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CHAPTER FIVE

Routing Ethnic Violence in a Divided City:
Walking in the Footsteps of Armed Mobs in Jos, Nigeria*

Abstract
Scholars of ethnic riots disagree on which are more susceptible to collective violence between ethnically segregated and diverse socio-spatial settings. Studies of riot-prone cities have produced contradictory conclusions. This article proposes that the ambivalence stems in part from disregarding the mobile nature of armed mobs and conflating their origins with their locations of violence. Drawing from extensive ethnographic fieldwork involving mobile interviewing, in-depth discussions and visual documentation, the article maps the footsteps of armed mobs from their origins to sites of confrontation during the 2008 Christian-Muslim riots in Jos, Nigeria. Findings suggest both segregated and mixed settlements contributed to violence. While armed mobs were likelier to originate from segregated neighbourhoods, mixed settlements, especially those sandwiched between segregated ones, served as frontiers for fighting; armed mobs preferred narrow alleys inaccessible to security forces. These findings’ implications can advance the understanding and management of ethnic riots in urban areas.
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* This chapter is based on an article that is forthcoming: Madueke, K.L. (forthcoming) “Routing Ethnic Violence in a Divided City: Walking in the Footsteps of Armed Mobs in Jos, Nigeria,” Journal of Modern African Studies
Introduction

They were in their hundreds and armed with guns, machetes and clubs. Some of them were naked, with ashes and markings of charcoal on their faces and bodies. They were yelling and charging at us and there was nowhere to run. Behind us was a high wall. I don’t know how, but I scaled the fence. I ran as fast as I could. It was when I stopped to catch my breath that I realised my mother, older brother and aunt never made it. I wanted to go back and die too. I can still hear the wild yelling of those bloodsuckers.91

This one account of the violence that overtook Jos in 2008 echoes the experience of many residents in the Nigerian city.92 Survivors in some of the hardest-hit neighbourhoods describe how armed mobs invaded and murdered their loved ones. While individuals were attacked by neighbours in some instances, a common eyewitness claim is that their settlements were overrun by outsiders. Corroborating this, police reports indicate several rampaging mobs were apprehended on their way to or from unleashing violence in residential areas that were not their own.

Research on collective violence has long stressed ethnic composition to explain a locality’s susceptibility to riots (see Boal 1976; Olzak 1983; Horowitz 1985; Nagel 1994; Brubaker & Laitin 1998; Fearon et al. 2007; Kasara 2012). Two competing views have come to dominate the ethnic composition and collective violence literature. Arguing that it positively correlates to violent riots (see Pettigrew 1998; Hewstone et al. 2006; Pettigrew et al. 2011), some scholars believe segregation engenders violence by breeding in-group solidarity and out-group resentment (Boal 1972; Byrne et al. 2012; Kasara 2013; Cunningham & Gregory 2014). Others maintain that ethnically mixed areas are more susceptible to violence (Shirlow & Murtagh 2006; Weidmann & Salehyan 2013), based on the assumption that contact between members of rival groups increases the likelihood of frictions that can ignite confrontations (Kauffman 1996).

91 Discussion with resident of Jos, 10.02.17.
92 While I use ‘ethnic violence’ and ‘ethnic riots’ synonymously, ‘ethnic conflict’ follows Horowitz’s (1985) usage to refer to all conflicts based on ascriptive group identities, including language, religion, race, caste, tribe, language and sect. Ethnic riots refer to disturbances, which may be labelled ‘religious’, ‘linguistic’, ‘communal’ or ‘tribal’ (see Horowitz 2001).
Diverse regional studies on different spatial units present conflicting evidence. Bhavnani et al. (2014: 1) found that Belfast’s increased segregation following the frequent conflicts of the 1960s and 1970s helped prevent resurgences. In Baghdad, Weidmann and Salehyan (2013) observed how a sharp drop in group violence corresponded with high residential segregation, arguing that demarcations between adversarial neighbourhoods reduced contact and thus propensity for confrontations. By contrast, in the UK, race riots were observed to prevail more in ethnically diverse areas (Peach 2007). Violence appeared likelier to occur in the ethnically diverse areas of Afghanistan (Bhavnani & Choi 2012). And another study of Belfast (Jarman & O’Halloran 2001) found ethnically mixed areas more violence-prone than homogenous neighbourhoods demarcated by sharp boundaries.

This article identifies an issue that has perpetuated, if not compounded, the ambivalence of conflicting findings: a tendency to ignore the mobility of most mobs and to conflate their origins with the locations of their violence. Accounts from riot-prone cities suggest violence is mostly perpetrated by highly mobile armed mobs. In Jos, much violence was by groups who went ‘on a rampage’ (see Krause 2017: 269, 2011: 38; Higazi 2011: 26). Of the 1984 Delhi riots, Tambiah (1997: 1179) noted ‘most of the mobs were from areas different from where they operated’. Also in India, Brass (2004: 4841) described how Hindu rioters moved around from one neighbourhood to the other attacking Muslims in Meerut. The literature is hardly explicit about the implications armed mobs’ mobility has on the spread of violence and what it means for mobs to be mobilised on or off their own turf. Conflation of rioters’ origins and destinations in turn obfuscates our understanding of what it takes for a locality to be considered violent.

Addressing this concern, this article examines how ethnic composition combined with neighbourhood location – meaning situation vis-à-vis adjoining neighbourhoods of similar or dissimilar ethnic composition – and the nature of connecting infrastructure affect the mobility of armed mobs and, consequently, the spread of violence. Contrary to the determinist stance dominating segregation-diversity debates, this article argues that ethnically segregated and mixed neighbourhoods contribute differently but complementarily to violence’s production. The central ideas are encapsulated in three propositions: armed mobs are likelier
to originate in segregated neighbourhoods; violent events are likelier to occur in ethnically mixed areas, especially those between rivalling segregated settlements; and armed mobs prefer using alleyways that are narrow, unplanned and inaccessible to security forces.

