

Sustainable Development Cost of Nomadic Pastoralist –Farmers Conflict in Nigeria: A Cause for Rethink

¹Ugwoke Chikaodilli Juliet (Ph.D), ²Attamah, Paulinus Ikechukwu

Department of Public Administration and Local Government, University of Nigeria, Nsukka

¹julietugwoke@gmail.com, ²Paulinus.attama@unn.edu.ng

Abstract: Nigeria since independence has been besieged with violent conflict, differently; Nomadic pastoralist-farmers conflict has spread to six geo-political zones accompany with horrifying socio-economic and environmental implications. Nigeria has witnessed a great loss of lives and properties, destruction of invaluable facilities, and unconducive environment for normal business activities to take place. All these point to the retardation in sustainable development efforts. Nigeria cannot promote sustainable development in an environment devoid of peace, justice and freedom. This dreadful situation requires a proactive solution; a paradigm shift from transhumance to ranching is necessary. Federal government as the custodian of security should implement its impending ranching policy, ban open grazing and strengthen its security agencies so to safeguard the country from the scourge of persistent nomadic pastoralist-farmers conflict.

Keywords: Conflict, Nomadic Pastoralist, Farmers, Sustainable development, Cost.

1. INTRODUCTION

Security threat is a global issue that requires urgent attention as it occurs in different parts of the world in various forms and dimension. In regard to the global Peace Index 2018, the global level of peace has deteriorated by 0.27% in the last year, marking the fourth successive year of deteriorations. The world is less peaceful today than at any time in the last decade using three thematic domains: the level of Societal Safety and Security; the extent of Ongoing Domestic and International Conflict; and the degree of Militarisation. Violent conflict has become part and parcel of human existence. It is a phenomenon that occurs as a result of interaction or contact among people; hence conflict is an “unavoidable concomitant of choice and decision and expression of basic fact of human interdependence” (Zartman, 1991). Incomparably, violent conflict in Nigeria has become more frequent, more intense, and wider in scope and of a longer duration.

The Nigeria state since early 1960's has been engulfed with incessant and unprecedented level of violent insecurity emanating from ethno-religious conflict, inter/intra tribal war, civil war, indigene and non indigene conflict, communal clashes, political conflict, militancy and insurgency. Accordingly, Nigeria was ranked 148th position out of 163 independent states in the 2018 Global Peace Index and counted among the sixteen least peaceful countries in the world. In the same pattern, in the regional average, Nigeria was placed very low at 40th position of 44 independent states in Sub-Sahara Africa owing to internal political tensions and an increase in the impact of terrorism and internal conflict. Paradoxically, the 1999 constitution of federal republic of Nigeria Chapter 2, section 14 (2b) clearly stated that the provision of security to safeguard lives and property and welfare service provisioning is the statutory responsibility of the government to its citizens. The inability of the

government apparatus to secure lives and properties have made the scholars to question the efficacy of the Nigerian government in discharging its primary obligation since Nigeria independence. What however is so disturbing with the development is how the attacks in almost all cases took place under the eyes of security agencies (Gadzama, 2018).

The most direct and serious security threats facing Nigeria currently is violent conflict which exists between Fulani herdsmen and farmers. The climatic changes and desert encroachment in the far northern part of Nigeria have forced the herders to move further central and south in search for alternative pasture and water for the survival of their cattle. Nomadic pastoralists carry their cattle from street to street, from villages to cities in search of green pasture and water with erroneous perception of land as a common property. Regrettably, nomadic herdsmen subscribed to a high degree of irregular mobility which they are yet unwilling to change. Many of them contend that nomadism is among their tradition, a part of their identity which they are not willing to sacrifice for anything.

Conflict root lies on the indiscriminate grazing, destruction of large expanse of arable agricultural farmland, raping of the non-Fulani women by herders and pollution of water through defecation by cattle. This situation has led to violent disagreement as farmers want to protect their means of livelihood and Fulani herders see the survival of the cattle as their lives. Subsequently, Northern central Nigeria remained a cauldron of constant commotions and perilous unrest that threaten the peace, security and corporate existence of the Nigerian state (Itumo, Udeuhele and Aro, 2017). The Fulani herdsmen attack on the farmers is incomparable to the former, as it has spanned almost all the Northern state, currently in southern region with dire consequences. Violent conflicts between nomadic herders from northern Nigeria and sedentary agrarian communities in the central and southern zones have escalated in recent years

and are spreading southward, threatening the country's security and stability (International Crisis Group, 2017).

