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CHAPTER ONE
General Introduction

Introduction

Apart from large-scale armed struggles that fall under the rubric of civil war, Africa is home to numerous violent conflicts involving rival ethnic categories.\(^1\) Though not conventional wars, these conflagrations are as devastating in terms of deaths and physical destruction. Nigeria is among the African countries currently not experiencing a full-blown civil strife, yet pockets of intergroup antipathy still rankles the society. While secessionist aspirations in the south-east region once plunged the country into a three-year civil war and longstanding regional rivalries persist, continuous conflicts concern ethno-linguistic and/or religious identities. Being the most ethnically diverse part of Nigeria, the central region known as the Middle Belt (see Figure 1.1) has long presented the most precarious security situation.\(^2\) The region’s penchant for intergroup fighting may have been encouraged to fester by the paternalistic manner in which the colonial administration managed ethnic diversity. For administrative expediency, the colonial administration let the various small groups of indigenous peoples from the north, who were predominantly Christian and pagan, be subsumed under the political dominance of the Muslim Hausa-Fulani. The colonists, in their indirect rule, stayed impervious to their subjects’ cultural differences and territorial integrity. Struggles by the indigenes to ‘liberate’ themselves started in the 1930s, but became more determined after

\(^1\) The dissertation uses the terms ‘ethnic violence’ and ‘ethnic conflict’ following Horowitz’s (1985) understanding of violence that is perpetrated across the boundaries of ascriptive group identities including race, language, religion, tribe and caste. Included under this category is the violence between Protestants and Catholics in Belfast, Hindus and Muslims in Meerut, Shias and Sunnis in Pakistan and, indeed, Christians and Muslims in Jos (for a similar broad application of the concept of ethnic violence, see also Varshney, 2001: 364).

\(^2\) The Middle Belt includes Abuja (Federal Capital Territory, FCT), Adamawa, Benue, Kogi, Nasarawa, Niger, Plateau, Southern Kaduna and Taraba Benue states.
independence in 1960. The very label ‘Middle Belt’, adopted by indigenous politicians of the region, represents the struggle to differentiate the area geographically and, more consequently, culturally and politically from the ‘One North’ notion championed by the Hausa-Fulani.

Figure 1.1: Map of Nigeria showing Middle Belt and the location of Plateau State (Source: created by author).

Though Nigeria’s colonial legacy has present-day salience, its role should not be overstated or allowed to eclipse recent developments. The regularity of violent confrontations in post-colonial Nigeria is best understood by considering how contemporary politics of identity and materialism, poor governance and endemic corruption have combined to erode the institutional capacity to regulate group
competition. Years-long military rule repressed the aspirations of the indigenous groups, partly because Muslim northerners dominated the military hierarchy, but also because authoritarian regimes left little room for the expression of collective grievances. Nigeria’s return to a democratic system of government in 1999 reawakened pernicious questions around ethnic identity, indigeneity, political representation and several other contentious issues that were dormant but remain at the crux of Nigeria’s citizenship crisis. Nigerian authorities lack clear definitions for indigeneity and citizenship, and have been unable to spell out how the two can coexist without contradicting each other. Who qualifies as an indigene is mentioned in an unclear way in the constitution, yet is acknowledged as the determining factor for federal and state appointments. This has led to ambiguities and contradictions in the interpretations of indigeneity and competing claims on the distribution of rights and resources, such as political appointments, employment quotas, school admissions and scholarships. It is thus unsurprising that the politics of identity has held a strong foothold in Nigeria. Groups are perpetually mobilising along ethnic lines to negotiate or renegotiate their stake and boost their chances, as indigenes, for exclusive access to distributable goods. Intense political and economic dramas have unfolded without a strong formal framework for managing and checking the excesses of actors. The result has been resorting to a kind of self-help, which has often meant – in the absence of a strong nonpartisan regulating authority – open confrontation against their own compatriots. During Nigeria’s euphoric return to democracy, the Middle Belt became a hotbed of these identity politics. Indigenous groups positioned themselves to take political control of what they believed were their territories against the overbearing presence of the Hausa-Fulani. These struggles are generally framed as indigene-settler conflicts, and nowhere in the country have they been as pronounced and atrocious as in Plateau State.

One of Nigeria’s 36 constituent federating units, Plateau State is perhaps the country’s most ethnically diverse. It is inhabited by some 54 ethno-linguistic groups (Plateau Peace Conference, 2004: 11). However, as chapters 1 and 2 of this dissertation show, indigene-settler conflicts have only involved particular groups. Moreover, they have been confined to some areas in the northern and southern senatorial districts, leaving the central zone being relatively rancour-free.
Though several parts of the state have experienced some form of violence over the last decade, Jos stands out. Plateau State’s capital has been hardest hit in terms of number of deaths and scale of destruction.

In Nigeria’s Middle Belt, the city of Jos sits on a tableland that averages 1,200 metres above sea level (see Figure 1.2). Following its establishment around 1915, a thriving colonial tin mining industry and a sizeable European population gave the city a head start in communication infrastructure. The city had road networks, railways and telegraph lines before most urban areas in the region. Jos’ scenic topography and semi-temperate climate also attracted tourists and migrants from inside and outside the country (Plotnicov, 1967: 28). Situated on the fault line between the country’s predominantly Muslim north and predominantly Christian south, the city has some 800,000 inhabitants, who are roughly equal halves Muslim and Christian.

Figure 1.2: Map of Plateau State Showing the Location of Jos (Source: created by author).

The city is also a centre of religious revivalism, where a number of both faiths’ sects have headquarters (Best, 2008: 10). Many migration waves from different
parts of the country over the years have made Jos a melting pot as well as a battleground. Despite being in what was once considered among Nigeria’s most peaceful regions, contestations over political representation, indigene rights and ownership of the city have culminated into episodes of collective brutality. Between 2001 and 2010, over 5,000 people were killed and some 300,000 displaced within the metropolis and the outlying rural areas.\(^3\) Though the conflicts have been primarily between, on one side, the three groups considered indigenous to Jos – Berom, Afizere and Anaguta – and on the other side, the settler Hausa, violence was perpetrated mainly along religious lines. This is because boundaries between ethno-linguistic and religious identities overlap, even if not so neatly, and religion presents a wide support base for mobilisation. Most of the indigenes are Christian and the Hausa are consistently Muslim.\(^4\) Because of religion’s long reach, residents belonging to groups that are not ordinarily involved in the indigene-settler dispute have become entwined in the violence, too.

Contrary to what many analyses suggest, the different groups in Jos have not been coexisting entirely harmoniously. In fact, the city witnessed violent conflicts long before many parts of the country. Plotnicov (1971: 298) gives Jos the distinction of hosting the first bloody riot in modern Nigeria. A riot brewed as early as 1932, during the Great Depression and following an exodus of European miners, though it was squashed with the execution of ten of the perpetrators. What came to be known as the ‘village revolts’ happened in the wake of rumours that the Europeans were finally leaving. In 1945, a much more pervasive level of violence erupted between the Hausa and the Igbo, who were at the time fiercely competitive traders. Accounts differ about how it all started, though one says it began at the potato market in a dispute between a Hausa man and an Igbo man. While the trigger may well remain a mystery, competition between the groups was a causal factor in these clashes. More Igbos had migrated to Jos after World War II in

---

\(^3\) Different sources estimate total fatalities to be between 5,000 and 7,000 (see Higazi 2011).

\(^4\) The self-ascriptions ‘indigenes’ and ‘Hausa’ are used here in want of better categorisation. Though Berom, Afizere and Anaguta internally wrangle over chieftaincy, land and some serious political differences, all three groups have consistently fought against Hausa claims to indigeneity. As the next chapter explains, ‘the Hausa’ in Jos represents a social category that, besides the Hausa, includes other originally non-Hausa groups such Fulani, Nupe and Kanuri who are also predominantly Muslim. These groups have intermarried with the Hausa for generations and have adopted Hausa language, traditions and customs.
search of jobs and trading opportunities, and soon made significant progress in trade and local politics, sectors the Hausas had monopolised for several decades (Plotnicov, 1971: 305).

Though its history of ethnic riots goes back to the 1930s, deadly violence in the twenty-first century is what earned Jos notoriety. The scale is unprecedented and continues to baffle observers. As Higazi (2007: 7) notes, religion in Jos has played a prominent role during the recent rounds of riots and did so in a distinct way from earlier clashes across ethnolinguistic or regional boundaries. The first large-scale violence to occur in modern-day Jos was in 2001, following the appointment of a Hausa man as coordinator of a poverty alleviation programme in Jos North. The violence started in a slum, south-east of the city centre. Christians and Muslims engaged in open clashes, using sticks, cutlasses, bows and arrows, spears, petrol bombs and locally made firearms. Within a remarkably short time, similar clashes erupted in different parts of the city, with mobs killing, maiming and burning. The police were overwhelmed; it took the military to finally quell the violence six days later. About 1,000 people were killed in the pandemonium. Another round of violence almost engulfed the city in May 2002, but calm was restored and it did not spread to other parts of the city. It started with skirmishes between Christian and Muslim party loyalists at an electoral registration centre and ended in mobs rampaging around Angwan Rukuba, Eto Baba, Nasarawa Gwong and Dogon Dutse areas. In the end, about 50 people were killed and up to 100 vehicles burnt (Nyam and Ayuba, 2016: 367). Yet, this was minimal compared to what happened in 2001 or what was to come in 2008. That horrendous violence was directly linked to the local government area (LGA) elections held on 27 November 2008. Once again, armed mobs killed, maimed and vandalised. After two days of fighting, 700 people were dead and hundreds of buildings and vehicles burnt and/or destroyed. Another round of violence occurred in 2010. Unlike the episodes in 2001 and 2008, which were related to (elected or appointed) political positions, this one was sparked by a seemingly trivial event. On 17 January, a

---

5 In 1994, small-scale social unrest followed the appointment of a Hausa as care committee chairman of Jos North LGA. Another violent episode between the indigenes occurred in Bukuru, south of Jos, in 1998 (see Best 2008: 10-11). For a complete account of the 1994 incident, see also the Justice Aribiton Fiberesima Commission of Enquiry into the riots of 12 April 1994 in Jos metropolis.
Muslim whose home was destroyed in Dutse Uku during the 2008 violence brought labourers in to start renovating the house, which he owned. An altercation then ensued between the labourers, who were Muslim, and the area’s Christian residents on their way to church that Sunday morning. As in previous violence episodes, before long the altercation spiralled into mass killings, replicated in neighbourhoods across the city.  