**Ethnic composition, neighbourhood location and rioters’ spatial patterns**
The common proposition that armed mobs are likelier to emerge from segregated settlements is based on beliefs that ethnic concentration facilitates intragroup communication, eases mobilisation and increases potential for confrontation against the out group (Weidmann 2009). Lichbach (1995) elaborates three ways ethnic concentration can shape conflict behaviour. First, it brings group members into close interaction, which reinforces ‘cognitive proximity’ to establish what Weidmann (2009: 7) called ‘collective grievances’. Second, organising collective action is more cost-effective in a homogenous concentrated territory than in dispersed or mixed territories. Third, an effective reward and penalty system to deter ‘betrayal’ and sustain the struggle is more feasible in a concentrated territory than other settings. Consistently, Laitin (2004: 365) found that group concentration predicts rebellion and conflict far more than other factors, including inequalities and grievances. Weidmann (2009: 7) accordingly hypothesised that ‘population dispersion of a group leads to lower risk of conflict involvement’. We therefore expect groups in segregated areas to be likelier to mobilise and engage in violence than their counterparts in mixed localities.

In combination with ethnic composition, a neighbourhood’s location affects its vulnerability to violence (see Jarman 2004). The contested boundary hypothesis and the notion of the frontier offer useful insights into how this works. Legewie and Schaeffer (2016) described the contested boundary as an ethnically mixed socio-geographical context where the other group’s presence is perceived as a threat; there is polarisation and ambiguity about social rank and exclusive ethnic identities; contestations concerning group turf are more pronounced than in ordinarily mixed areas. Combined, these mechanisms dispose the contested boundary to greater conflict, beyond the frictions that generally characterise mixed neighbourhoods.
An ethnically mixed neighbourhood located between segregated settlements exemplifies the contested boundary. Boye and Kaarhus (2011) noted how such boundary neighbourhoods become sites of contestation as each group tries to usurp resources in the locality.

Evidence associating violent incidents with boundary neighbourhoods, known as interfaces in Belfast (Shirlow 2003; Jarman 2004; Byrne 2005), supports the contested boundary argument. Jarman and O’Halloran (2001) observed that the city’s ‘buffer zone’ – a type of interface wherein a mixed settlement falls between two segregated neighbourhoods – is more violence-prone than homogenous neighbourhoods demarcated by sharp boundaries. Relatedly, the notion of the frontier exposes the dynamics of violence in an ethnically mixed neighbourhood located between segregated settlements. Kotek (1999: 228) said frontiers are ‘not only polarised on an ethnic or ideological basis… but are, above all, disputed because of their collocation on fault-lines between ethnic, religious or ideological wholes’, leaving this ‘territory for two dreams’ beleaguered by conflicting claims. Returning to the case of Jos and based on these scholars’ arguments, I expect Nasarawa Gwong, an ethnically mixed neighbourhood between segregated settlements, to be relatively more vulnerable to violence than other mixed neighbourhoods that are not similarly located.

Some of the main reasons neighbourhood ethnic composition and location matter concern how these factors affect the mobilisation and mobility of armed mobs. Mobs have received comparatively little attention even though their role in revolutions and other riotous events is incontrovertible. Rudolph’s (1959: 448) work on the activities of mobs in the eighteenth century’s French and American revolutions detailed mobilisation and attacks – on, respectively, the Bastille in Paris and Fort George in New York – by mobile mobs as crucial points in the revolts. Of Paris, Tilly (2000: 148) reported how mobs ‘coursed the streets between the Hôtel de Ville and the Bastille’.

Studies on Indian cities have highlighted how social network dynamics can instigate riots. Brass (2004) discussed what he calls a ‘riot system’, a network of politicians, government officials and local criminals who instigate, coordinate and sustain riots. Berenschot (2011) similarly illustrated a complex patronage network
comprising politicians, local criminals and residents who helped spread violence in Ahmedabad. He found that this mobilisation proved more feasible in poor neighbourhoods where residents lacked direct access to government institutions and basic amenities. Although eighteenth-century revolutions are a removed political context from ethnic violence in contemporary plural societies, the spatial conditions that give rise to mobs and armed networks tend to persist. For example, Tilly (2000) conceived of segregated areas as ‘safe spaces’ where intragroup communication is unconstrained. The logic is that the mobilisation of people into mobs is more feasible in ‘safe areas’, where ‘contentious claim making gains protection from routine surveillance and repression because of terrain, built environment’, and individuals freely engage in ‘speech-making that would have brought rapid incarceration to their participants elsewhere in the metropolis’ (Tilly 2000: 144). Similar to Rodger’s (2009: 5) observation that youth gangs ‘symbolically epitomize urban violence in the Nicaraguan collective consciousness’, armed networks in Jos represented social anxiety and fear. In the latter’s case, however, beyond the collective trepidation they seem to cause, the networks are appreciated, and even respected, seen as neighbourhood protectors when riots erupt.

Also worth evaluating is how roads and barriers affect rioters’ mobility, thereby contributing to shaping the spread of violence (see Brand 2009; Kutmanaliev 2015). Physical environment was found to influence rioters’ choice of routes and targets during the London riots, with highways and rivers acting as barriers against offenders (Baudains et al. 2013). Empirical evidence from criminology also suggests any of these physical features’ presence between a would-be offender’s residence and a potential target diminishes the chances the offender will choose that target (Clare et al. 2009). Tilly (2000: 140) argued that location can constrain or facilitate conflict by ‘showing that diffusion of a movement or an organizational form follows previously established lines of communication’.

These ideas help construct a spatial profile of ethnic riots, even if nebulous at this stage. As this article describes, the profile shows that armed mobs are likelier to originate from ethnically segregated neighbourhoods. They prefer alleys that are hidden and inaccessible to security forces. Violence is disproportionately
concentrated in mixed neighbourhoods that share contiguous boundaries with segregated neighbourhoods. Contrary to the determinist stance that dominates the segregation-diversity debates, this model shows how ethnically segregated and diverse settlements both contribute in violence’s production albeit differently. Following the actual footsteps of rioters within and across neighbourhoods in Jos uncovers the extent to which this theoretical conjecture aligns with empirical evidence.