Owing to public security volatility in the conflict ridden states, industrial, agricultural and commercial activities have often been constrained. Nomads have seen farmlands as the primary area of launching their attack on peasant farmers. In addition, the fear of attacks by the pastoralist has often driven communities into hiding. The proliferation of illicit small arm and explosive weapon among the nomadic pastoralist has considerably intensified instability, violence and insecurity in our contemporary society. Omale (2013), states that the conflict between Pastoralists and Farmers over that the land related issues, especially on the grazing fields account for the highest percentage of the conflicts in Nigeria.

Explicitly, it appears that nomadic pastoralist-farmers conflict portends grave consequence on agricultural production with long term negative and severe impacts on socio-economic and environmental development of Nigeria. It is against this backdrop that this study examined the impact of Nomadic pastoralists-Farmers conflict on the present and future development of Nigeria.

2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Persistent conflict between farmers and nomadic pastoralist has become challenging issue in Nigeria state as its consequences have overtaken that of the book Haram. International Crisis Group (2017) categorically stated this conflict has exacted a heavy humanitarian toll with thousands killed and tens of thousands displaced. Some estimates suggest about 2,500 were killed countrywide in 2016 – a toll higher than that caused by the Boko Haram insurgency over the same period. Achieving sustainable development goals by the year 2030 have been the global target. Nigeria is signatory to this policy. The outcry of the menace of open grazing is a worrisome issue as it has potential of curtailing achievement of Sustainable Development Goals, hence this study explores the impact of this conflict on the present and future development of Nigeria, with the aim of adopting better strategy that would favour both the nomads and farmers; and enthrone development that is sustenance. The study is guided with the following research questions:

1. What are the social sustainability development costs of farmers-pastoralist nomadic conflict in Nigeria?
2. Are there economic Sustainable development costs of nomadic pastoralist –Farmers Conflict in Nigeria?
3. What are the environmental sustainable development costs of nomadic pastoralist –farmers Conflict in Nigeria?
4. Can restricted grazing system curb perennial farmers-pastoralist nomadic conflict in Nigeria?

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The broad objective of the study is to examine the impact of Pastoralists and Farmers conflict on the sustainable development. The specific objectives are to:

1. Examine the social sustainability development cost of farmers-pastoralist nomadic conflict in Nigeria
2. Ascertain the economic Sustainable development cost of nomadic pastoralist –Farmers Conflict in Nigeria
3. Investigate environmental sustainable development cost of nomadic pastoralist –farmers Conflict in Nigeria
4. Find out if restricted grazing system can curb perennial farmers-pastoralist nomadic conflict in Nigeria

4. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Conflict

Conflict has become part and parcel of human existence as man is a social being that exists in an interdependence of one another. In otherwords, conflict is a phenomenon that occurs as a result of interaction or contact among people, scarcity of resource in the society and conflicting values and ideas. Zartman (1991) noted that conflict is an unavoidable concomitant of choice and decision and expression of basic fact of human interdependence. According to Boulding (1963) conflict is a situation of competition in which the parties are aware of the incompatibility of potential future position and each party want to occupy a position that is incompatible with the wishes of the other. Due to the scarcity of resources and desire of each party to harness the resource at the expense of the other, conflict and war engulf the international system.

The most pathetic about these conflicts is that they seem to have defiled meaningful solution and their negative impacts have retarded growth and development as a result of the insecurity it generates. National security is the topmost priority of any nation state in the world. Security is a prerequisite for national development. It provides an enabling environment for national development efforts to thrive. Gwarzo (1998) sees national security as freedom from hunger, freedom from threat to a nation's inability to protect and defend itself, promote its cherished values and interest and enhance the well being of its people. Differently, Beland (2005) defined insecurity as a state of fear or anxiety stemming from a concrete or alleged lack of protection. Insecurity common descriptors include: want of safety; danger; hazard; uncertainty; want of confidence; doubtful; inadequately guarded or protected; lacking stability; troubled; lack of protection; and unsafe (Achumba, Ighomereho, and Akpor-Robaro, 2013). Insecurity in Nigerian state has assumed the level of an alarming proportion as it has widened and deepened socio-economic and political crisis in our society.

5. CONCEPT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The plethora of armed robbery, ethnic crisis, assassination, militancy, kidnapping and insurgence has devastating implications to sustainable development. Sustainable development as multidimensional concept has been defined in different perspectives. UN, World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987) defined sustainable development as “development, which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”. This definition emphasizes equity as imperative in the exploitation of resources within and between generations. It harmonizes continued socio-economic growth with ecology. Man is manipulating his immediate environment for the satisfaction of his own needs. The Brundtland Commission advocates highlights prevention of undue harm to natural resources in man’s efforts to meet his essential needs. UN’s Conference on Environment and Development or ‘Earth Summit’ held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 concluded that there is interplay between the environment and development. Moreover, it emphasized that the three pillars of sustainable developments (economic, environmental and social developments) are mutually reinforcing and interrelated; and any activity in one pillar has a spillover effects in the others.