Although the current study concentrates on urban Jos, it is worth mentioning where outside the city the violence reached. The 2001 violence spread to Kaduna Vom, Farin Lamba, Heipang, Bisichi, Vwang and Sabong Layi. Police reports detail low-level violence in Pankshin and Kabwir in Kanke, where a mob of about a thousand young men burnt a mosque and some vehicles. In the years following these events, violent attacks occurred in different parts of southern Plateau and, to a lesser extent, the central senatorial district. Rampaging mobs wreaked havoc in Wase, Shendam, Langtang North and Langtang South LGAs. The most atrocious violence in southern Plateau started around 2002 and peaked in 2004, with the massacre of hundreds of rural dwellers in Yelwa Shendam and Wase areas. After engulfing parts of Bukuru in Jos South, the 2010 violence spread to neighbouring Barkin Ladi and Riyom LGAs. The horrific attack on Kuru Jenta, where at least 150 people were killed by Christian Berom groups, was followed by a series of intermittent attacks that culminated in another major incident in which at least 200 people were hacked to death by armed militias believed to be Muslim Fulani. It is estimated that 400 deaths occurred within Jos metropolis in January 2010, and up to 1,000 in coordinated militia attacks in the rural parts of Jos South, Barkin Ladi and Riyom LGAs (Higazi, 2011). Jos experienced several violent incidents between 2010 and 2015, but many were revenge attacks in the

---


8 For an exhaustive analysis of violence in the rural districts of these areas, see Higazi (in press).
wake of bombings by Boko Haram. Though difficult to extricate from the preceding Christian-Muslim clashes, the 2010 – 2015 occurrences were unique and deserve separate attention. Thus, this study primarily deals with the period between 2001 and 2010.

At the time of writing, Jos is enjoying a fragile peace. The visible presence of a military taskforce and the reconciliatory efforts of peace-building networks have contributed to creating a semblance of stability. While the city has not recorded any incident of Christian-Muslim clashes since 2015, it still reels from the large-scale violence of the past. A high crime rate, drug abuse, mutual suspicion and fear pervade the city’s divided society. Neighbourhoods are characterised by a strong presence of miscellaneous networks that combine the characteristics of vigilantes, ethnopolitical interest groups and criminal cartels posturing as vanguards of defence. These emergent assemblages pose a major security challenge even in times of relative stability. Moreover, issues at the root of the conflict remain largely unaddressed and, at the time of writing, some rural areas in Bassa, south-west of Jos, are recovering from a series of militia attacks that claimed about 75 lives in a matter of weeks. Experts on Jos are well aware that the questions concerning indigeneity and city ownership can be ignited by political developments at any time. The LGA elections scheduled to take place in February 2018 are, at the time of writing, being viewed with apprehension.

Jos thus presents an intriguing case study. It offers a look at how peaceable intergroup relations can suddenly give way to carnage; how congenial neighbours can suddenly become deadly enemies; and how mundane residential areas can become spaces of fatal combat seemingly overnight. As the next section discusses, scholars have studied conflict and violence in Jos from various angles. Existing literature offers a repository of insights on the structural factors and political developments that have, time and again, turned the city on its head. In other words, the underlying causes of violent conflict in Jos are known and

---

9 See Mustapha, Higazi, Lar and Chromy (in press).
11 Thanks to Adam Higazi and several other individuals who shared their perspectives in personal communication concerning the LGA elections scheduled for February 2018.
documented. However, which factors shaped its spread and patterns across many neighbourhoods have yet to be thoroughly analysed. An emergent body of research narrowly focuses on how variables such as levels of poverty, population density, street infrastructure and ethnic composition can make a neighbourhood violent or nonviolent. The recent scholarship is bringing clarity to which factors shape the spatial distribution of violence, yet some questions persist. This study adds a new dimension to the discussion by proposing that a neighbourhood’s ethnic composition in combination with its location can help account for variations in spread of violence across a city’s neighbourhoods.

**Key perspectives on ethnic conflict and violence in Jos**

Ethnic conflict and violence in Jos has attracted considerable scholarly attention. Earlier historical and anthropological works trace pre-colonial encounters between the indigenous people of Jos Plateau and migrant groups. Hodder (1959) describes the cordial interaction and intergroup trading activities that thrived between indigenous groups and middlemen from the Hausa states before the dawn of colonial rule. However, whatever conviviality existed disappeared at the onset of attempts to invade the Jos Plateau by the forces of Usman dan Fodio in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Although dan Fodio himself was Fulani, Hausa men were prominent in spreading jihad southward. Based on this fact, it is highly probable that when the colonialists came to Jos Plateau, the relationship between indigenes and Hausa was characterised by mutual suspicion. After the colonial administration subdued the Islamic emirates of northern Nigeria, it turned to the huge challenge of taming the diverse, less centralised groups in central Nigeria. It took the use of considerable force to finally subdue groups on the Jos Plateau and its surroundings (Tambo, 1978; Morrison, 1977). Once the people were under control, a colonial tin industry replaced the small local one, opening a large window of opportunity to Hausa, who were at the time struggling to pay the poll tax. The tax regime was a major motivator for working in the tin mines. The

12 By 1906, the entire Islamic state of the Sokoto sultanate and its emirates, established by dan Fodio and his jihadist forces, had fallen to the superior Royal West African Frontier Force. For a comprehensive account of the conquest of northern Nigeria’s Islamic sultanates by the colonial forces, see Killingray (1986).
indigenous groups who were at first very reluctant to mine soon had little choice since tax was required in cash (Freund, 1982). Researchers have shed light on the historical and social underpinnings of ethnic competition by describing the waves of migration from northern Nigeria (Freund, 1981), the establishment of city in 1915 and the segregationist sociospatial organisation of residential settlements by the colonial administration (Plotnicov, 1967). The inflow of migrants from the south intensified economic competition and resulted in one of the earliest violent clashes in Jos, the aforementioned potato market riot.

Another important perspective on ethnic conflict and violence in Jos emerges from colonial legacy. This view stresses the role of the colonial administration in creating social and political structures that were inherently conflict-prone thanks to the ‘divide and rule’ principle (Plotnicov, 1967: 40). The colonial administration found the Hausa model of chieftaincy better suited for managing large populations than the less sophisticated, decentralised systems of the indigenes. This gave the Hausa political ascendancy in terms of accessing power and resources. However, the creation of the Gbong Gwom chieftaincy stool for the Berom in 1949 reversed the advantage. It caused a major power shift; the Hausa chiefs (Tsarkis), though still coordinating their people, found themselves with less authority than the Gbong Gwom, whose authority spanned districts. The Hausa did not like the development, but their struggles to reverse it proved futile.

Clear connections have been established between these colonial antecedents and regional identity politics in post-colonial Nigeria (Logams, 1985; Osaghae and Suberu, 2005). The Hausa forms the majority group in northern Nigeria and is by far the most politically dominant. At the dawn of independence, the minority ethnic groups in north-central Nigeria found themselves under the hegemonic clutch of the Hausa (Logams, 1985). Struggles by the minorities to break free and assert their political autonomy started during colonial rule and continued after its end. The incompatibility of these interests has translated into local power struggles, which have in recent decades become violent in tone (Egwu, 2011). The violent conflict between the indigenous groups of Jos and the Hausa is part of this and is, in essence, a microcosmic expression of these political struggles (see also Best, 2007, 2008).
Ethnic competition has been at the crux of Jos analyses. It is generally accepted that the fall in oil revenue and the implementation of a structural adjustment programme (SAP) in the 1980s intensified competition over dwindling resources among Nigeria’s ethnic categories (Jega, 2000; Egwu, 2004). This period of the country’s history is hallmarked by a proliferation of ethnic associations established to champion diverse group interests (Osaghae, 1995). The year 1987 saw the creation of the Jasawa Development Association (JDA), the association that pushes Hausa interests in Jos and is a key protagonist in the conflict. Competition for political representation and access to resources continued to fuel the conflict (Danfulani and Fwatshak, 2002). Positions of power have been intensely contested, leading to the outbreak of violence more than any other singular factor. Three of the four major episodes of violence between 1994 and 2010 were directly related to appointive and elective offices. The general rise in insecurity and the frequency of violent ethnic conflicts has been traced to the harsh economic conditions, unemployment and deprivation catalysed by the SAP (Eze, 2009). It is apparent here how identity politics interweaves with structural factors such as unemployment, poverty and deprivation to foster rivalry and violent conflict. Corruption, in turn, further engenders poverty, deprivation and, by implication, social upheavals. Showing how social history intersects with contemporary urban politics of governance and group rights in the context of the indigene-settler crisis, Higazi (2007: 1) links contemporary Jos’ violence to heightening ‘corruption and factional divisions’ among political elites.

The intense competition among ethnic identities is further compounded by Nigeria’s citizenship crisis and ambiguities surrounding indigeneity (Elaigwu, 2001). Nigerian authorities distinguish between indigenes and non-indigenes (or settlers) within states and LGAs (Bach, 1997). All over Nigeria, the constituent states and LGAs assign certain rights and privileges to persons and groups considered indigenes. The constitution, however, only vaguely defines the term, leaving it open to subjective interpretations that are often conflicting (Fourchard, 2015; Ehrhardt, 2017). While some base indigeneship on autochthony, others see it in terms of long-time residence and aiding an area’s development. The indigenous groups of Jos lay their claims of city ownership and consider themselves the only bona fide
indigenes because, they argue, the city was built on land inhabited by their ancestors since time immemorial (Ostien, 2009). The Hausa proclaim they qualify as indigenes because they have been around for an extensive period and contributed to the growth of the city since its formal establishment a century ago (see Best, 2008). What is more, being a Nigerian citizen does not guarantee the privileges that indigene status does, so who qualifies as an indigene has become a pervasive issue.