Research design and methods
This article draws from an ethnography that investigated the spatial practices of rioters during the ethnic violence that ravaged parts of Jos from 27 to 29 November 2008. The study comparatively explored the spatial patterns and behaviour of armed mobs in two neighbourhoods. Both neighbourhoods are located within the city centres, similarly have roughly 30,000 residents and have comparable levels of congestion, unemployment, deprivation and inadequate physical and social infrastructure. However, the two neighbourhoods differ in ethnic composition and location.

Angwan Rogo is ethnically segregated, while Nasarawa Gwong is mixed. The segregated case shares several parts of its boundaries with other segregated settlements and one part with an ethnically mixed neighbourhood. On two sides the neighbourhood is separated from the adjacent segregated areas by a major highway; on another side there is no highway, and the neighbourhood is contiguously linked to the adjoining ethnically mixed area through narrow back roads. Ethnically mixed Nasarawa Gwong is located between segregated settlements with which it shares contiguous boundaries connected by a web of narrow lanes. Although both neighbourhoods have featured prominently in official and research reports on violent riots in Jos, there remains no systematic examination of the spatial patterns of rioters within and across their boundaries.

Methods and data sources I used include primary school common entrance examination registers, mobile interviews, key informant interviews (KII), photography and graphically depicting mental maps and routes by participants.
The research involved many informal discussions with residents, eyewitnesses, survivors of violence, security forces, NGO fieldworkers, ethnic and religious leaders, local politicians and academics.

The three in-depth mobile interviews I conducted involved talking and walking with participants in the 2008 violence. The walk started at the point where the participant recalled joining other rioters and ended where violence erupted. Discussions were open-ended, though led by questions concerning how residents of the interviewee’s neighbourhood responded upon learning of the violence; whether residents gathered at a single point or in separate groups at different points; identification and estimated number of gathering points; details on whether rioters were led by youth leaders, vigilantes, local criminals, elders or others; and exactly where and how the violence unfolded. These talks lasted between 30 and 45 minutes, though length of the walks varied greatly. The longest walk was about one and half kilometres; the shortest was about 150 metres. I had intended to audio record the interviews, but within minutes of the first, recognised the excessive environmental noise as well as how recording prevented the respondent from moving and expressing himself freely; I therefore settled for note-taking throughout the mobile interviews.

The four KIIIs I undertook sought to reveal the role of neighbourhood leaders in mobilisation processes, construct a general profile of the neighbourhoods where nodes of mobilisation and violence were located and determine the dominant conflict frame in the area. The KIIIs also helped cross-validate some data obtained through mobile interviews. Dozens of other interviews and discussions within the neighbourhoods and elsewhere in Jos, which I had done for previous projects, complemented the data for this study. The KII was organised around several discussion points. Respondents were asked to describe their neighbourhood’s population, unemployment level, poverty level; how they understood the 2008 violence and the Jos conflict, in general; how the residents’ association responded when news about violence boke; and how other neighbourhood associations responded. Another question concerned whether response patterns in their neighbourhoods were centralised and organised or decentralised and disorganised.
Mobile interviews and KII s were analysed thematically according to five coding categories: key actors in the mobilisation; centralised or decentralised mobilisation; routes types (involving main roads accessible to vehicles vs. narrow footpaths); distance covered; points of violence (whether inside or outside the neighbourhood, involving segregated or mixed populations and on what route types); type of neighbourhood boundary (contiguous or separated); and key actors in violence (armed mobs + rival armed mobs or armed mobs + armed forces). These categories were then grouped and discussed under three themes: points at which individuals formed into mobs; the type of mob routes; and points of violence.

My interviewees were found via snowballing sampling, though my selection was based on individuals’ length of residence in the neighbourhood, territorial representation and, for mobile interviews, participation in the 2008 riots. The mobile interviews respondents all actively participated in the violence. Each of the KII respondents was a prominent residents’ association member for at least 10 years and lived in the neighbourhood for longer.

Nasarawa Gwong has both Christian and Muslim populations, so I conducted mobile interviews with one riot participant from each group. My Christian guide was a 41-year-old with no formal employment who occasionally engaged in menial jobs as a source of livelihood. He was born in another part of the city, but was a resident of Nasarawa Gwong since age 12. He was 32 when the 2008 violence happened. My Muslim guide was a 39-year-old trader who had resided in the neighbourhood since birth. He was 30 when the violence happened. In ethnically segregated Angwan Rogo, my guide was a 33-year-old born and raised in the neighbourhood, and apart from short visits to relatives outside, he had never left the city. Not formally employed, he engaged in odd jobs and different trades to support his young family. He was 24 when the violence happened.

Since Nigerian censuses do not record ethnic composition, I used public primary school common entrance examination registers as a proxy to determine the ethnic composition of the neighbourhood in which the school was located. I analysed the graduating classes of 2005 as a representative sample of the school since these pupils all sit for the final written test to gain admission into secondary school. The class register contains full names, graduation year, among other
information, allowing me to categorise the pupils as ‘Muslim’, or ‘Christian’. In Jos and in much of Nigeria, an individual's name is usually an indicator of his or her religion. Table 5.1 shows the ethnic composition of Angwan Rogo and Nasarawa Gwong on the basis of this data.

Table 5.1: Ethnic composition of Angwan Rogo and Nasarawa Gwong in 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Number of pupils</th>
<th>Number of Christians</th>
<th>Percentage of Christians</th>
<th>Number of Muslims</th>
<th>Percentage of Muslims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angwan Rogo</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasarawa Gwong</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using interviews has its limitations. A major concern is the extent to which memory can be trusted. Some events discussed happened nine years prior. Event details could have been blurred by time's passage or trauma or from repeatedly discussing and hearing the stories of others. That said, some survivors cannot forget their traumas. To mitigate the risk of such issues, I triangulated information from different sources and regularly compared my findings against archival material and other studies. To cross-validate my findings, I undertook a ‘ground truthing’ process involving extensive informal discussions with randomly selected residents and other individuals considered knowledgeable on violence in Jos. These efforts give me good reason to believe the data I obtained is reliable.