For development to be sustainable, all the three pillars must be sustainable. Teodorescu (2015) posits that sustainable development requires simultaneously ensuring of economic development, environmental protection and social welfare, resulting in an interrelationship between the three pillars: social, economic and environmental dimension.

Social development pillar of sustainable development is focused on promoting the living condition of the present through the eradication of poverty, reduction of inequality and at the same time preserving the natural capital. Sustainable social development is mainly achieved through the broadening of the employment opportunities of the individuals through skill acquisition, access to education and job creation. It is a veritable machinery of addressing inequality and escaping from poverty.

Environmental sustainability requires maintaining the natural capital as both a provider of economic inputs called ‘sources’ and an absorber of economic outputs called ‘wastes’ (United Nations General Assembly (1987). The natural capital constitute the plants, minerals, animals, air or oil from the biosphere seen as means of production of goods. Sustainable environmental development encourages the practice of renewable energy, reducing fossil fuel consumption and emissions, sustainable agriculture and fishing, organic farming, tree planting and reducing deforestation, recycling, and better waste management as means of overcoming environmental problem and attainment of sustainable development (Yada Drop, 2014). These are necessary for the existence of man and his survival; as well,

it requires that there should be a mutual enforcement and balance among the three pillars.

Economic Sustainability is the ability of an economy to support a defined level of economic production indefinitely. From the economic perspective, sustainable development implies a maximum profit in terms of satisfaction of other pillars of sustainability. Apparently, it is impracticable to pursue the desired economic growth in the isolation of ecological or social pillar. For economic development to be enhanced, it requires addressing social issues such as fear of safety, inequality, and unemployment problem; alongside with environmental degradation factors.

The Relationship between Insecurity and Sustainable Development

Security and sustainable development are inextricably linked; the threats to security have negative sustainable development implications, including contests over natural resources, spillover effects of environmental degradation, economic and social inequalities, economic and political, migration, and natural disasters, among others (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (2015). Nigeria is blessed with rich natural and human resources; however, a preponderant range of poverty amidst plenty in Nigerian undoubtedly explains the inherent and perilous level of insecurity that has bedeviled Nigeria society. Crime and violence are increasingly recognized as serious obstacles to social and human capital formation and sustainable economic development. Emphasizing on the implication of insecurity on achieving sustainable development, Achumba, Ighomereho and Akpor-Robaro (2013) state thus:

Therefore, security is crucial for sustainable development. In the absence of security, economic growth and development cannot be sustained as it destroys economic, human and social capital. Under conditions of peace and security, people and government can direct their efforts and resources towards improving human life.

The continuing issues of external aggression and internal upheavals rendered sustainable development process ineffective due to wanton killing that is inbuilt in violent conflict, destruction of invaluable facilities, diversion of the economic resource to the security sector and reduction in the foreign investment in conflict ridden zones. Multidimensional social conflicts in any state stand as the major indexes of measuring its strength and viability. Wars, conflict, crises, poverty, and political instability mark the

hallmarks of fragile or failed states, reliance on black market, outbreak of various epidemics, electoral instability, and refugee flow (Ifesinachi, 2011). The worsening state of insecurity in the third world countries have claimed a lot of lives, stagnated development and destroyed the economy of the area.

6. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Social conflict theory

For an in-depth explanation and understanding of the pastoralist nomadic herdsman-farmer conflict in Nigerian politics, the analysis of this study is anchored on social conflict theory. Social conflict theory is a distinct theory that analyzed the influence of scarce resource, conflicting values and inequality on the relationship between groups in the society. Social conflict theory was propounded by Klar Marx between 1830-1880. Social conflict theory proposes that there are existences of groups in our society that compete over scarce resources. In other words, it states that conflict occurs as result of scarce resources in society. The parties in the conflict are aggregate of individuals rather than a single individual. The social conflict argues that society is characterized by various inequalities and insufficient supply of resources, hence conflict abound.

The groups are aware that increase of the resource of one group directly leads to the decrease of the resources of the other. In social conflict theory, each group usually adopts the strategy of inflicting damage, injury or harm on the opponent as a means of eliminating them. According to Coser (1967), social conflict is a struggle over values or claims to status, power and scarce resource in which the aims of the conflict group are not only to gain the desired values but also to injure or eliminate the opponent. This theory capture the clash between Fulani herdsman and farmer in

Nigeria, they are struggling over scarce resources. This is because, as the nomadic herdsman are busy searching for pasture and water for the survival of the cattle and make livelihood from their sales, the residents of host communities (farmers) protect their farms which these animals use as grazing land. It has noted that activities nomadic pastoralist in Nigeria has led to the genocides of some communities in Plateau and Benue through their explosive weapons in their bid to achieve their goal.