In all this, religion as a weapon of mass mobilisation has also received ample attention (see Best, 2001; Best and Rakodi, 2011; Tertsakian, 2005; Mwadkwon, 2001). Although officially secular, Nigeria is a highly religious society, with most citizens taking their religious identity very seriously (Adogame, 2010). Religion is therefore a readily available platform for mobilising people during conflicts (Ukiwo, 2003). The situation becomes even more volatile when the boundaries between tribal and religious identities overlap, as is the case in Jos (Egwu, 2004). It has been argued, quite persuasively, that the deterioration of group relations in many Nigerian conflict hotspots followed a period that witnessed a politicisation of religion (Egwu, 2004; Osaghae, 1995). This politicisation has been spurred on by the aforementioned competition over scarce resources due to oil prices plummeting and the SAP during the 1980s (Jega, 2000; Egwu, 2004; Osaghae, 1995). Research has viewed cities, mainly because of their diverse makeup, as incubators of social movements that compete in pursuit of group rights and interests that are often incompatible (Nicholls and Vermeulen, 2012; Miller and Nicholls, 2013). Within the context of Nigeria’s economic crisis and ethnic competition, social mobilisation had a particular intensity in Jos’ hyper-diverse landscape. Competing social categories, driven chiefly by parochial ethno-political interests, have appropriated and deployed religion as the basis for mobilisation because of its wide support bases. The result has been an explosion of Christian-Muslim brutality in Jos and other parts of northern and central Nigeria.

As demonstrated so far, the underlying causes of ethnic conflict and violence have received ample attention. But beyond these structural factors, researchers are becoming increasingly curious about the spatial dimension of ethnic violence (see Krause, 2011, 2017; Scacco, 2012; Nyam and Ayuba, 2016;
The growing interest in explaining spatial variations of violence in Jos is consistent with research traditions in violent cities around the world, such as Belfast (Cunningham, 2013; Mesev, Shirlow and Downs. 2009), Jerusalem (Bhavnani, Donnay, Miodownik, Mor, and Helbing, 2014; Benvenisti, 1983) and Beirut (Bou Akar, 2012). India-focused researchers have done extensive work on the spatial distribution of riots (see Varshney, 2001; Brass, 2004; Wilkinson, 2006; Berenschot, 2011). For Jos, discussions on the factors that shape the spatial distribution of violence have surrounded the following variables: poverty, population density, ethnic composition, political power-sharing, and civilian peace-building networks.

Scholars agree on poverty’s crucial role in shaping spread of violence across Jos’ neighbourhoods. Higazi (2007: 18) notes that violence mainly happened in poor neighbourhoods, while ‘wealthier areas such as Rayfield and the GRA where the elite live were unaffected’. Krause (2011) and Scacco (2012) also posit that violence mainly took place in poor and densely populated areas. Scholars, however, differ on how poverty contributes to violence. Krause (2011) attributes the propensity for violence in poor neighbourhoods partly to poor infrastructure, observing how pathways along which rioters travel, behind the main streets are so narrow and how many policemen and soldiers are unwilling to go into these areas for fear of being outnumbered by mobs. Meanwhile, the middle-class areas experience far less violence because they are easier to police thanks to better street infrastructure (Krause, 2011: 33). Scacco (2012), however, finds that deprived areas experience more incidents of violence because poor neighbourhoods are not priority areas for security forces, compelling residents to go out to fight and defend themselves and their families. Both explanatory mechanisms are plausible, and can – and do – work concomitantly.

Apart from poverty, Jos experts consider ethnic composition an important factor for explaining variations in spread of violence. Both Higazi (2007: 17) and Krause (2011: 34) highlight how Christians were attacked and driven out of predominantly Muslim neighbourhoods, the same happened to Muslims in predominantly Christian neighbourhoods and some mixed areas then became battlegrounds. A significant body of work deals with the interrelation between ethnic
composition and ethnic violence (Toft, 2005; Gregory and Pred, 2007; Kaufmann, 1996). Two perspectives dominate the discourse. Emanating from contact theory (Pettigrew, 1998; Allport, 1954), one maintains that segregation increases susceptibility to violence. Doherty and Poole (1997: 533) describe a cyclic ‘persistent mutual impact’ between violence and segregation. They submit that segregation contributes to violence and violence, in turn, consolidates segregation, which attracts more violence. This dynamic has a recursive nature, though the undergirding idea is that segregation increases a locality’s vulnerability to violence (Doherty and Poole, 1995). The second perspective is of conflict theory and argues that ethnically diverse areas are more violence-prone (Kaufmann, 1996). Accordingly, ‘while ethnic segregation may not be desirable, or even stable in the long-term, it may serve as an immediate fix to large-scale bloodshed’ (Weidmann and Salehyan, 2013: 54). These divergent views index a longstanding debate on the role of ethnic composition in violence.

More recent work on Jos focuses on civic networks and power-sharing as explanatory factors for spread of violence. Comparing a violent neighbourhood and a non-violent one, Krause (2017) finds that Dadin Kowa managed to remain non-violent because of the firm intervention of individuals and social networks that worked to prevent youth from engaging when riots broke out in 2010. These findings reiterate the relevance of civilian agency in preventing violence. Bunte and Vinson (2016) argue that the likelihood of ethnic violence is significantly lower in areas with power-sharing than those without. Comparing the violent areas of Jos North and the relatively peaceful Chikun area of Kaduna State, they show that the rhetoric of politicians is appeasing in districts with power-sharing and inflammatory in those without it. Further, they posit that power-sharing affects public perception of ethnic tensions, and that ‘individuals living in districts with power-sharing institutions are less likely to experience religious diversity as threatening’ (Bunte and Vinson, 2016: 49).

So, why did this type of violence erupt? And why did it happen when it did? The Jos-focused literature addresses these questions, though at a more aggregate level and at higher spatial scales, such as the city level. The literature wholly emphasises how the return to a democratic system in 1999 intensified competition
for political representation and distributable resources between indigenes and non-indigenes (Best, 2007; Higazi 2007; Ostien, 2009; Kwaja, 2011; Krause, 2011). However, there is scant, if any, analysis on how political developments and events at national, state and city levels played out at the neighbourhood level. In other words, there is a lacuna of research into how Jos’ neighbourhoods transformed from sites of congenial residence to ethnic killing fields. The goal of this dissertation, therefore, is to illustrate just that. The following section defines the various puzzle pieces that help make up the picture.

**An intriguing puzzle**

Common to the explanatory perspectives thus far discussed is an assumption that a neighbourhood is either violent or nonviolent according to its internal dynamics. Demographically, the ethnic composition of the neighbourhood is often used to explain its vulnerability to violence by contact and conflict theorists alike. Similarly, it is assumed that social networks embedded within the neighbourhood make it violent or nonviolent. Both perspectives consider factors within the neighbourhood, ignoring external forces. Yet, several neighbourhoods in Jos experienced violence not only because of their internal dynamics, but also because of their spatial adjacency to particular areas. For example, observations in the ethnically mixed neighbourhood of Ali Kazaure reveal that even when residents enjoyed a peaceful coexistence and organised joint patrols, external armed mobs from adjoining areas invaded and instigated violence. So regardless of internal dynamics, adjacency to particular areas can contribute to a neighbourhood experiencing violence.

In the same vein, the presence of certain types of social networks that are thought to instigate violence does not directly translate into that locality experiencing violence. To use an example fully analysed in chapters 4 and 5, the neighbourhood of Angwan Rogo reflects a strong presence of networks analogous to Brass’ (2004) riot systems, Varshney’s (2001) intra-ethnic networks and Berenschot’s (2011) patronage networks. The neighbourhood itself, however, stayed calm throughout 2008 and the 2010 because there were no rival group members to attack, since survivors of the 2001 violence had fled the area. That said, Angwan Rogo’s violence networks were not idle. These mobs marched into
the nearby ethnically mixed neighbourhood of Ali Kazaure and engaged in large-scale violence in both 2008 (Human Rights Watch, 2009) and 2010 (Krause 2011).

While these scholarly works advance the discourse on the spatial distribution of violence, an important question remains. Why do levels of violence vary across demographically identical neighbourhoods? This question can be further broken to ask: why did some mixed neighbourhoods experience violence while other mixed neighbourhoods remained relatively peaceful? Why did civilian violence prevention networks succeed in some mixed neighbourhoods but fail in others? Why did groups in some segregated neighbourhoods engage in violence while groups in other segregated neighbourhoods did not?

Rather than focusing only on the internal dynamics of a neighbourhood, this study sets itself apart from others by scrutinising 1) location and ethnic composition of a neighbourhood and ethnic composition of its adjoining neighbourhoods; 2) their shared boundaries; and 3) the mobile nature of armed mobs and, with that, a distinguishing between their origins and the destinations of violent events. The dissertation emphasises a neighbourhood’s ethnic composition and location over poverty as an explanatory variable because, though all the neighbourhoods that experienced significant levels of violence are poor, some poor neighbourhoods experienced no violence. This shows that while the conditions of poverty may be requisite, poverty alone cannot explain variations in spread and levels of violence across Jos’ neighbourhoods. As such, this study acknowledges poverty as an important factor, but only as a control variable. Evidence marshalled in chapter four illustrates that a neighbourhood’s ethnic composition in combination with its location explains variations in spread and levels of violence more accurately.

**Research questions**

**Main research question**

How does the ethnic composition and location of neighbourhoods affect the spread, patterns and recurrence of ethnic violence in the riot-prone city?
**Sub-questions**

How does ethnic competition at the city level translate into territoriality and violent mobilization at the neighbourhood level? This question focuses on the relationship between struggles for political representation between rivalling ethnic categories and the spread of violence within and across Jos’ neighbourhoods. Chapter 2 responds to this question, analysing the role of ethnic associations and neighbourhood networks in fostering territoriality and collective violence.

How do neighbourhoods once peaceable become sites of deadly violence? This question probes into how political developments and events at national, state and city levels translate into violence at the neighbourhood level. Addressed in chapter 3, this question focuses on how Jos’ neighbourhoods transformed from mundane residential areas into spaces of ethnic contention and violence. It considers how the independent variable - neighbourhood ethnic composition and location affect the first dependent variable – the spread of violence.

How are a neighbourhood’s ethnic composition and location and recurrence of violence interrelated? This question focuses on the overarching relationship between the independent variable – neighbourhood ethnic composition and location – and the second dependent variable – recurrence of violence. The question is touched on partly in chapter 3 and exhaustively in chapter 4.

How does a neighbourhood’s ethnic composition in combination with location affect mobilisation and mobility of armed mobs within and across neighbourhood boundaries? This question focuses on the relationship between the independent variable - neighbourhood ethnic composition and location - and the third dependent variable – mobilisation and mobility of armed mobs as central to explaining patterns of violence. Chapter 5 takes up this matter.

**Research objectives and organisation of dissertation**

The researched was guided by two principal objectives. The first objective was to examine how a neighbourhood’s ethnic composition and location interrelate with
ethnic violence. This involved unravelling how such factors work together to affect a locality’s susceptibility to violence. To ascertain that, a first step identified distinct neighbourhood characteristics in terms of ethnic composition and location. The second step tallied and compared incidents of violence across different settings and over time.