Jos experienced several other episodes of ethnic violence apart from the 2008 riots, notably in 2001, 2010 and after. I chose 2008 for this case study because I could access individuals who actively participated in those riots and agreed to walk me through the routes. Although my ethnographic research also allowed me to meet and talk with participants in the 2010 riots, most of them declined doing a guided walk. Moreover, since the 2008 riots have mostly been studied alongside other episodes of violence, examining them alone could uncover hitherto unnoticed or under-analysed dimensions.
The 2008 post-election violence

Literature on Jos has extensively described the social and political issues that translated into tremendous violence (see Higazi 2011; Krause 2011; Ostien 2009; Best 2007). Contemporary politics of exclusion, lack of institutional capacity to regulate ethnic competition, tensions between indigenes and settlers and Nigeria’s citizenship crisis created a perfect storm, with ensuing violence causing thousands of deaths, many more injuries and displacements (see also Mang 2013; Kwaja 2011).

The 2008 violence began over the chairmanship of Jos North LGA. Since its creation from greater Jos in 1991, the Jos North LGA has been a hotbed of ethnic rivalry. The predominantly Muslim Hausa felt the LGA belonged to them because the new boundaries placed the indigenous Berom outside Jos North, thereby leaving the Hausa as the majority. They were confident they would elect one of their own as chairman. To avoid losing as they did in the 1999 elections – when Frank Tardy, an indigenous Christian, was elected chairman – this time, intense political campaigning would ensure Hausa voted for their candidate, running under the opposition umbrella of the All Nigeria Peoples Party (ANPP). On their part, indigenes, with the support of other Christians, doubled their efforts to ensure election of a Christian. The stakes were in their favour because the governor, Jonah Jang, who controlled the Plateau State Independent Electoral Commission, was Christian. Jang also belonged to the ruling People’s Democratic Party (PDP), known for using state machinery to rig elections and impose candidates. When Muslims approached Jang to negotiate a power-sharing arrangement, he rejected the idea. Absence of power-sharing has been a key factor in making Jos particularly violence-prone (see Bunte & Vinson 2016). The Muslim community became exasperated when Governor Jang chose one of his kinsmen, a Berom and an indigene of Du in Jos South, as the PDP candidate. These developments provide a broad stage-setting for the catastrophe that was to come (Ostien 2009).

On 27 November 2008, council elections were held across Plateau State’s seventeen LGAs. Candidates from the ruling PDP and the main opposition ANPP were foremost in the running for the Jos North LGA chairmanship. Christians
mainly aligned with the PDP and Muslims with the ANPP, as per the respective candidates’ religions. This was consistent with patterns in most of Nigeria, where it is common for ethnic identity to determine political affiliation and the direction of votes. The elections were largely peaceful, with no major disturbances recoded. However, the Hausa became suspicious after a last-minute relocation of the collation centre by the state’s electoral body. Trouble began at the centre when ANPP party agents and loyalists started protesting what they suspected was an attempt to rig the elections by PDP officials. The police dispersed the crowds using teargas. Large-scale violence started sometime between when the crowds left the collation centre and when they arrived in their neighbourhoods. As they made their way home, the crowds looted and destroyed shops while alerting co-ethnics via phone and word of mouth to come out and fight. Before dawn, many neighbourhoods erupted (see Human Rights Watch 2001).

The violence’s scale and intensity was unprecedented (see Human Rights Watch 2009). It concentrated in the city’s poorer settlements, where people were targeted on the basis of their religion, not their political affiliation (see Krause 2011). Rampaging mobs moved around the city, killing and maiming anyone of the opposite faith (Higazi 2011). Similar to Jos’ 2001 violence, youths mounted roadblocks and killed motorists who could not prove they were co-ethnics, for example, by reciting a particular prayer. In other situations, they were killed on the basis of dress (Human Rights Watch 2009). Although in Jos, Muslims generally wear kaftans and Christians wear Western-style clothing (see also Trovalla et al. 2014), this is not always the case, so many people were mistakenly killed by co-ethnics who thought, on seeing their apparel, they were of the opposite faith (Krause 2011).

After two days of fighting, calm was restored following firm intervention by a joint force of military and mobile police (MOPO). The violence’s tragedies (see Krause 2011) included massive destruction of landed property (homes, offices and businesses) and religious institutions. The Muslim community reported a razing of twenty-three mosques; Christians claimed an undisclosed number of churches as burnt down or destroyed. Human Right Watch estimated that at least 133 people, mostly Muslims, were summarily killed by security forces and there was no
recourse to justice (see Human Rights Watch 2009). An estimated minimum of 700 people were killed and over 10,000 displaced during the two days of fighting (Higazi 2011).

Rioters' footsteps in and around a segregated neighbourhood

My guided walk in Angwan Rogo started at the southern end of the main street, where two-storey buildings marked a gateway into the neighbourhood. The buildings are part of the neighbourhood shopping hub, selling groceries, clothes, GSM recharge cards and services in tailoring, printing and photocopying, inter alia. On our walk, dozens of shoppers crowded around, though my guide recalled how none of the shops was open the morning of the riots. Still, many residents gathered. They convened to discuss how Christians were killing Muslims in other parts of the city and were planning to invade the neighbourhood. Although informal and unruly, the discussions were led by neighbourhood leaders and local politicians. Gunshot sounds and thick swirls of smoke appearing in the sky from around the city made the tales of massacres, even if exaggerated, believable. Moments after he joined the shopping hub gathering, my guide followed a northward gravitation towards the neighbourhood centre.

This gathering slowly built into a crowd as it moved down the neighbourhood’s main street. This five-metre-wide dirt road is flanked by several rows of buildings, divided into rows and columns by footpaths that run parallel and perpendicular to the main street. Most of the buildings are what Nigerians call ‘compounds’, square-shaped edifices with a single entrance and semi-detached units with doors overlooking a small courtyard. Most compounds are inhabited by extended families, comprising multiple generations. Because homes are frequently owner-occupied, many residents have been neighbours with each other for at least a generation – sometimes up to three. Long-time residence and the fact that residents belong to the same ethnic group contribute to high social trust and collective efficacy observable in the neighbourhood. Research has noted how long-time residence helps stabilise social ties (Coleman 1988), which can positively affect social efficacy, while ethnic segregation can increase capacity for collective action (Sampson & Groves 1989).
The majority of neighbourhood residents who came out did not participate in the riots. They simply walked around and discussed the situation with co-ethnics. However, from the gathering there emerged an armed mob of young males, most between ages fifteen and forty. While most were ordinary residents, leading them were local criminals and activists known to work closely with politicians. These same individuals, I was told, were seen canvassing for votes at the neighbourhood polling stations the day before during elections.