Methodology

The data for this study were generated through secondary sources. The relevant materials on nomadic pastoralist -Farmers conflict and sustainable development in Nigeria were obtained from textbooks, journals, magazines, newspapers, periodicals and seminars. Unpublished materials that contained valuable information on complicated problem of herder-farmer conflict in specified countries and its' implications on sustainable development were also utilized. Secondary sources were chosen because they helped to gather a wider range of information that have been analysed by the authors.

Social Sustainability Cost of Pastoralist Nomadic-Farmers Conflict in Nigeria

Social sustainability development is centered on human development. This is measured with indicators such as level of employment, safety of lives and property, reduction of inequality and access to the social services. Nomadic Pastoralist -Farmers conflict had dire humanitarian consequences on conflict ridden communities and Nigeria at large. Owing to herders-farmers conflict that has spread in 22 states out of 36 states in Nigeria, the livelihood conditions of the affected States have been disastrous.

Table: I. States Affected by the Herder -Farmer Conflict (Geopolitical Zones)

S/N	North West	North East	North Central	South East	South-South	South West
	Kaduna	Yobe	Nassarawa	Enugu	Delta	Ogun
	Kebbi	Adamawa	Kogi	Imo	Cross River	Oyo
	Sokoto	Taraba	Benue	Abia	Edo	Ekiti
	Zamfara		Kwara			
	Kastina		Plateau			

Source: Mbaeze, C. N. and Nnaji, E. S. (2018)

Grazing on the farmland has destroyed the livelihoods of farmers and rendered them ineffective to meeting their basic needs. Over 40% of Nigerian farmers in these regions have abandoned their farms for the safety of their lives. The conflict between the Herders and the Farmers has prompted a reduction in not just the farmers' outputs but also in the income of farmers owing to the destruction of crops by cattle (Mbaeze and Nnaji, 2018). The looming destruction of farmland and reduction of income of farmer's portends devastating consequences for social sustenance

United Nations member states unanimously adopted a sustainable development goal 2 towards ending hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition for all, by the year 2030. Regrettably, the deteriorating effect of pastoralists-farmers

conflict on Agricultural production indicates the irony in the development efforts. The total population of Nigeria as at 2000, stood at 123,337,800 million people, this number increased to 170,123,700 in the year 2012, which shows a growth rate of 3.8% between 2000 to 2012 (Mundi index, 2012). All the same, the Nigerian population is highest in Africa. Agriculture is the mainstay of Nigeria's economy, employing approximately two-thirds of the country's total labor force and the main source of providing adequate, safe and nutritious food for Nigerians (IFAD 2012). Invariably, securing food for this growing population largely hinges on the performance of the agriculture sector.

Explicitly, food security has become a serious issue in Nigeria since Nomads have seen farmlands as the primary

area of launching their attacks on peasant farmers. Apparently, the Buhari administration steers its development efforts on the path of agricultural production promotion, this commitment is shown in its 5 agricultural initiatives: Anchor Borrowers Programme, Presidential Fertilizer Initiative, Youth Farm Lab, Presidential Economic Diversification Initiative (PEDI) and Food Security Council (Toromade, 2018). Its commitment to agriculture is also made manifest in budgetary allocation to the sector since his ascension to power, the president Buhari led administration allocated N118.98 billion as budgetary allocation to the Agricultural sector for the year 2018. This amount allocated to the sector is however an improvement from the N103.79 billion allotted to the sector in the Nigerian 2017 budget, an increase of about N15.19 billion (Opurum, 2018).

Concurrently, the incessant killing and destruction of the farm crops by the armed Fulani pastoralist poses threat to food security in Nigerian state and undermines the Buhari's development efforts through agriculture. Mercy Corps (2016) disclosed that the perennial clashes between herdsmen and farmers in Nigeria drastic effects on food security. A perfect storm of food scarcity, and the country's population explosion, is plunging Nigerian into the biggest crisis by pushing up food prices and spreading hunger and poverty from rural areas into cities.