The second objective was to examine mobilisation and mobility of armed mobs and how they affect spread of violence within and across the distinct sociospatial settings identified under the first objective. This meant disentangling how a neighbourhood’s ethnic compositions in combination with its location affect mobilisation and mobility. It gauged how each of the identified sociospatial settings either facilitates or hinders armed mobs within and across different neighbourhood settings. Particular attention was devoted to the nature of the neighbourhoods’ shared boundaries (in terms of their contiguity, roads, alleys or other demarcations) and how the boundaries either enhance or impede cross-neighbourhood violence.

The dissertation contains six chapters. The present chapter, the introduction, starts by providing a brief chronological account of violent conflict in Jos within the study period. It then discusses the main explanatory perspectives in existing literature on Jos, thereby uncovering the underlying causes of ethnic conflict and violence. From here, the research problem, questions and objectives are specified. Next, it provides an outline of the dissertation’s structure.

Building on the introductory section, chapter 2 discusses Jos’ political and social history, politics of identity and how indigene-settler contestations culminated into territoriality and collective violence. The chapter articulates the historical antecedents of ethno-spatial differentiation and territoriality in the city and how they intersected with contemporary ethnic politics in the lead-up to large-scale violence in 2001. It touches on spread and patterns of violence and the role of neighbourhood networks in its production.

Chapter 3 addresses the sub-question that asks how a neighbourhood’s ethnic composition and location and violence’s spread are interrelated. The chapter explains this interaction, adopting a processual approach to illustrate how these variables interact over time within the broader context of political developments and events at the national and city levels. Drawing empirical evidence from two
neighbourhoods, the chapter examines how these interactions led to the emergence of two types of neighbourhood settings. Determined according to a neighbourhood’s ethnic composition and location, neighbourhoods can be categorised as strongholds and frontiers – socio-spatial settings that, as chapter 3 illustrates, are important in shaping patterns of violence.

Chapter 4 addresses the sub-question that asks how a neighbourhood’s ethnic composition in combination with its location affects the recurrence of violence. It illustrates why and how ethnically mixed neighbourhoods located between rivalling segregated neighbourhoods experience more recurrent violence than ethnically mixed neighbourhoods that are not similarly located. It also demonstrates how recurrence of violence is fuelled by internal rivalries in combination with struggles by rivalling groups in the adjoining strongholds to extend their political and territorial dominance. The chapter empirically demonstrates how the location of ethnically mixed Ali Kazaure, between rivalling segregated settlements, made it a contested site, where rival political and territorial interests clashed and turned it into a frontier.

Chapter 5 addresses the sub-question that asks how a neighbourhood’s ethnic composition in combination with its location affect mobilisation and mobility of armed mobs within and across neighbourhood boundaries thereby shaping patterns of violence. The chapter maps their mobilisation and mobility in neighbourhood settings differentiated according to ethnic composition and location. It shows the difference between the origins of armed mobs and the destinations of violent events, concluding that both ethnically segregated and mixed neighbourhoods contribute to violence. While segregated neighbourhoods provide the suitable setting for mobilising armed, mixed areas sandwiched between segregated ones form the battlegrounds. The chapter also calls attention to how different types of neighbourhood boundaries can either enhance or hinder armed mobs’ mobility, thereby shaping spread of violence.

The concluding chapter summarises the study’s key findings. It discusses their academic implications, highlighting the ways they deepen scholars’ understanding of the relationship between a neighbourhood’s ethnic composition and collective violence and the factors that shape spread and patterns of violence.
in the divided city. The conclusion also offers practical and policy-relevant implications, notably, how the findings can inform more context-sensitive and effective management strategies and responses to ethnic riots. On a final note, the chapter discusses the limitations of the study and identifies possible directions for further research.
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CHAPTER TWO

From Neighbours to Deadly Enemies:
Excavating Landscapes of Territoriality and Ethnic Violence in Jos, Nigeria

Abstract
Jos, a central Nigerian city engulfed by deadly violence in September 2001, offers a unique case study to explore what happens when a modern metropolis lacks the institutional capacity to regulate its competing groups and latent rivalries ignite into widespread, systematic brutality. Emerging from combined political and cultural dynamics radically different from those of better-known examples, such as Jerusalem and Belfast, Jos provides fresh insights into the roles of group concentration and conflict framing in engendering territoriality and violence in the city. As this paper shows, Jos’ colonial history in tin mining, waves of migration and an urban policy of sociospatial differentiation have shaped and intersected with the contemporary politics of ethnicity to foster explosive relations between Christians and Muslims. Building on literature and primary data from interviews and discussions with surviving residents, the paper explicates how group geography and conflict became so entangled, leading to the so-called ‘Jos crisis’.

Keywords: collective violence, peacebuilding, urban conflict, neighbourhood, ethnic mobilization

Introduction

Some of the boys were my neighbours. They set the house on fire but I remained hidden inside and watched as they used big sticks and machetes on four people. Three of the people they killed were my family.\(^\text{13}\)

This is just one among many stories of neighbours preying on neighbours during the violent conflict that engulfed a central Nigerian city in September 2001. A decade later, when this resident of Jos was telling me how his three siblings were murdered and his home set ablaze by people he well knew, burn scars from the incident were still visible on his face and arms. Overnight, it seemed, neighbourhoods once scenes of convivial coexistence had become fierce battlegrounds of ethnic cleansing between Christians and Muslims. The crux of the conflict is the dispute over indigeneity. On one side are three ethnolinguistic groups indigenous to Jos – Afizere, Anaguta and Berom – who are consequently considered indigenes; on the other are the Hausa, who are more recent arrivals to the Jos Plateau than the indigenes but established themselves in urban Jos before other groups.\(^\text{14}\) Although the conflict is about indigeneity and ownership of the city, the violence took on a religious coloration. Residents were maimed and killed not because they were indigenes or Hausa, but because they were Christian or Muslim. As a result, members of other ethnic nationalities not belonging to the indigeneity imbroglio also became entangled in the violence. By the end of the six-day clashes that came to be known as the ‘Jos crisis’, more than 1,000 people were killed and countless homes, businesses, schools and religious centres destroyed (HRW 2001, 2). Since then, the city has witnessed intermittent large-scale violence but none has been as perplexing as that initial instance in 2001 when neighbours became deadly enemies.

\(^\text{13}\) Interview with 47 year old male resident of Yan Trailer, 15 November 2011
\(^\text{14}\) In the context of Jos, ‘the Hausa’ constitutes more of a social category than an ethnic group. Besides the Hausa speakers who originate from the Hausa states of northern Nigeria, the category includes other ethnic nationalities (e.g. Fulani, Nupe, Kanuri) who have adopted Hausa language and culture and have intermarried for generations.
The eruption seemed antithetical to the peaceful disposition associated with Jos. While surrounding states like Kaduna, Bauchi, Gombe and Kano boiled in violent unrest through the 1980s and 1990s, the Plateau State’s capital city was an oasis of calm, a safe haven where displaced persons sought refuge (Danfulani and Fwatshak 2002, 244). Peaceable relations among its diverse groups, along with scenic geography and a pleasant climate, even earned the city the epithet ‘Home of peace and tourism’. The sudden intense violence is one reason Jos presents an interesting case study. Most examples of urban conflict - Jerusalem and Belfast, among others – are protracted cases with long histories of religious or sectarian rivalry. Although Jos witnessed 1932’s ‘village revolts’, 1945’s ‘potato riots’ and 1966’s so-called ‘anti-Igbo pogroms’ these were of a different nature than what befell the city in the early 21st century (Higazi 2007, 2). Exploring why violence along religious lines had hitherto eluded Jos brings fresh insights into some of the issues precipitating its turn from relatively peaceful to violence-ridden city. Also, the case of Jos offers a unique frame through which to peer into the dynamics of conflict framing. Specifically, it presents an opportunity for scrutinizing how a conflict around indigeneity is framed in religious terms.

The bulk of research on what caused dissonance in Jos tends towards a constructivist perspective, explaining identities and groups in terms of constructs created and recreated as a means to achieve political-cum-economic ends (Egwu 2004; Best 2007; Ostien 2009; Krause 2011). Several analysts pinpoint the strife in the once peaceful city and elsewhere in Nigeria to an intersection of factors that reveal politics as essentially being a series of struggles between individuals and groups over economic advantage (Bunte and Vinson 2016; Osaghae and Suberu 2005). The manipulative and mobilizing role played by religion in the context of Nigeria’s hyper-religiosity is also an important consideration (see Vinson 2017; Mwadkwn 2001).

Insofar as historical, political, economic and religious frames provide crucial views on the Jos conflict, they do not account for what happened in 2001 in any specific sense. In other words, political, economic and religious factors fall
short of explaining how Nigerians rationalized and realized the murder of some 1,000 lifelong neighbours. Contestations around political positions — with ensuing economic implications between political heavyweights who double as ethnic champions — are almost synonymous with politics in Nigeria and the rest of Africa (Collier and Vicente 2014). The trend is too constant to explain the irregularity of ethnic violence. From Sokoto in Nigeria’s far north to Bayelsa in the farthest south, ethnic diversity and political and resource-based rivalry bestride the entire country. Yet, violence of the scale under discussion prevails mainly in Plateau, Kaduna and, to a lesser extent, Taraba states.

This paper adds a spatial dimension to the puzzle. It shows how historical, political and economic factors as well as the socio-economic conditions of actors signposted in existing literature on Jos became interwoven. But beyond this, and perhaps more importantly, it scrutinizes the spatial characteristics of the city in terms of neighbourhoods and how the activities of ethnic and religious networks within them promoted a particular framing of the conflict that engendered territoriality and a renewed zeal for dominance. My aim is to illustrate how these processes led to the breakdown of order in 2001.

The remainder of the paper is organized into four sections. First, after a brief contextualization of urban conflict and some methodological considerations, I discuss the emergence of group concentration in Jos as the impetus for constructing categories and territories. Here, I adopt a constructivist view on the formalization of physical and symbolic boundaries in Jos. Second, I discuss indigeneity and creation of Jos North LGA as pivotal to the development of antagonistic relations between the categories. Third, I show how the activities of ethnic associations in segregated neighbourhoods are a fallout of the creation of Jos North LGA. I also illustrate how these activities catalyse group solidarity, territoriality and confrontational relations at the neighbourhood level. Fourth, I look at how patterns of violence during the events reflect dominance-ownership. Finally, I make concluding remarks on ethnic groups, conflict framing, territoriality and collective violence in urban contexts,
as well as suggest possible directions for further study.