According to my guide, before joining the crowds, these criminals held clandestine meetings at discrete sites used for selling drugs and making other illicit exchanges. Called ‘jungles’ in local parlance, the sites were out of the public eye and thus perfect for gathering and distributing weapons to fighters. While easily accessible weapons such as machetes, knives and sticks were openly distributed on the street, where fighters converged, more sophisticated firearms were distributed at the jungles. Considered ‘contraband’, they included pistols, shotguns and automatic rifles. My guide described how a friend of his sighted a dozen young men distributing sophisticated weapons among themselves while consuming large amounts of drugs and other hard substances in one such jungle. As the hysteria on the streets grew and became more riotous, I was told, the criminals simply slipped in and took control of the crowds. Armed and emboldened by drugs, they portrayed a fearless disposition that instantly attracted crowd members behind them.93

Tracing the rioters’ footsteps started in earnest when we branched off the main street onto one of several alleys leading into the neighbourhood’s inner recesses, onto back roads. The mostly mud buildings behind the street were in close quarters, the myriad of intersecting alleys, no doubt confusing to a newcomer. I observed how they simultaneously served as a runoff for liquid waste from lavatories and a playground for many frolicking children. This was the path used by the armed mob. The route was narrow and winding (see Figure 5.1). Rioters must have kept in a file since the space was barely enough for two people to walk side by side. There were several wider, less torturous paths, but the rioters preferred those that provided cover because, besides being inaccessible to

93 Interview with riot participant, 17.05.17.
security forces, they kept the rioters anonymous to family, friends and fellow residents.

Following the trail led us out of Angwan Rogo into Ali Kazaure, a neighbourhood farther south. The walk lasted roughly about a kilometre and half. After many twists and turns through very narrow lanes, we came out on a wider lane that led over a culvert into a large open space used for Muslim prayers during the Eidel al-Fitr celebration. Eid square, as it is known, terminates at the start of the main street of Ali Kazaure. Much smaller in size, this neighbourhood has some 10,000 to 15,000 people, but is similarly densely populated. Unlike Angwan Rogo, however, it is ethnically mixed and sandwiched between rivalling segregated neighbourhoods.

Figure 5.1: Alleys used by fighters in Angwan Rogo and Angwan Rukuba (Source: Photos by author and Julius Morno).

Angwan Rogo and Yan Kaji, both contiguous segregated Muslim neighbourhoods, form the north-eastern border while the humongous segregated Christian settlement of Apata forms the south-western border.

A small intersection at the upper end of Ali Kazaure’s main street was where the rioters who marched from Angwan Rogo and Yan Kaji met to confront Christians in Ali Kazaure. The Christians were also supported by a large group of Christian rioters from Apata and beyond (see Figure 5.2). The neighbourhood therefore became a battleground for rioters from Angwan Rogo and its surrounding segregated neighbourhoods.
Clashes took place on two levels. First, the neighbourhood’s Christian and Muslim residents fought among themselves. Though attacks were perpetrated across ethnic lines, rioters did not operate in an organised manner and targets were arbitrary. There was neither leadership nor hierarchy of command. Main weapons were kitchen knives, sticks and other domestic objects.\(^{94}\) One resident recalled a few instances of residents using fire arms.\(^{95}\) On a second level, a more organised form of warfare was transpiring among the armed groups who marched in from the surrounding segregated neighbourhoods. Armed Christians swooped in from settlements south of Ali Kazuare while armed Muslims descended from the north. These groups were organised, wielding more sophisticated weapons, including firearms and Molotov bombs. My guide said some fighters wore military fatigues and painted their faces as warriors.\(^{96}\)

Standing some hundred metres apart, the two camps fired shots, shot arrows and threw Molotovs at each other. Occasionally, one group’s members would charge

\(^{94}\) Discussions with resident, 18.02.17.
\(^{95}\) Discussions with residents, 17.05.17.
\(^{96}\) Mobile interview, 17.05.17.
forward and engage the other in close combat. In these instances, swords, machetes and clubs were used. 97 Direct combat usually went on for a few minutes before fighters would retreat, leaving behind many wounded and possibly dead in pools of their own blood. 98 Frequently, members of these external armed groups went into the back alleys to support co-ethnics against members of the other group. Residents helped their visiting co-ethnics identify the homes of rival group members; the ensuing attacks involved swift killings and house burnings. 99 These clashes continued intermittently throughout the first day of the riots. Fighters from Angwan Rogo and Apata returned to their neighbourhoods at dusk. When fighting resumed the next day, 29 November 2008, morning dawned with clashes between Christian and Muslim armed groups. However, the violence took a new turn when a large MOPO deployment arrived to quell the riots. Seeing the security forces, many rioters darted for cover. Christians fled through the alleys that linked to Apata; Muslims from Yan Kaji and Angwan Rogo also hastily retreated. 100

MOPO started chasing and shooting. They broke into several Ali Kazaure houses where they suspected fighters had hidden, and arbitrarily shot dead several young men. By the time MOPO jumped into their trucks and left the neighbourhood, many were dead, their bodies lying in bedrooms, courtyards and on the street (see Human Rights Watch 2009). According to my guide, Muslims were unfairly targeted because the security forces took orders from the state governor, a devout Christian. Many other Muslim residents of Angwan Rogo and Ali Kazaure shared this view. 101

Although the official death toll in Ali Kazaure is not known, discussions with residents suggested up to fifty people could have been killed. About fifteen died on the first day and possibly forty or more on the second. 102 Residents attributed the high number on the second day to killings by MOPO. 103 Years later, the main street of Ali Kazaure still has ruins of burnt buildings, dwarfed by overgrown grass. This is

---

97 Interview with residents, 18.02.17.
98 Ibid.
99 Discussions with residents, 17.02.17.
100 Discussions with residents, 18.02.17.
101 Discussions with residents, 15-17.02.17.
102 Discussions with residents, 17.02.17.
103 Discussions with residents, 18.02.17.
the result of the 2008 violence as well as riots in 2010 onwards. Christians who
used to live towards the street’s northern end fled southward or left the
neighbourhood entirely. Muslims who lived at the neighbourhood’s southern end,
towards the border with Apata, have either relocated northward or left for good.104

The armed mobs in Angwan Rogo were characterised by several
noteworthy dynamics. Neighbourhood and youth leaders were prominent in
disseminating information and mobilising residents to be vigilant and secure the
area. Although it had a large cache of potential fighters, the neighbourhood did not
experience violence because it was ethnically homogenous – there were no rival
group members to attack. The armed mob moved up to 1.5 kilometres to engage in
violence in an adjoining ethnically mixed neighbourhood. It demonstrated a strong
preference for narrow, winding alleys that are difficult to access by security forces
and other outsiders.