The northern central states are the Key food producing states; unfortunately the violent clash between Farmers and pastoralist nomadic has a deteriorating effect in the food production. Many farmers have abandoned their unharvested crops for the safety of their lives due to armed Fulani herdsmen, hence hunger and poverty increased beyond possible imagination. The 2012 Global Hunger Index ranked Nigeria 40th out of 79 nations, still, as situation become worst, Nigerian ranks 84th out of 119 countries on the 2018 global hunger index-behind Togo, Kenya, Cameroon and Senegal. Nigeria is among four countries in world that at [immediate risk](#) of dying of hunger due to violent conflict that cripple Agriculture sector and deprive indigent citizen the means of livelihood, thus; unemployment, poverty, inequality and hunger abound. Emphasizing on the effect of conflict and violence in Nigeria on food security, Global Protection Cluster (2017) clearly stated thus:

More than 20 million people across four countries risk facing starvation. Wars in Yemen, northern Nigeria, South Sudan and Somalia have devastated livelihoods and collapsed economies. ...conflict is devastating the agriculture sector, ruining the country's

rural and urban economy, and bringing the country to the brink of famine. Conflict and violence in all four countries have impeded physical and economic access to food, particularly as a result of the disruption of livelihoods and markets, as well as distorted access to land and employment.

The GHI scores the global ranking of two famine-threatened countries; Nigeria and Yemen fall in the serious and alarming categories, respectively. It is expected that in near future Nigeria will still be categorized among the countries with high risk of hunger if this conflict is not in the bud.

Human Casualties/Fatalities:

The worst humanitarian consequences of the pastoralists-farmers conflict has been its tolls on human life and safety. Herders-farmers conflict has led to loss of many lives, in addition to various degrees and dimension of human injury. International Crisis Group (2017) noted that the conflict has exacted a heavy humanitarian toll with thousands killed and tens of thousands displaced. It recorded that about 2,500 were killed countrywide in 2016 – a toll higher than that caused by the Boko Haram insurgency over the same period. Benue state has the hardest hit, Ortom reports that more than 1,878 people were killed between 2014 and 2016.

In 2018 Nigeria experienced the biggest yearly deterioration in pastoralists-farmers conflict on record. The conflict between the farmer and herdsmen was intensified as it claimed the lives of 168 helpless villagers in Adamawa, Benue, Taraba, Ondo and Kaduna states in January alone (Amnesty International, 2018). Nevertheless, More than 1,300 Nigerians died from the farmer-herder conflicts in the first half of this year, while the death toll from the Nigeria-based Boko Haram's insurgency was about 250 (Olukoya, 2018). This is due to the proliferation of arms and explosive weapons among the herdsmen. The former Director General of National Agency for Food, Drug Administration and Control (NAFDAC), Paul Orhii confirmed that herder used chemical weapon in their perennial attacks on farmers. Speaking to journalist, he stated thus: "Chemical weapons have been used on our people and for the first time i saw it yesterday. It was concealed in canister smells" (Abah, 2014).

Apart from the Nigerian Civil War (1967 – 1970) and Boko Haram insurgency, no other event of complex emergency has been as debilitating as the herders-farmers clash in terms of humanitarian impacts. National Bureau of Statistics (2018) disclosed that the most common of this conflict event experienced by the household was

displacement or migration of at least one household member, which affected one third of households (33%). In addition, Tens of thousands also have been displaced from January 2015 to February 2017, at least 62,000 people were displaced in Kaduna, Benue and Plateau states; in the absence of Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) camps, most seek shelter in other poor, rural communities, straining their already scarce resources (International Crisis Group, 2017). In addition, the study reported that from September 2017 through June 2018, farmer-herder violence left at least 1,500 people dead, many more wounded and about 300,000 displaced – an estimated 176,000 in Benue, about 100,000 in Nasarawa, over 100,000 in Plateau, about 19,000 in Taraba and an unknown number in Adamawa. The associated consequences of displacement are limited access to social service such as education, health, cleaning water and high increase of rape.

Economic Sustainability Development Cost of Pastoralist Nomadic-Farmers Conflict in Nigeria

Sustainable economic development is an offshoot of sustainable social development. The economic implications of herders-farmers conflict has become a reality in conflict prone areas in particular and Nigeria at large. The Institute for Peace and Sustainable Development (2018) puts that Nigeria's annual financial loss to on-going herder-farmer conflicts in Benue, Kaduna, Nasarawa and Plateau states at about \$13.7 billion (N479bn) in three years. The mercy Corps study found out the four study states of Benue, Kaduna, Nasarawa, and Plateau have lost between NGN 109 million to NGN 347 million in Internally Generated Revenue due to the conflict - roughly \$719,000 to \$2.3 million in 2010 USD, or 22-47% of their potential IGR collection. As a result, a new face of hunger is staring the Nigeria at large in the face. Pathetically, the Benue state Governor Samuel Ortom disclosed that attacks by herders coming from more northerly states, and possibly also from Cameroon and Niger, had cost his state N95 billion (about \$634 million at that time) between 2012 and 2014. In the same pattern, Agatu community in Benue state lost N65 billion in property (\$204 million) during the early 2016 herder attacks (Ethnic Nzor-Tiv Global Association, 2016).