**Contextualizing ethnic conflict and violence**

Adequately illustrating the argument of this paper means situating it within dominant debates on ethnic conflict in an urban context, two theoretical approaches of which are relevant for this paper. Post-Cold War literature on ethnic conflict falls into two main schools of thought, the primordialist and the constructivist, with their dividing line falling along conceptions of ethnicity. Primordialists interpret ethnicity in terms of native traditions, beliefs, kinship ties, common biological features and territory (Grosby 2005). Constructivists see ethnicity as a socially constructed phenomenon employed by political and opinion leaders to mobilize support for a range of causes (Hopf 1998; Cederman and Daase 2003). Reiterating the constructivist view, Chandra (2006) draws attention to how boundaries get reshaped and loyalties and group membership stay fluid.

Both analytical lenses are important for understanding remote and proximate causes of the Jos crisis. Discussing conflicts elsewhere in the world, Toft (2003) argues that a conflict’s violence level can be determined by the indivisibility of territory among groups who hold territories as integral to their identity. Territory tied to identity becomes symbolically indivisible and groups fight to death to protect it. While this theory sheds light on why the indigenes fatally fought to assert dominance, it falls short of explaining why the Hausa were also willing to battle to their own deaths for rule over the same jurisdiction.

Although the pursuit of power played out at different levels, everyday members of the conflicting groups found fighting against perceived enemies apt in one setting, in particular: the neighbourhood. The outburst that overwhelmed the city manifested in a series of attacks and counterattacks by residents whose goal was exclusive dominance in their neighbourhoods or, in some cases, to extend dominance to new frontiers. However, many riot participants admitted their actions were only defensive. Some residents of Tina Junction, for example, insisted they only went out to defend their neighbourhood from
incursion. Whatever the motivation for joining the unruly mobs who shot, stabbed, burned and pillaged, most people fought to prove, as one resident put it: ‘This is our territory, not yours’.15 Beyond the primordialist-constructivist debate, looking at ethnic and religious organizations and their activities within neighbourhoods uniquely offers a window into the undercurrents of conflict framing, territoriality and collective violence. And it does so in a way that merely analysing the popular narratives of groups does not.

Methodological considerations

For a more nuanced and context-sensitive analysis, I zoom in on micro- and meso-level group dynamics. Prevailing literature emphasizes intergroup relations in exploring the function of group geography in conflict. This paper instead draws attention to intragroup dynamics at the neighbourhood level and, in so doing, brings to bear salient factors seldom mentioned in large-grained analysis.

To develop the central argument, I use the notion of dominance-ownership, a concept I introduce to the discourse by way of this paper. I see this as an implicit assumption among many Jos residents that the group with greater numerical strength – and hence potential to dominate – ‘owns’ the neighbourhood. My interactions of over three years with their residents suggest that this thinking is endemic to the residents of the following Jos neighbourhoods: Angwan Rukuba, Angwan Rogo, Rikkos, Kabong, Apata, Jenta, Tina Junction, Yan Shanu, Angwan Rimi, Dogon Dutse and Dutse Uku. The normativeness of this mind-set is also corroborated by discussions with groups in LGAs surrounding the city of Jos including Barkin Ladi and Jos South, all settings for intermittent clashes in the last decade. Dominance-ownership supports the logic of territorialisation that is forwarded in this paper. It accounts for not only the seemingly sudden descent into violence, but also the pervasiveness with which it was unleashed and the patterns it adopted. Apart from discussing dominance-ownership as the chief motivation for residents

15 Interview with 37-year old resident of Filin Ball – Nasarawa Gwong, 8 December, 2010
engaging in ethnic cleansing at the neighbourhood level, I also discuss the key function of ethnic associations and religious organizations in forging group solidarity and influencing collective action locally.

The paper draws from various data sources. Several studies have been conducted on Jos, earlier from anthropological and historical perspectives, but most recently by political scientists and sociologists. I supplement insights from this rich body of literature with archival materials and newspaper sources. I also introduce primary data from dozens of interviews and discussions I conducted in Jos, mainly between 2011 and 2013. Though these interactions were for other projects I was working on at the time, I find the datasets relevant, especially in terms of group positions and personal accounts of how the indigenes and the Hausa populations experienced the violence within their neighbourhoods. Further informing my research were discussions that I observed at intergroup mediation sessions, conferences and peace advocacy visits to affected neighbourhoods, involving hundreds of indigenes and Hausa participants. These events were organized by the Centre for Conflict Management and Peace Studies at the University of Jos, NGOs, government agencies and other groups.

The emergence of group concentration and category construction

Colonial policy guided the establishment of Jos as a new, booming tin mining hub. City planning in parts of northern Nigeria was based on the colonial ‘sabon gari’ model where migrants where confined to a particular part of the city away from the indigenes. This was the practice in Kano and Zaria (Home 1983). Although the ‘sabon gari’ model was not replicated in Jos, similar patterns of sociospatial segregation were implemented, as will be explained later.

Even before the dawn of colonial rule in northern Nigeria in the second half of the 19th century, the indigenes had been in touch with Hausa traders from the far north. In a small local tin mining industry at the foot of the Jos hills, some 25

16 ‘Sabon gari’ is a Hausa term that means ‘new town’. The colonial administration created so-called ‘new towns’—settlements for migrants away from indigenes— all over northern Nigeria.
kilometres north of the city centre, Hausa traders served as intermediaries between the indigenous miners and merchants from North Africa (Morrison 1977, 207; Freund 1982, 72). At the time, the jihadist forces of Usman dan Fodio, comprising Fulani and converted Hausa men, tried to invade Jos Plateau. In one of these attempts, combined indigenous forces retaliated heavily, causing major fatalities among the jihadists in the second half of the 19th century (Freund 1982). However, by 1905, diverse groups, including Hausa, Nupe, Kanuri and others from the provinces of Northern Nigeria came up the Jos Plateau at the behest of the British colonial administration, as labourers for the new Royal Niger Company (Morrison 1977).

Perhaps the most enduring effect tin mining had on the Jos Plateau, however, was demographic. Following the establishment of a tin mining industry, the Hausa, Kanuri, Nupe and several other groups from different parts of Northern Nigeria rushed to Jos for jobs, becoming the main workforce in the mining industry (Hodder 1959; Morrison 1977). Not all the migrants worked directly in the mines, many engaged in other economic activities. Because Hausa language was the main mode of communication among members of these diverse groups and they mostly shared the same religion - Islam, they were labelled Hausa. Following the introduction of the poll tax in 1907 (see Berger 2009), the indigenes joined the Hausa and other groups in the mines, albeit only seasonally since they still preferred subsisting on farming. Construction of the Bauchi Light Railway in 1914 and the Kafachan-Jos line in 1927 provided a direct link to the south, thus precipitating migrations from other parts of the country. For an idea of the scale of migrations into Jos at the time: the census conducted by the colonial administration in 1952 categorized 44 per cent of the total population of Jos as ‘strangers’ – the colonial administration’s label for migrants (Hodder 1959; Ostien 2012).

Colonial policy on residential units in Nigerian townships, especially in the north, sanctioned clear group boundaries (Fourchard 2009). Based on this residential pattern, Jos was divided into two major sections: Jos Township and Jos Native Town. The township was further split: one part for Europeans and the other for skilled migrants from Asia and other African countries. Jos Native Town
was mainly for migrants from elsewhere in Nigeria. This is where Hausa, Yorubas, Igbos, Edo and other ethnic nationalities from outside Jos Plateau resided. What could be considered as a third section consists of the surrounding rural areas where the indigenes resided in their ancestral villages (Plotnicov 1971; Higazi 2007). Residence permits were issued to persons considered suitable to the township. Local authorities were mandated to evict from the township, after a three-day notice, anyone belonging to the indigenous community who could not show evidence of being engaged in a positive venture (Plotnicov 1971).

The segregated residential pattern formalized by the colonial administration had a number of effects. First, it reified ethnic boundaries by adding a sociospatial dimension. This, according to some scholars (Bhavnani et al. 2014; Weidmann and Salehyan 2013; Boal 2005), means creating a sociospatial wedge that hinders prospects for cooperation and serves to reinforce mutual exclusivity. Second, it birthed parallel societies, which necessitated the construction of institutions that soon proved conflictive and transmuted into antagonisms for the future. Third, it set the tone for future discrimination between settler and indigene categories, which is the subject of the next section.

**The politics of indigeneity**

Contestion over who is and who is not an ‘indigene’ is common in Nigeria (see Ehrhardt 2017). Apart from being a citizen, every Nigerian is supposed to register as a certified member of a specific patrilocal community. Indigene certificates are issued by LGA authorities to differentiate between the indigenes also referred to as ‘sons of the soil’ – and the migrants or settlers (Fourchard 2015). Although the practice has its roots in colonial policy, identification has assumed more importance in post-colonial Nigeria. Now a criterion for accessing certain socio-economic rights and privileges, the indigene certificate lets individuals benefit from scholarships, school admissions, employment quotas and tenured positions as heads of government ministries and agencies (HRW 2001; Ostien 2009). Individuals and groups resident in a state other than their states of indigeneity are considered settlers, thereby lacking such rights and
privileges and often being subjected to other forms of everyday discrimination.

In Nigeria, different groups define indigeneity in frequently contradictory terms (Fourchard 2015). Some interpret its basis as an autochthonous or very old connection to an ancestral land. Others do not see it in that strict sense, believing indigeneity is an ascription earned by groups who are long settled in any part of the country and active in its development (Ostien 2009). This clash of views has sparked endless debates, notably in ethnically heterogeneous spaces like Jos.

Hausa populations argue that they are indigenes of Jos North by virtue of their long stay and contribution to its growth. Since establishment of the tin mining industry on the Jos Plateau a century ago, they have inhabited certain neighbourhoods. To them, ownership of these areas is beyond contention since even the colonial administration labelled them Hausa settlements and they were successively headed by Hausa chiefs. Based on the predominance of Hausa in these neighbourhoods located in old Hausa settlements, some Hausa representatives contend that when their ancestors came from Hausa land, much of what is Jos today was unoccupied territory. By this, they argue, they are the city’s rightful owners (Best 2007).