Rioters’ spatial patterns in a mixed neighbourhood
My first guide around Nasarawa Gwong was a Christian living at the time in Dutse
Uku, a small ethnically mixed area between Nasarawa Gwong and Tina Junction. It
is bordered by a mainly Muslim area to the west and a mainly Christian area to the
east. Boundaries between these neighbourhoods are contiguous without any road
or physical barriers. We started our walk at an open space, near his home, where
crowds had gathered the first morning of the riots. Low buildings housing homes
and small shops lined the main street. Many edifices were in shoddy condition,
their walls peeling and roofs faltering, though some fairly new ones were in good
shape.

This neighbourhood’s ethnic composition contributed to residents’
(in)ability to mobilise into armed mobs. Leaving their homes and congregating was
not always feasible because residents’ movement was severely restricted during
the riots. Unlike in the segregated neighbourhood where residents belonged to the
same group, residents of the mixed settlement were divided into two ‘enemy’
camps. Although co-ethnics living in relative proximity managed to organise

104 Discussions with residents, 15.02.17.
themselves and form protective walls around their residences, little else could be done to defend their spatial jurisdictions. My guide said there was no central point where residents generally congregated. He explained that although dozens of people gathered around the neighbourhood’s main shopping centre, where a fairly big store still stood, most residents stuck near their homes. This finding differed from the segregated neighbourhood, where most residents stormed the main street.105

Our route involved short walks from one end of the street to the other, reflecting just how spatially constrained residents were during the riots due to mutual suspicion between Christians and Muslims.

One of the problems we had was that we were not sure what the Muslims living on the street behind us were planning. We were not sure if they wanted peace or were preparing to fight. We could hear some movements coming from this side, but could still not understand much… and the truth is everyone was scared… no one was ready to go there and see what was happening.106

The inability to navigate – much less mobilise – meant Nasarawa Gwong residents could not form into a force formidable enough to keep invaders at bay. At a bend that served as the boundary between a few Christian and Muslim homes, my guide described how he and some eleven other Christian residents temporarily barricaded the narrow passage using stones, wooden planks, metal scraps, and any solid object they found lying about. Armed with sticks and iron rods, they stood guard. They turned away many fellow Christians who wanted to scale over the demarcation, though finally gave way when violence escalated and the pressure became overwhelming. Armed mobs outnumbered my guide and his cohort and, brandishing deadlier weapons from the adjoining areas, forced their way through.107

Another possible explanation for the inability to organise into a unified group was the neighbourhood’s lack of collective efficacy. As an ethnically mixed area, lower levels of mutual trust meant lower levels of social efficacy and capacity

105 Interview with riot participant, 20.02.17.
106 Ibid.
107 Mobile interview, 20.02.17.
for collective action (Sampson & Groves 1989). The absence of an organised force made the neighbourhood vulnerable and easy prey to external armed groups.

Nasarawa Gwong’s location between rivalling segregated settlements made it particularly vulnerable. Although residents maintained some semblance of order during the riots’ earlier stages, by cordoning off their streets and warding off potential troublemakers, this neighbourhood became a battleground, too. Christians and Muslims from the segregated surrounding areas invaded to support their co-ethnics against rival group members. Figure 5.3 shows the directions of these movements.

Figure 5.3: Directions of movement by fighters from Angwan Rukuba to Nasarawa Gwong (Source: created by author).

My guide believed that without infiltrations from the surrounding areas, the neighbourhood would not have experienced that level of violence. Some discussions suggest that up to fifteen people were killed in the two days of the riots in Dutse Uku. Although some claim up to 30 residents could have been killed and up to 100 injured, a neighbourhood leader who went round to take stock the week after the violence said he recorded 15 deaths and 42 injuries. Routes that linked the neighbourhood to adjoining settlements facilitated invasion. Our walk traversed

---

108 Discussion with residents, 20.02.17.
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a complex network of alleys and footpaths that crisscrossed the neighbourhood’s contiguous boundaries and its surroundings. These routes were back roads inaccessible to security forces and outsiders.

Elsewhere in the neighbourhood, my Muslim guide led me on, essentially, a series of short walks. Once the riot was underway, Muslim residents could only move short distances for fear of ending up on Christian territory, which could easily be the next street or turn. We started from the southern boundary of Nasarawa Gwong and headed northward, taking back roads about a block off the busy main street. My guide identified several points where small groups of residents had mounted barricades.

Most buildings along the main road held shops and small businesses. Throngs of customers paraded through tailors, barbing salons, phone repair shops, GSM card kiosks, cigarette stalls and various other enterprises that sprawl to the road’s edge. Describing the local atmosphere during the riots, my guide noted that all shops were closed and no commerce went on. People walked briskly or ran, seeking safety in all directions.110 Smoke clouds filled the air as residents mounted barricades and burnt tyres to keep intruders from entering their streets.111 Intermittently, loud gunshots would rent the air and the crowds on the main road would disappear through the complex network of alleys shouting: ‘They are coming!’ Once gunshots ceased, the crowds would reconvene.112

Many participants in the violence came from the adjoining areas. My guide identified a busy intersection as the battle line between Christian and Muslim armed mobs.113 Although neighbours used sticks, knives and a few machetes on each other, the violence was relatively low-level leaving only a few individuals with minor injuries. There were no deaths at this point.114 Yet, the violence intensified when rival groups from the surrounding neighbourhoods invaded the settlement later that morning. These groups were armed with sophisticated weapons and

110 Mobile interview, 17.02.17.
111 Discussion with resident, 15.02.17.
112 Mobile interview, 17.02.17.
113 Ibid.
114 Discussions with resident, 15.02.17.
came in large numbers, ‘shooting, hacking and burning anything that stood on their way’.  