Economic cost of this conflict has really stared in the face of Nigeria. The prolonged insecurity occasion by herder-farmer clash has plunged Nigeria into diversion of the meager resources that would have used for infrastructural development, transformation of social service sectors such as education and health to security sector.

Table: II. Allocation to Security Sector from 2008-2018

Year	Budget (N)	Allocation to Security
2008	2.213trn	N 444.6 billion
2009	3.049trn	N 233 billion
2010	5.248trn	N 264 billion
2011	4.972trn	N 920 billion
2012	4.877trn	N 921.91 billion

2013	4.987trn	N923 billion
2014	4.962trn	N932 billion
2015	5.068trn	N969 billion
2016	6.061trn	1.063trillion
2017	7.444trn	1.142tn
2018	9.12trn	1.334tn

Source: Budget Office, 2018

Explicitly, as a way of curbing the menace of this scenario, Nigeria's budgetary allocation to security/defense sector has been on the increase for the last ten years. Since Muhammad Buhari ascended to power, the share of nation budget to security sector moves from 1.063 trillion in 2016 to 1.142 trillion in 2017, and up to 1.334trillion in 2018. This huge resources allocated to the security sector was structured to address internal security threats including threat to oil installations, Boko Haram, kidnaps, Niger Delta militancy, armed robbery, herdsman-farmers clashes, cattle rustlers, pipeline vandalism, intertribal clashes, cultism, extortion and hooliganism, religious clashes and tensions, piracy and extrajudicial killing. Unfortunately, violent conflicts especially, the issue of herdsman-farmers clashes has remained unabated in Nigeria especially in Northern central states in Nigeria. According to Nwagboso (2012) insecurity is a drain on local and national resources at the expense of development and peoples' well being thereby, having adverse consequences on economic growth and development

Priority was given to security while sectors were played down in allocation. This has resulted to drawback in Nigerian expectation of promoting sustainable development. Babatunde, Uyanga and Olanrewaju(2017) puts forward that:

leadership in Nigeria is confronted with the problem of focusing its expenditure priorities on security in disfavour of viable human capital development and other growth and productivity promoting sectors. This no doubt, poses a serious challenge to a dynamic framework for the provision of job options and the elimination of poverty, which of course constitutes the hallmark of sustainable development.

Invariably, the insufficient allocation to the social service sectors curtailed the social human development and overall development of Nigeria. This explained the interrelatedness of the three dimensions of sustainable development. Inadequate performance of any pillar of sustainable development has a spillover effect in the effectiveness of the other.

Plethora of insecurity in Nigeria encourages capital flight as many local and foreign investors look for secure and

stable environment for the economic viability of their business operations. This is due to direct and indirect cost that might be incurred in carrying out business activities in unstable environment. Investors have fear of losing their goods or properties and precaution to take risk involved in doing business in an insecure environment. Consequently, Nigerian's foreign direct investment (FDI) has reduced in recent years. One of the obvious economic concerns of the activities of herder-farmers conflict is the instant drop in foreign direct investment (FDI). The Nigerian economic situation is related to an inflow of foreign direct investment. As Boko Haram and Fulani militant heightened its devastating effect since 2009, there has been a decline in the foreign direct investment in Nigeria. According to (Anyadike, 2012); violent conflict slow economic growth and development has been due to the lack of inflow of foreign investment.

Table: III. Direct Foreign Investment (DFI) for the period 1999 – 2017. (Billion)

S/N	YEAR	FDI
1	1999	4, 035
2	2000	16, 453
3	2001	4, 937
4	2002	8, 988
5	2003	13, 531
6	2004	20, 064
7	2005	26, 083
8	2006	41,734
9	2007	4, 324
10	2008	4, 659
11	2009	3, 810
12	2010	3, 810
13	2011	5.199
14	2012	3.304
15	2013	6,740
16	2014	2.7
17	2015	9.64
18	2016	5.12
19	2017	981million

Source: Central Bank of Nigeria Statistical Bulletin, 2013

World Investment Report (2013), states that FDI flow into Nigeria has dropped by 21% in just one year-from \$5.199 billion in 2011 to \$3.304 billion in 2012. The loss of \$1.895 billion for a country in desperate need of money – such as Nigeria – was a staggering blow. Many foreign investors are scared of investing in the economy because of insecurity and destruction of invaluable property incited by armed Fulani herdsmen. Recently, the National Bureau of Statistics (2016) reported that FDI dropped from \$9.64 billion in 2015 to \$5.12 billion in 2016, a whopping 46 percent drop. It reached a mediocre \$981million in 2017, which is lowest for the past 10years. Herders-farmers clashes

in Nigeria constituted a constraint in local economic activities and finally affected the foreign direct investment.