The debates about who is and who is not an indigene are common all over Nigeria, but they have not translated into large-scale destruction in most cases. It thus appears that the indigene-settler contentions of Jos could not have resulted in clashes without an overlapping variable. In the next section, I posit that the 1991 creation of Jos North LGA and the embargo placed on the issuing of indigene certificates to members of the Hausa community in 1999 are crucial landmarks in the transition from calm to chaos.

Creating Jos North LGA and the territorialisation of neighbourhoods

The creation of Jos North LGA added a strong territorial dimension to the indigene-settler conflict in Jos. As this subsection will show, it consolidated the dominance-ownership notion across the city’s neighbourhoods. Between 1985 and 1991, Nigeria’s General Ibrahim Babangida-led government created 11 new states and
297 LGAs across the federation. One of the newly created LGAs was Jos North. Carved from the former Jos LGA, the new LGA covered 291 square kilometres, including the central city of Jos where the former Jos LGA headquarters, the ultramodern Main Market, the University of Jos and other infrastructural hallmarks were all located. Apart from being the official capital city, it was considered Plateau State’s economic nerve centre.

Jos North LGA was created amidst controversy. The Justice Bola Ajibola Commission of Inquiry investigating civil disturbances in Jos documents the contentious correspondence that transpired prior to its establishment. First, a group of indigenes known as the Berom Elders Council wrote to General Babangida, then serving as Nigeria’s head of state. Their letter requested the creation of a Jos Metropolitan LGA from Jos LGA and recommended that the new LGA cover the central city of Jos, Vwang, Kuru, Du, Gyel and Gwong, all districts in Jos LGA. The areas and boundaries suggested for the new Jos Metropolitan LGA were no different from the old Jos LGA. This seems to have been part of the indigenes’ spatial politics for maintaining their status quo. The Hausa community also wrote a letter requesting the creation of a new LGA, specifically a Jos North LGA that would mainly comprise the city centre of Jos. On 30 September 1991, the Babangida administration announced the formal creation of Jos North LGA, with boundaries exactly where the Hausa community had suggested.

The aggrieved Berom Elders Council pushed the administration to reconsider the boundaries, but their efforts yielded no meaningful response. The Du Elders Council complained that the newly created Jos North’s south-eastern boundary bisected Du district, leaving one half in Jos North and the other in Jos South. A general feeling among the indigenes was that the LGA was fashioned by Babangida, himself a Muslim, to favour the Hausa population in Jos and to further the political cause of the seemingly hegemonic Muslim north in Plateau State and the rest of the Middle Belt. Jos North’s creation crucially changed the demographic status of groups in the city. It had far-reaching implications for ownership claims, too. The Hausa arguably became the majority in Jos North. With politics being a game of numbers, the group
became a major contender to gain the LGA chair. The new boundaries rendered many indigenes, particularly Berom and some Afizere, the indigenes specifically of Jos South LGA. This curtailed their active participation in the politics of Jos North LGA and weakened their claims to the city.

Effects of the evolving demography did not take long to manifest. In the first election conducted in the LGA following its creation, a Hausa man, Sama’ila Mohammed, emerged as chairman of the local government council. The indigenes took this as justification of their fears and a major blow (Ostien 2009). From then on, they adopted a stiffer stance, fighting any government decision that appeared to favour the Hausa. They staunchly protested and successfully influenced the reversal of two appointments that favoured members of the Hausa community in 1994 and 1998 (HRW 2001). In both cases, the protests elicited Hausa counter-protests, which turned into low-scale violence (Best 2007). These initial fracas were, at best, skirmishes that resulted in few deaths and limited property destruction. Nevertheless, boundaries between indigene-dominated and Hausa-dominated neighbourhoods began to sharpen and take on new meaning. For instance, a Muslim resident told me that in the 1980s and early 1990s, he was not so conscious of the boundary between his neighbourhood and Christian-dominated neighbourhoods. Jos North LGA’s creation marked the dawn of territorialisation, characterized by an acute awareness of which group is in charge and, by implication, ‘owns’ the neighbourhood.17 Different factors contributed to the entrenching of the dominance-ownership notion but, as the next section shows, the neighbourhoods’ ethnic associations, religious organizations and other coalitions were paramount.

Some eight years after the creation of Jos North LGA came another important development. The country’s return to democratic governance in 1999 suddenly resurrected many latent issues. In Plateau State, the controversy around indigene certificates had never disappeared, but during military rule, the mostly Muslim governors of Plateau State had prevailed on successive chairmen of Jos North to issue them to Hausa community members (Ostien

17 Interview with 49-year-old resident of Rikkos neighbourhood, Jos, 8 December 2011.
2009). However, this issuance came to a halt with the swearing-in of Plateau State governor Joshua Dariye, a Christian Mushere from Bokkos LGA, and Jos North chairman Frank Bagudu Tardy, a Christian Anaguta indigene, now late. This move implied the exclusion of Hausa from the rights and privileges that came with being a certified indigene. The embargo on certificates remains a major source of frustration among the Hausa. Moreover, it significantly contributed to the tension that followed appointing a Hausa as coordinator for the Jos North LGA branch of the National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) a few months before violence engulfed the city (CJCDA 2013).

**Ethnic associations, religious organizations and segregated neighbourhoods**

Ethnic associations, religious organizations and other coalitions and networks all contributed to the territorialisation of Jos’ neighbourhoods. Before delving into how these mechanisms played out in Jos, it is useful to note that organizations have historically used territory as a strategy for asserting control over resources and people (Sack 1983). In Jos, and elsewhere, ethnicity is an organizing principle for territoriality and mobilizing for conflict. When there is insufficient institutional capacity to regulate competing ethnic groups or urban managers prioritize particularistic interests, the activities of these ethnic associations can often deteriorate into violent confrontations. First, most ethnic and religious organizations in Jos locate their secretariats in neighbourhoods predominated by their members. This has several implications. The strategic siting of operational bases sends a strong psychological message promoting group solidarity. It creates a feeling of homogeneity that pervades interactions at the neighbourhood level and shapes relations within and across sociospatial boundaries.

In addition, communicating between ethnic associations and co-ethnics is cost-effective when organizations have a strong neighbourhood base in the form of an office. Unhindered, frequent interaction can pass between the association and residents. For example, the Jasawa Development Association (JDA) is a powerful mobilizer for Hausa populations along Bauchi Road and
other adjacent neighbourhoods around Abba na Shehu electoral ward, where its secretariat is located in the centre of one of the largest conglomerations of Hausa neighbourhoods in Jos. Similarly, the secretariat of the Jama’atu Nasril Islam (JNI) sits in a Hausa enclave, facilitating communication with the majority Hausa residents. The office of Jamma’ati Izalatil Bid’ah Wa’iqamatis Sunna (JIBWIS) is also situated in a part of Dogon Karfe neighbourhood with high concentrations of Hausa populations and where Hausa gather for activities.

Various ethnic associations representing indigenes are equally active at the neighbourhood level. For instance, the Afizere Cultural and Community Development Association (ACDA) is a large umbrella organization for all members of the Afizere ethnic group. Fond of hosting well-attended festivals, ACDA has under its wings various small associations, including youth and women’s groups. Its secretariat is located in Lamingo, a large settlement dominated by the Afizere. Another ethnic association is the Berom Education and Cultural Organisation (BECO). With headquarters at the palace of the Gbong Gwom, BECO is an effective rallying point for Berom indigenes. BECO also hosts festivities for raising Berom socio-cultural consciousness.

How these organizations influence collective action can be understood through Olzak’s (1983, 356) conception of ethnic solidarity as ‘the conscious identification with a given ethnic population’ coupled with ‘maintenance of strong ethnic interaction networks and institutions that socialize new members and reinforce social ties’. In this context, the construction and reification of group identities and boundaries is facilitated through close, frequent interaction between ethnic associations and the co-ethnics they represent.

The years following Jos North LGA’s creation witnessed an upsurge in activities by ethnic and religious organizations at the neighbourhood level, including meetings, socio-cultural festivities and awareness-raising via literature distribution and rallies. To say these groups were comatose prior to this would be inaccurate. BECO, for instance, was active long before 1991. However, the new LGA and the socio-political developments it spurred swelled these organizations’ activities. The question of identity vis-à-vis indigeneity took centre stage and group relations became increasingly tense, culminating in

Through the years, groups, such as JDA, became active in mobilizing support for Hausa candidates at the polls. The effort paid off when one won the chairmanship elections in 1992. Hausa electoral success shook the indigenes. In response, associations like BECO, ACDA and ADA intensified mobilization along ethno-religious boundaries at different levels, especially the neighbourhood. What followed was a proliferation of associations and other coalitions that actually worked to build group solidarity by emphasizing ethnic differences in the city (Adetula 2005).

It is relevant to note, too, how tribal associations align their interests with those of religious organizations. For example, the JDA argues that its members are discriminated against not only because of their Hausa ethnicity, but because they are Muslim (CJCDA 2013). Similarly, while the Plateau Indigenous Development Association Network (PIDAN) accuses the JDA of turning an ethnic issue into a religious one (PIDAN 2010), members of indigene representation groups such as BECO, ACDA and ADA have labelled the violence in Jos as part of a jihad orchestrated by Muslims from northern Nigeria.18 This is how ethnic networks such as JDA and BECO could manage to become co-strugglers with religious bodies such as, respectively, JNI and CAN. Framing the conflict in religious terms is a highly effective strategy not only for its power to evoke intense emotion, but also because it gathers a huge support base. This framing has attracted both sympathy and animosity for the groups in Jos from well beyond the city and resulted in the violence spreading to other parts of Plateau State.

Several commissions of enquiry have noted how these organizations’ chauvinistic disposition was demonstrated in the impassioned correspondence that preceded the outbreak of violence in September 2001. The communications were both intragroup and intergroup. While co-ethnics were charged to stand up, fight for their rights and defend their territories, threats

18 Discussions with indigenes at several fora between 2012 and 2014.
were also launched across ethnic divides and neighbourhoods.¹⁹ The Justice Niki Tobi Commission of Inquiry accused some of these groups and their members of striking the match that set the city ablaze (PSG 2002).