Violence resumed in the early hours of the second day. Residents and outside armed groups joined forces again to launch attacks against rival group members. However, following the governor’s earlier imposed dusk-till-dawn curfew and a directive for urgent military action against perpetrators, MOPO stormed the scene by late morning and shot at people sporadically. One resident of Fillin Ball said MOPO broke into houses and killed several young men.

Some residents said there were up to twenty deaths and over one hundred injuries on the first day, and fifteen more deaths and around fifty injuries on the second. Other residents quoted higher figures, though thirty-five deaths and 150 injuries over both days seems most reasonable to me. On our walk, physical effects of the violence were not obvious; most houses destroyed during the riots were rebuilt and businesses activities were abloom. However, my guide felt that the social fabric swaddling Christian and Muslim residents together in cordial interactions was torn, saying that only trade still brought them together to engage in passive fleeting transactions.

As small groups of neighbours united to defend their street section from infiltrators, residential mobilisation was decentralised. One of the conspicuous aspects of the riots in Nasarawa Gwong was the prominent role played by armed mobs mobilised from outside the neighbourhood. Christians marched from Angwan Rukuba and Muslims from Dilimi and Gangare into the area and turned it into one of Jos’ fiercest battlegrounds. Although there were initial efforts to secure the area through joint patrols, these efforts gave in to the pressure from external groups as violence increased.

**Factors enhancing and impeding armed mob’s mobilization and mobility**

A neighbourhood’s ethnic composition affected how information was spread and people first mobilised. Leaders of residents’ and youth association and vigilantes
led the process in segregated neighbourhoods (see Table 5.2). Early on, individuals learnt about the security situation through informal social networks via phone or word of mouth, but at a later stage, associations took responsibility, disseminating information and organising collective responses. These neighbourhood coalitions engaged in intelligence-gathering and strategic planning. Association leaders called meetings, where members shared information and decided what steps be taken to secure the neighbourhood. In both neighbourhoods, youth associations and vigilantes were saddled with patrolling and preventing troublemakers from gaining entry.

Table 5.2: Key actors in mobilisation in segregated and mixed neighbourhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Key actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segregated (Angwan Rogo)</td>
<td>Neighbourhood and youth leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed (Nasarawa Gwong)</td>
<td>Individuals/small groups of residents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information dissemination and mobilisation in mixed neighbourhoods followed a slightly different pattern. Information was channelled through quotidian networks including families, friends and neighbours. As Table 5.2 indicates, neighbourhood and youth leaders had no prominent role in spreading information like those in the segregated settlement. Mobilising residents was also not as centralised here. While residents in segregated neighbourhoods converged at a central point, those in the mixed neighbourhood clustered across multiple sites, where residents felt safe. Because these were mixed neighbourhoods, the enemy could be one street over or right next door, prompting small groups to convene in front of their homes or at covert corners. Navigating the neighbourhood from one’s residence to some central point for mobilisation was unfeasible for fear of being attacked on the way. Co-ethnics living in relatively close proximity met within their immediate vicinity to decide which security measures to take.
Ethnic composition therefore determined whether individuals could mobilise into the large crowds from which armed mobs eventually formed. Those in Angwan Rogo were mobilised to keep threats from coming in by fortifying the settlement’s three main entry points. Although the majority of these crowds did not venture out of the neighbourhood, individuals from within formed armed mobs, led by criminals. Some mobs marched about 1.5 kilometres to engage in violence in Ali Kazaure. Most neighbourhood leaders I spoke with seemed unaware of how these mobs came about. But many Ali Kazaure residents well recalled how armed groups from the adjoining areas invaded.

By contrast, individuals in ethnically mixed Nasarawa Gwong could only move short distances from home. Navigating the neighbourhood to reach a central point for mobilisation was unfeasible for fear of being attacked en route. Mobilisation was decentralised, with co-ethnics living relatively close to each other and forming small armed bands to secure their homes and families (see Table 5.3). Their mostly rudimentary weapons included sticks, iron bars and knives. These groups dotted the neighbourhood, rarely venturing farther than their own streets. In one instance, I calculated the distance covered by two of these groups together only added up to about 600 metres.

Table 5.3: Points of mobilisation in segregated and mixed neighbourhoods

---

118 Interviews with residents, 17.02.17.
Neighbourhood | Number of points of mobilisation/gathering
---|---
Segregated (Angwan Rogo) | 1
Mixed (Nasarawa Gwong) | 7

Although in many instances neighbours fought neighbours, a significant – and perhaps deadlier – segment of violence in ethnically mixed Nasarawa Gwong was perpetrated by armed groups from adjoining segregated settlements. Sandwiched between rivalling segregated groups, the settlement was a frontier where Christian groups from Angwan Rukuba and Tina Junction met Muslim groups from Yan Shanu, Fillin Ball, Dilimi and other adjacent Muslim strongholds. The armed mob from Angwan Rogo marched up to one kilometre from its origin to the confrontation point.

Two takeaways stand out. First, a large cache of potential rioters, akin to what Brass (2004) called ‘riot systems’ or Berenschot (2011) labelled ‘patronage networks’, does not automatically translate into violence; these assemblages need a battleground to be violent. So without a readily available frontier where they can combat other groups, their violent character essentially has no stage. Second, interethnic networks in ethnically mixed areas do not automatically translate into non-violence during riots. What made ethnically mixed areas such as Ali Kazaure and Nasarawa Gwong frontiers was not so much lack of interethnic engagement as it was pressure by rivalling external groups from the adjoining segregated settlements. Interethnic joint patrols endeavoured to prevent violence in both neighbourhoods, but it was futile in the face of escalating violence and pressure from external forces. The violence prevention networks were not useless, but the location of these settlements between rivalling segregated areas made them highly vulnerable to incursion from outside.