Environmental Sustainability Development Cost of Pastoralist Nomadic-Farmers Conflict in Nigeria

The harmful environmental effects of livestock production are becoming increasingly serious at all levels--local, regional, national and global--and urgently needs to be addressed. Livestock production contributes 3.2% to the gross domestic product of Nigeria economic growth. Despite that, it's devastating impact in environmental sustainability is a serious issue to be addressed. This ranged from overgrazing, pollution of the fresh water through defecation, bush burning, deforestation, erosion to desertification. These have consequences that constitutes clog on the wheel of sustainable development. The grazing and overgrazing of fields and farm lands by ruminant herds leads to vegetation depletion, tearing (in part) and hardening of farm/non-farm top soils, erosion and flooding, destruction of food and economic crops, loss of biodiversity and a host of other adverse environmental effects (DFID, 2006).

It is so obvious uncontrolled grazing in the northern part of the country contributed to desert encroachment, extinction of some shrubs and enormous soil erosion. Overgrazing affects the botanical composition and species diversity by depressing the vigour and presence of dominant species, which then enables colonization by less competitive, plant species which are grazing tolerant. Selective grazing of palatable herbaceous plants by livestock enhances the growth of annuals and unpalatable herbaceous plants as well as woody plants resulting in the decline of palatable species (Bilotta, 2007). The environmental cost of open grazing has no bound as it affect the present generation and with much prospective of affecting the next generation.

A paradigm shift to ranching as a panacea of curbing menace of open grazing in Nigeria

It is obvious that Fulani Herdsmen-farmers clashes have brought untold hardship to Nigeria. Nigeria has witness a great loss of lives and properties, destruction of invaluable facilities, and unconducive environment for normal business activities to take place. All point down to retardation in development efforts. Nigeria cannot promote sustainable development in an environment devoid of peace, justice and freedom. It is high time for transhumance practice of cattle rearing to be changed in Nigeria. Although, livestock production contributes 3.2% of nations gross domestic product, nevertheless there is need to take a precaution in order to halt the impending consequences of open grazing.

Many developed and developing countries such as South America, the western United States, the Prairie Provinces of Canada, and the Australian have embraced ranching as the best strategic option of controlling the sporadic clashes between farmers and herders. Buhari administration will not be echoing extensive Agriculture production as a means of diversification of the Nigerian economy and at the same time cripple its success due to a

reluctant indulging in open grazing as a tradition. There is an urgent need for federal government to collaborate with the state government and introduce ranching and ban open grazing. This avenue will give the nomads the opportunity to plant the better species of grass for their cattle, reduce migration from one city to the other and increase their access to social service such as education, health, electricity and clean water.

In consonance with the above, Ademosun (1976) states an array of the benefits of ranching ranging from easing seasonal migration, improving the quality of herds, multiplying outlet for bovine product, and enhancing access to extension and social services. Federal government will not only provide empty land for grazing rather it will be equipped with health facilities, education and others. This will help to promote literacy rate, life expectancy rate and total development in Nigeria. However, the users (nomadic Pastoralist) will be given license that will permit them to use the venue which they will be renewing yearly if they are interested. This will serve as an avenue of generating internally revenue by the state government.

Finally, federal government should demonstrate willingness and commitment in curbing this persistent conflict through increasing the number of the government security personnel both military and police; and adequately equipping them with new modern sophisticated equipment.

7. CONCLUSION

Nomadic pastoralist-farmer conflict in Nigeria has detrimental implications on social, economic and environmental development. The elimination of this threat should be the number one goal of governments in Nigeria at all levels as the conflict ridden states cannot achieve any significant development amidst insecurity and violence. It is clear that farming and open grazing cannot co-exist as a result of the increasing needs of promoting crop production to feed teeming population. This state of affair calls for a holistic and inclusive approach to drastically reduce farmers-herders conflict in Nigeria. Federal government should introduce ranching in collaboration with the state government, ban open grazing and equipped the security personnel with sophisticated equipment.