Also crucial are neighbourhood organizations. These voluntary groups with diverse agendas, formed for the collective good of residents, meet periodically to discuss sanitation, security, weddings and burials involving any of their members. In segregated neighbourhoods, the associations serve as very strong mediums of group solidarity and mobilization. Discussions in different neighbourhoods, including Angwan Rukuba, Tina Junction and Yan Trailer, reveal that when the violence broke out, most of these neighbourhood-based associations suspended discussions on other issues to focus on their members’ security and safety. Instead of once-weekly meetings, some neighbourhoods held up to three gatherings a week to assess the situation and how to fortify defence against possible threats. Such meetings occurred in practically all neighbourhoods across the city.²⁰

A number of ad hoc arrangements such as neighbourhood security committees and elder fora became particularly visible at times of tension in the city. Members of these groups often comprised highly influential neighbourhood residents who were connected to or were themselves top officials with direct links to the government. Their connections could be used to campaign for the deployment of agents to secure the neighbourhood. These individuals might also deliver urgent updates on political aspects of a conflict and keep residents informed on new developments and government plans.

Such ad hoc committees are crucial in shaping how the neighbourhood sees and responds to a conflict. Since they have direct links or are themselves part of decision-making institutions, their opinions are generally respected. Inasmuch as they generally check the excesses of the youth, some group members might have political agendas that do not necessarily further the interest of peaceful coexistence. Muslim and Christian women and youth groups in Dadin

---

¹⁹ Discussions with indigenes and Hausa groups from different neighbourhoods at Dadin Kowa Youth Centre, Jos, 30 May 2012.
²⁰ Discussions in Rikkos and Tina Junction neighbourhoods, Jos, 8-9 December 2011.
Kowa, Angwan Rukuba and Rikkos denounced the role some elders played in persuading youth to participate in riots. Strong feelings pervaded that these elders only sought to achieve personal gains and were capable of fuelling violence if that was what their personal advancement required (see Obateru 2002).

The reverse holds true, too. Elders have transcended categorical constraints to form coalitions against violence. For instance, in neighbourhoods like Dadin Kowa and Rantya federal and state low-cost housing areas, elder fora worked across ethno-religious divides to talk youth groups and neighbourhood vigilantes out of violence (Krause 2017). These neighbourhoods are the few places that the intermittent brutality witnessed in Jos since 2001 has never penetrated. This shows the influence held by these ad hoc groups, but also illustrates how much of the Jos crisis cannot be dismissed as irresponsible acts by unemployed, idle youth, as some literature suggests (Abdullahi and Saka 2007).

**Dominance-ownership and patterns of violence**

The city of Jos exploded into violent clashes on the afternoon of 7 September 2001. But in the weeks leading up, as would become clear, a chief objective of the two fighting sides was to assert territorial dominance. This was crystallized when Mukhtar Mohammed, a Hausa, was appointed coordinator of the Jos North chapter of the National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP). Printed campaign materials by alleged representatives of both the Hausa and the indigenes claimed they owned the city and would prove it by physically eliminating the other group. The Justice Niki Tobi Commission of Inquiry on Civil Disturbances in Jos reported that this literature flooded the city some weeks before the outbreak of violence (PSG 2002) As already described in the explication of dominance-ownership, there is an implicit belief that the more territories a group dominates, the stronger its claim on ‘ownership’ of the city.

The violence was widespread. Slums and rundown neighbourhoods in

---

21 Discussions in Dadin Kowa, Rantya and federal and state low-cost housing neighbourhoods, 30-31 May 2012.
the city centre were worst hit (Krause 2011, 32). It is important to note that this is precisely the predicament of segregated and territorialised neighbourhoods, which trace their emergence to the colonial policy on residential patterns. At the northern fringe of the city around the University of Jos, stick-wielding students clashed with groups armed with guns and machetes from the Muslim-dominated neighbourhoods of Angwan Rogo and Angwan Rimi, allegedly trying to invade the university premises. Further, in Angwan Rogo, many Christians, including university students and staff, were killed and their property looted and destroyed. Some motorists caught in the crossfire along Bauchi Road were hacked and burnt in their vehicles (HRW 2001). At Congo-Russia junction, clashes resulted in several deaths, along with burnt vehicles, homes and worship centres. Deeper into the Muslim settlements of Gangare and Dilimi, Igbo motor parts dealers were caught in the whirlwind of violence. Mostly Christian, some lost their lives and others their shops to looters. There are, however, also tales of how Muslims helped some of the motor parts dealers to safety.22

While this transpired in Muslim-dominated parts of the city, killings and destruction of a similar scale happened where Christians formed the majority. One such scene was Angwan Rukuba neighbourhood, a slum north-east of the city. Many Muslims were killed in their homes and several others burnt in their vehicles. Farther south on Bauchi Ring Road, homes were sacked, their occupants stabbed or shot dead. Major clashes happened between residents of Dutse Uku and Tina Junction.

To the west of the city centre, Christian mobs, mostly of Igbo extraction, who were angered by rumours of attacks against their co-ethnics in Dilimi, were said to fight any Muslim in sight. Major clashes took place near Fatima Catholic Church, around Ali Kazaure, a relatively mixed neighbourhood, serving as a buffer between the largely Christian Apata and the Muslim-dominated Ali Kazaure. Just as in Hausa-dominated neighbourhoods, some Christians helped their Muslim neighbours to safety.23

Apart from ethnic cleansing, the use of religious inscriptions at strategic

---

22 Discussions with a group of former students from the University of Jos in Tina Junction, 5 August 2013.
23 Interview with 32-year-old resident of Rikkos, 8 December 2011.
points in the neighbourhood offered evidence that groups were motivated by a need to demonstrate ownership of territories. To this day, several handwritten signs announce ‘Sharia line’ on the major road that runs through Muslim-dominated neighbourhoods such as Angwan Rogo and Angwan Rimi. These signs declare them Muslim territory, out of bounds for non-Muslims. Similarly, inscriptions of ‘New Jerusalem’ are a common sight in neighbourhoods dominated by Christians (Trovalla, Adetula and Trovalla 2014, 67; Danfulani and Fwatshak 2002, 253).

Territorialisation was thus instrumental to the destruction that befell Jos. Where they constituted the majority, either group tried to chase away, if not kill, members of the minority ‘other’. Their intention was not only to assert dominance, but also to prove they were the city’s rightful owners. Last (2008, 6) notes the tendency for groups in Nigeria to use violence as a means for asserting dominance. Muslims were attacked and their properties looted and destroyed in areas dominated by the Christians such as Angwan Rukuba, Kabong and Apata. Similarly, Christians were attacked and their property destroyed in Muslim-dominated areas such as Angwan Rogo, Angwan Rimi, Rikkos and Ali Kazaure (HRW 2001).

Fragile peace has returned to Jos, thanks to the presence of a military taskforce and the activities of civilian peace building networks. However, the city is still reeling beneath the shock and unpleasant outcomes of large scale violence.24 Reports suggest a strong presence of armed networks and increased levels of crime, drug abuse and insecurity across the city’s neighbourhoods.25 Jos’ landscape is balkanised into ethnically homogenous strongholds interspersed by pockets of mixed areas characterized by ethnic differentiation, mutual suspicion and fear. Moreover, urban clashes in Jos have sparked riots and militia violence in the rural areas around Jos and southern Plateau (Higazi 2008, 2011). At the time of writing, Irigwe villages - four kilometres southwest of Jos –

---

were still mourning dozens of deaths from a new wave of militia attacks.²⁶

Conclusion

This paper illustrated how the quest to assert dominance at the neighbourhood level turned convivial neighbours into deadly enemies in Jos, the capital city of central Nigeria’s Plateau State. Using a multi-layered theoretical approach, I explained the emergence of group concentration, the construction of the discriminatory categories of indigene and settler and their meanings for group relations in an urban environment. Considered, too, was how the creation of Jos North LGA ignited renewed attachment to territories, especially in segregated neighbourhoods, and how this, along with the embargo on the issuance of indigene certificates to members of the Hausa community, spiralled into violence in September 2001. At the centre of all this, is the crucial role of ethnic associations and religious organisations.

While the indigenes invoked autochthonous and ancestral attachment to patrilocall villages to back their claims of ownership over Jos, the Hausa always argued their existing dominance in particular neighbourhoods to support ownership claims. Many members of both groups fought and died. Based on this, it appears, primordial attachment is not the only factor that can account for people fighting to death over territories, as prevailing literature on the subject suggests. As far as the Jos case is concerned, the Hausa, a migrant group with no primordial attachment to the city, has shown just as much zeal as the indigenes in fighting for dominance.

I conclude that more than primordial factors, constructed categories and the meaning ascribed to place – neighbourhoods in this context – underlie groups resorting to violence. By this logic, being an ‘indigene‘ is a mere status to be attained or a category to strive to be part of through a group’s control of decision-making institutions, such as the local government council of Jos North LGA. In turn, appropriate public support is needed to be elected or

appointed to these state institutions, which decide who is and who is not an ‘indigene’. That support must be mobilized at the neighbourhood level. It is thus apparent how segregated neighbourhoods in Jos, with their roots in a segregationist colonial policy on city planning, became the locale for conflict framing, mobilization, solidary-building and fighting out the perceived enemy.

These urban patches morphed into fields for engaging in combat, where dominance was equated with ownership, and ownership at the neighbourhood level was used to amplify the clamour for indigene status. This mechanism reiterates the dominance-ownership notion. Apart from motivation, segregated neighbourhoods also provide opportunity for ethnic associations, religious organizations and other configurations to mobilize support for, coordinate and engage in conflict. Spatial proximity offers cost-effective, unhindered communication channels between these associations and residents. They are exploited through various fora that emphasize ethnic cleavages and set the mood for conflict.

The primary goal of this paper was to draw attention to the complex, often contradictory assumptions of primordial and constructivist perspectives on ethnic conflict, especially around territory. There is scarce consensus on the specific function of group geography in ethnic conflict. Attempting to add value to this discourse, I zoomed in on the activities of ethnic associations and religious organizations at the neighbourhood level. Of notable consequence, the paper posited that in order to understand why groups settle for a particular identity category as the basis for mobilization, the groups’ internal dynamics must be uncovered and teased apart. In the Jos scenario, for example, religion easily becomes the mobilization tool of choice – favoured over a number of other options – because of its overarching nature and capacity to transcend a number of salient intragroup cleavages. The indigenes have internal political differences, but once gathered under the banner of religion, their scuffles tend to lose relevance and a seemingly united front across Berom, Afizere and Anaguta is forged. Similarly, the Hausa and the Fulani do not agree on some issues, but a religious framing of the conflict automatically places them on the same side. Furthermore, this paper holds that besides evoking emotion, religion offers the
opportunity to gather a wider support base than the confines of tribal boundaries would ever foresee.