Mixed areas near rivalling segregated neighbourhoods are violence-prone because, first, each group sees them as no man’s land. Like a prize, a mixed area is claimed by those who assert greater dominance. This is common in social conflicts where the very ownership of the city is contested and territorial
dominance is a boon to a group’s claims of political and social advantages. In this kind of setting, the mixed neighbourhood, especially one sandwiched between rivalling segregated neighbourhoods, becomes a frontier where rivalling groups in the adjoining segregated settlements are perpetually struggling to expand their territorial and political control by displacing rival group members. Second, because of the transboundary nature of social networks across the neighbourhoods, armed groups from segregated areas easily find accomplices among their co-ethnics within the mixed area. This dynamic is not unique to Jos; an official report of the 1984 Delhi riots (Tambiah 1997: 1179) noted that ‘most of the mobs were from areas different from where they operated and only a few local people had joined such mobs to facilitate the operations’.

Further, it is important to ask why armed mobs went after ethnically mixed Ali Kazaure when there were ‘enemy’ populations in other nearby areas. A government reserved residential area and two University of Jos senior staff quarters (one on Bauchi Road, east of Angwan Rogo, and the other to its north) are about a quarter kilometre away – at least four times closer than Ali Kazaure. These areas had many Christians, whom mobs from Angwan Rogo could have attacked, but they were spared the type of violence experienced in Ali Kazaure. There are two plausible explanations for why. As segregated neighbourhoods, these areas had high levels of collective efficacy and capacity for collective action (Sampson & Groves 1989). Residents could therefore self-mobilise and, armed with sticks, knives and possibly firearms, many formed a defensive wall. Moreover, these areas were separated by major highways that security forces constantly patrol. I was told about a mob from Angwan Rogo who tried to cross the Bauchi Road highway to invade a Christian settlement, but was violently intercepted by security forces. According to reports, some 26 young men, all residents of Angwan Rogo, were killed in that incident (see Human Rights Watch 2009). However, the neighbourhood’s leaders told me the men were only observing what was happening across the road, where a sizeable Christian mob was forming. What really happened that Saturday morning may remain unproven, but what is certain is that the security forces applied disproportionate force in dealing with the situation and the highway proved costlier to the mobs than the back roads. The government
residential area and the university staff quarters were fortunate because, as Krause (2017: 265) points out, middle-class areas 'generally receive more police protection and are much easier to police than overcrowded slum areas with very poor street infrastructure'.

The type of neighbourhood likeliest to experience violence during riots, therefore, is an ethnically mixed neighbourhood that is sandwiched between rivalling segregated settlements. However, it is much likelier to be invaded by armed mobs if it is contiguously connected to the segregated settlements through back roads that are inaccessible to security forces and outsiders. Armed mobs’ penchant for narrow, hidden-away routes was also demonstrated by Christians from Angwan Rukuba who invaded parts of Nasarawa Gwong.

Conclusion
The literature has presented conflicting evidence of how ethnic segregation and diversity are related to collective violence. This article argued that some of this ambivalence stems from assumptions about the mobile nature of armed mobs and its implications for the spread of violence. This study showed how the origins of armed mobs are not one and the same as the locations of their violence. I demonstrated this by walking in the footsteps of rioters within and across neighbourhood boundaries. Contrary to the determinist stance currently dominating ethnic composition and violence debates, both ethnically segregated and mixed neighbourhoods contribute to violence’s production, albeit differently. While segregated localities are suitable for mobilising armed mobs, diverse areas, especially those located between segregated settlements, are wont to violent clashes.

As for these findings’ implications, I begin by emphasising that armed mobs are more easily mobilised in ethnically segregated areas, yet they need a battleground to engage in violence. An adjoining ethnically mixed settlement, especially if it shares parts of its boundary with another segregated settlement inhabited by a rival group, provides an apt frontier for confrontation. Such ethnically mixed areas lack the cohesiveness to mobilise against external forces. Even when
they organise joint patrols to keep troublemakers out, such efforts prove futile in the face of escalating violence and determined external armed mobs. Thus, although homogenously segregated neighbourhoods may not experience violence, they do contribute to violence in the adjoining areas. Moreover, though ethnically mixed areas may be the sites of recurrent violence, they may not always be home to the fighters. It is pertinent, therefore, to also consider how neighbourhoods contribute to violence rather than only focus, as short-sighted studies have done, on whether they are violent or not.

Understanding how localities contribute to violence’s production reveals major undercurrents, which the conventional dichotomous categorisation of neighbourhoods as violent versus non-violent ignores. By seeing the segregated settlement as the supplier of fighters and the ethnically mixed area next to it as the frontier hosting the opportunity to fight, we recognise how both settings help in the outbreak and spread of violence; we also see how the absence of either can alter the dynamics of violence dramatically. Further, understanding the shared boundaries of localities and how they enhance or impede rioters’ mobility helps explain the spread of violence. By actually walking in the footsteps of rioters, I got a more grounded, clearer grasp of the factors shaping their spatial behaviour. This complements and enriches aspatial conceptions of the dynamics of collective violence. It can ultimately advance our understanding of the factors that shape levels and patterns of violence in urban environments.

From a policy perspective, understanding the processes and conditions under which individuals become armed mobs, their preferred routes and the areas where violence is likeliest to occur can contribute to the management of violence. While it is beyond this article’s scope to provide indicators for predicting violence, the overarching objective was to identify riots’ spatial behaviour in different settings. Understanding that residents’ and youth association leaders play more prominent roles in information-sharing and mobilisation in segregated settlements than mixed settings is valuable; it can give authorities clues concerning whom to focus on and work with to prevent violence. Pre-knowledge of rioters’ preferred routes and likely-to-target neighbourhoods can encourage more proactive responses, thus containing fighters before large-scale violence breaks out.
These findings, emerging from an ethnography of Jos, should prove interesting and perhaps necessary to re-examine in determining how far they reflect the reality of other cities with similar struggles. This could be challenging considering the paucity of disaggregated micro-level data. It may be feasible, though, in cities with census tracts down to neighbourhood or street levels, as well as detailed records of arrests, addresses of perpetrators, incident locations and CCTV footage.
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