REFERENCE

- [1] Abah, H. (2014). Nigeria: Benue crisis - chemical weapons used - NAFDAC DG. Daily Trust, 31st March, 2014.
- [2] Achumba, I.C., Ighomereho, O. S. and Akpor-Robaro, M. O. M. (2013). Security challenges in Nigeria and the implications for business activities and sustainable development. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*. Vol.4, No.2,
- [3] Adekunle, O & Adisa, S. 2010. An empirical phenomenological psychological study of farmer-herdsmen conflicts in North-Central Nigeria. *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences*. Vol 2, No 1, 1-27
- [4] Ademosun, A (1976). Livestock production in Nigeria: Our commissions and omissions, Inaugural lecture delivered at the University of Ife on February 29 1976. Ife: University of Ife Press.
- [5] Amnesty International, (2018). Nigeria: Dozens killed as military launches air attacks on villages beset by spiraling communal violence. 1050 Brussels, Belgium
- [6] Anyadike, N. (2012). The hindrance to foreign investment and development in Nigeria. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*. 4 (4), 761.
- [7] Beland, D. (2005). The political construction of collective insecurity: from moral panic to blame avoidance and organized irresponsibility. Center for European Studies, Working Paper Series 126
- [8] Bello, A. 2013. Herdsmen and farmers conflicts in North-Eastern Nigeria: causes, repercussions and resolutions. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*. Vol 2, No 5. pp 129-139
- [9] Bilotta, G. S, Brazier, R. E, Haygarth, P. M and Donald, L. S (2007). The impacts of grazing animals on the quality of soils, vegetation, and surface waters in intensively managed grasslands. *Advance Agronomy Academic Press*, pp. 237-280.
- [10] Boulding, K. (1963) "Social Justice in Social Dynamics", In: R.B. Brandt, (Ed). *Social Justice*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- [11] Budget office of federation (2018). 2018 Approved Budget Details. <http://www.budgetoffice.gov.ng/index.php/2018-approved-budget-details>
- [12] Olukoya, S. (2018). Nigeria farmer-herder conflict now deadlier than Boko Haram. <https://www.apnews.com/80034edf46334c9eb3fa4d9887f73e1a>
- [13] Coser, L. A. (1967). *The functions of social conflict*. <https://philpapers.org/rec/COSTFO-2>
- [14] Folami, O. 2009. Climate change and inter-ethnic conflict between Fulani herdsmen and host communities in Nigeria. A Paper Presented at Conference on Climate Change and Security Organized by the Norwegian Academic of Sciences and Letters on the Occasion of 250 years Anniversary in Trondiem, Norway 2010
- [15] Gadzama, A.A. (2018). Herdsmen attacks and implications for national security. Daily trust Jan 25, 2018
- [16] Global Protection Cluster (2017). 20 million people in 4 countries facing starvation, famine: UN <http://www.indexmundi.com/facts/indicators/nigeria>.
- [17] Gwarzo I (1998) "Meeting the current challenges of national security". National War College.
- [18] IFAD (2007). Food, poverty and women: Lessons from rural Asia, retrieved on 13th August, 2018 from <http://www.ifad.org>

- [19] Ifesinachi, K. (2011). Theoretical perspectives on the state, nation, ethnicity and nationalism in Africa-reconsidered. *International Journal of Modern Political Economy*, 1(1): 1-2.
- [20] Institute for Economics and Peace (2018). Global peace index 2018. <http://visionofhumanity.org/app/uploads/2018/06/Global-Peace-Index-2018-2.pdf>
- [21] International Crisis Group (2017). Herders against farmers: Nigeria's expanding deadly conflict.
- [22] Mbaeze, C. N. and Nnaji, E. S. (2018) Herders–farmers conflict in Nigeria: implication for national development. *International Journal of Social Science and Technology*. Vol. 3 No. 4.
- [23] Mundi Index (2012). Country facts and figure <http://www.indexmundi.com/facts/indicators/nigeria>
- [24] National Bureau of Statistics,(2018). Conflict and violence in Nigeria results from the North East, North Central, and South- South zones.
- [25] Nwagboso, C.I. (2012). Security challenges and economy of the Nigerian state (2007 – 2011), *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, Vol. 2 No. 6, 244-258.
- [26] Opurum, K. (2018). 2018 outlook for Nigeria's agricultural sector. *Leadership*, 10th January,2018.
- [27] Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. (2015). Security and development. <https://www.sipri.org/yearbook/2015/08>
- [28] Teodorescu, A. M. (2015). Sustainable development: A multidimensional concept. <https://ideas.repec.org/a/cbu/jrnlec/y2015vspecialp82-86.html>
- [29] Mercy Corps (2016). The economic costs of conflict and the benefits of peace: Effects of Farmer-Pastoralist Conflict in Nigeria's Middle Belt on State, Sector, and National Economies
- [30] Toromade, S. (2018). Buhari 5 agriculture initiatives by President's administration he wants you to know about.
- [31] United Nations General Assembly. (1987). Report of the world commission on environment and development: Our common future.
- [32] Zartman, W. (1991) (ed) *Resolving Regional Conflicts: International Perspectives*. The Annals. No 518. Vol. 4 (4), Serial No. 17, October, 2010. Pp 549-560