of resources suitable for their activities is addressed. It is revealed through this paper that in the conflict there is a hand of politicians who take the advantage of the conflict to penetrate their political interest, especially those related to getting political seats or remaining into power. In their attempt to penetrate their political interests, the two rival parties find themselves in serious conflicts which sometimes claim their lives and most often thwart their efforts to bring development. This article informs the Government of Tanzania that, in addressing, the conflict between farmer-herders, it is important to identify the other people or institutions around the two rival groups that are in conflict to take measures upon them before reconciliations between the two fighting groups are sought. Carl Max (as cited in Mpagala, 2000) and Adam Smith (as cited in Brass, 1991) had earlier warned about this tendency of the people in power to take an advantage of other’s problems to advance their interests. For example, Max came with an argument that when the state fails to enforce its coercive power, its citizens use that loop-hole to take illegal actions into their hands. Smith also holds the same argument but adding that ethnic conflicts are a result of the actions of community leaders who use their cultural groups as cites of mass mobilization and constituencies in their completion of power and resources.

However, it was revealed that some of the causes are not serious issues that should necessarily lead into the conflict and killing of people; for example, when herders graze on the fields after the harvesting is done should not be a point to kill each other. It is important to understand that people react differently to situations; thus, there is a need for the Government to educate people to build up the tolerance towards different understandings. It is argued by Long (2001) that when actors interact, their interactions begin with an interest in something and then they give different responses to similar structural circumstances, even if the conditions appear relatively homogeneous. Also, the Government of Tanzania cannot go without criticism for its tendency to frequently move herders from their original areas into different areas where they end up falling into clashes with the indigenous. This was raised by some herders who argued to be falling into clashes because they were forced to move into new areas. It should be known that these are the legacy of *Ujamaa* policy. Sendalo (2009) *Ujamaa* was introduced in 1967 by the first Tanzanian president Julius Nyerere where mainstream development paradigm. Nyerere believed that for those people who lived in the widespread
homestead or who practiced the traditional transhuman way of life, should all live in proper villages, commonly referred to as Ujamaa villages. However, it should be known that, during the time of Ujamaa policy, it was possible to move people because there was no private ownership of land and there were no investors as well so it is impractical to keep moving people from their indigenous areas. Thus, with these analyses, it suffices to say that the conflict between farmers and herders originates within our own internal factors and should be addressed internally.

The evidence that the conflict between farmers and herders is a result of the clashes between the parties over the scramble for resources and that some public officials and politician intensify the conflicts to advance their interests contradicts the argument med by Hussein et al. (1999) and Maganga et al. (2007) and as well the often argument held by many Africans that these conflicts are fueled by the colonialists. For example, Hussein et al. (1999) argue that colonial interference in Tanzania is one of contributing factors of deteriorating crop farmer-pastoralist relations and Maganga et al. (2007) argue that new entities of land management were ascertainment during colonialism, followed by the demarcation of tribal boundaries. 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 fact that the conflict between farmer and herders is not over boundaries, but fueled internally, is a proscription that these conflicts do not have external forces. These findings proscribe one of the assumptions earlier held by the article, as presented in the conceptual framework for the study that the conflict is caused by colonial legacies, especially boundary and areas given to some people during the colonial era; rather, the drivers of the conflicts are within the country, something which insinuates that the solution to the problem can be reached immediately. On the other hand, other factors assumed, like poor governance, scarcity of land, political leadership and development planning, modernization and climatic change are confirmed to be true.

**Recommendations**

In this study, it was found that most of the people from both the farmers and herders still lack awareness about land policies and laws, thus leading to unnecessary quarrels among the land users. It is, therefore, recommended that the Government of Tanzania should incorporate land policies in school curriculum, at least in the secondary education so that to increase the number of people with awareness about the policies. Given that land use plan is confirmed, through this analysis, to be a panacea to address land conflicts, the Government of Tanzania should make sure that the land in the country is properly planned to identify the areas for each of the activities on land. This will significantly arrest the conflicts everywhere in the country. Prior measures to prevent land conflicts should be made since the study realized that the government has been intervening in issues after physical fights occur. The strategies should also be improved to address the conflicts because the currently used strategies are proved to be ineffective but, more importantly, people should be enabled to use technology in their activities so that they reduce pressure on the available land, which will in turn help to arrest the conflicts.
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