The paper is far from conclusive. Instead, it aims to whet the appetite for more research, addressing the issues mostly in a broad sense. There is need for further study on how groups are constructed within spatial contexts, the meanings attached to these places and how the meanings in turn influence both intragroup and intergroup behaviour in the framework of group conflict. Specifically, there is need to understand more systematically the politics of ethnic networks in segregated and mixed neighbourhoods in divided cities like Jos. Viable inroads for exploring ethnic violence include a closer look at how neighbourhoods transform from mundane residential areas to sites of atrocious violence. In doing this, focus will be on the emergence and development of armed networks in different neighbourhood settings. In this spirit, a comparative study of intragroup dynamics represented in segregated neighbourhoods and their counterparts in mixed neighbourhoods would be invaluable.
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CHAPTER THREE

The Emergence and Development of Ethnic Strongholds and Frontiers of Collective Violence in Jos, Nigeria

Abstract
Contestations over indigene rights and political representation resulted in Christian-Muslim riots in the Nigerian city of Jos. Between 2001 and 2010, over 5,000 people were killed. This article complements existing literature on the spatial dimension of violence by focusing on how Jos’ neighborhoods transformed from everyday residential areas to spaces of ethnic differentiation and violence. The article draws from an ethnographic study to map the violence’s emergence and development in Angwan Rogo and Nasarawa Gwong. These neighborhoods represent, respectively, ethnic strongholds and frontiers, two kinds of socio-spatial settings conceptualized to help explain violence’s spread and patterns.

Keywords: ethnic conflict, urban conflict, neighborhood, city, Plateau State, Riots, Nigeria

*This chapter is based on an article that is currently under review.
Introduction

Jos sits on the edge of a tableland spread over 5,343 square miles at an average elevation of 4,000 feet above sea. The semi-temperate climate, scenic hilly ranges, and strategic location, in the center of Nigeria, make it a terminus for settlers and a tourist destination. Established by British colonialists in 1915, the city grew around a tin mining industry that attracted labor migrants and merchants from across the country. A century later, Jos remains one of Nigeria’s most diverse cities. Its 800,000 inhabitants belong to over fifty ethnolinguistic groups. Though no official statistic is recorded, the population is generally believed to be equal halves Christian and Muslim.

Between the late 1960s and 1990s, as ethnic conflict and religious extremism ravaged neighboring urban centers, including Bauchi, Kaduna, Gombe, and Kano, Jos ranked among Nigeria’s most peaceful cities. Over the last fifteen years, however, it gained notoriety as one of the country’s most violent. Episodic Christian-Muslim clashes in the metropolis and the outlying settlements claimed over 5,000 lives between 2001 and 2010.27 Boko Haram bombings and revenge attacks followed, persisting until 2015. Experts have analyzed the structural factors that led to the Jos crises (see Danfulani & Fwatshak 2002; Egwu 2004; Best 2007; Higazi 2007; Ostien 2009), highlighting contestations over indigene rights, political representation, and city ownership. Beyond structural causations, Jos scholars have sought to explain the factors shaping the spatial distribution of violence in the different outbreaks (Krause 2011, 2017; Bunte & Vinson 2016; Madueke 2014, 2015). This interest follows research trends for other violent cities including Belfast (Cunningham 2013; Mesev et al. 2009), Jerusalem (Bhavnani et al. 2014), Beirut (Bou Akar 2012), and Osh (Kutmanaliev 2015), while considerable work in this vein has been devoted to Indian cities (see Varshney 2001; Brass 2004; Wilkinson 2006; Berenschot 2011).

27 Actual number of deaths is unknown but conservative estimates range between 4,000 and 7,000 (see Higazi 2011:18; Krause 2011:12); In my mind, a reasonable estimate for deaths caused by violence within Jos and environs between 2001 and 2010 is 5,000.
The case of Jos has contributed meaningfully to local and global discussions about the intersection between spatiality and collective violence. Krause’s (2017) paired comparison of violent and nonviolent neighborhoods in Jos demonstrated that civilian networks are a key determinant of neighborhood violence, more so than demographic and structural factors. She observed how the neighborhood Dadin Kowa stayed non-violent thanks to individuals and social networks intervening to prevent youth from engaging in violence. While Krause emphasized civilian agency’s role in violence prevention, Bunte and Vinson (2016) illustrated how the presence or absence of power-sharing determined violence and non-violence across Jos North and Chikun districts. In so doing, they forwarded a convincing account of how the politics of exclusion works to cause violence. Studies have long cited poverty as a structural factor underpinning ethnic violence in Africa (Elbadawi & Sambanis 2000; Collier & Sambanis 2005) but how poverty and violence interact has been more elusive (Sambanis 2001). Explaining why Jos’ poorer neighborhoods are more susceptible to violence than wealthier, Scacco (2012) noted how residents of the former were forced to defend themselves and their families because the government did not provide their areas adequate security.

These studies have advanced our understanding of the spatial dimension of violence in Jos, but there remains much unearthing to do. At a disaggregated level, we still seek to understand how neighborhoods, once locales of peaceful coexistence and congeniality, turned into arenas of atrocities. We also need a systematic examination of how different types of neighborhood settings shaped patterns of violence and how the violence reshaped them.

Taking up these tasks, this article selects the neighborhoods of Angwan Rogo and Nasarawa Gwong for its case study. The analysis offers three major contributions to the field. First, by examining what Jos neighborhoods underwent, the study highlights transformational milestones that can be applied to understanding conflict in other cities struggling with similar security challenges. This insight is crucial for formulating and implementing violence prevention and peace-building. Second, in conceptualizing ethnic strongholds and frontiers, the article provides tools to make sense of the interaction between violence and its spatial context. Profiling the two distinct settings and how they differentially
contribute to violent outcomes produces practical tips for how authorities can respond to conflict with greater context sensitivity. Third, understanding what changes occurred in the two neighborhoods affords a general idea of what happened in other neighborhoods and helps explain why the violence rapidly spread across the city.

Divided into four sections, this article begins by chronicling factors underlying group relations and violent conflict in Jos and discussing political developments at national, state, and municipal levels that shaped neighborhood-level group dynamics. The second section then describes the study’s methods and data. The third traces how the aforementioned factors hastened Angwan Rogo’s transformation into an ethnic stronghold and Nasarawa Gwong’s into a frontier, and defines these two socio-spatial settings. The fourth details the 2001 riots of Jos, noting how the stronghold and the frontier shaped patterns of violence and how the violence, in turn, completed the settings’ transformations.

The progression of ethnic conflict and the spatial dimension of violence

Intergroup and intragroup dynamics at the neighborhood level were swayed by the same factors shaping the evolution of group relations in Jos. Relevant milestone include the politicization of ethnic identities in Nigeria during the 1980s, the creation of Jos North LGA in 1991, the low-scale violence of 1994, the country’s return to democratic government, the embargo on indigene certificates for the Hausa in 1999, and the violence of 2001. An outline of the events suffices for this article, though expert analyses exist (see Higazi 2011; Krause 2011; Ostien 2009; Best 2007; Egwu 2004).

Although politicization of ethnic identities in Nigeria has its origin in colonial rule, post-colonial events expedited the process. One definitive turning point was the 1986 implementation of IMF and World Bank structural adjustment program (SAP) following a recession triggered by fall in oil revenue. Intended to restructure consumption and production and to reduce dependence on crude oil and consumer goods imports, the SAP turned out to be counterproductive, plunging Nigeria into a major economic crisis (Anyanwu 1992:5). High unemployment followed due to cuts in government expenditure. Scholars have stressed the SAP’s negative effects not
only on the economy, but also on group relations (Ihonvbere & Ekekwe 1988; Beckman 1991; Adetula 1992; Osaghae 1995; Nnoli 1998; Mustapha 2000; Egwu 2004). The overlap of SAPs and conflict proliferation elsewhere in Africa is well documented (Williams 2004; Sesay & Ukeje 2009). In the wake of the SAP-precipitated austerity, Nigerians became discontent and the military government’s last flicker of legitimacy was extinguished (Jega 2000:36).

To relieve their plight, Nigerians looked beyond the state. A foremost source of succor was tribal and kinship ties (Egwu 1998, 2004:156). Growing ethnic consciousness coincided with rising ethnic associations (Osaghae 1995; Jega 2000; Egwu 2004). “Not only was there an upsurge in the membership of these associations,” stated Osaghae (1995:46), but also “there was a rapid expansion in their number, variety and purpose.” The government was generally hostile to signs of dissent; trying to curry favor with citizens, it therefore deployed a system of patronage, seeking influential religious and tribal associations to redeem its legitimacy (Jega 2000:20). In 1987, during an “ethnicization of politics” or a “ politicization of ethnicity” (Egwu 2004:32), the Jasawa Development Association (JDA) was born. Representing the Hausa population in Jos, this organization was a protagonist in the indigene-settler conflict that would ensue.

Meanwhile, several developments hastened transformation of Jos’ already politicizing residential areas into militarized ethnic strongholds and frontiers. The first was creation of Jos North LGA. Nigeria has 774 administrative units known as LGAs. Jos North LGA is the economic capital of Plateau State and was carved out of the old Jos LGA in 1991 amidst contestations between the indigenes and the Hausa. Experts have theorized how the new LGA intensified contestations over city ownership and added a territorial dimension to the issue (Best 2007; Ostien 2009; Higazi 2011; Krause 2011; Milligan 2013). In a climate of long-standing indigene resentment about the creation of Jos North, the city experienced its first wave of violent riots since the Igbo pogroms of 1966. Protests and counter-protests erupted after, in April 1994, Plateau State military governor Mohammed Mana appointed Aminu Mato, a Hausa, as chairman of the management committee of Jos North LGA.
Other events helped spur deterioration of relations. One was a return to democracy after military rule—1999’s electoral campaigns were particularly acrimonious. More consequential, though, was the newly elected chairman’s embargo on indigene certificates for the Hausa community (Ostien 2009). Issued by LGA authorities to differentiate between indigenes and migrants or settlers, the certificate lets individuals qualify for scholarships, school admissions, employment quotas, and tenured positions as heads of government ministries and agencies. The indigene certificate has been an infamous source of discrimination and conflict in Jos and elsewhere in Nigeria (Abdullahi & Saka 2007; Sayne 2012; Fourchard 2015; Ehrhardt 2017). Denying the Hausa indigene certificates directly contributed to the fracas culminating in large-scale violence two years later, though the last straw was the July 2001 appointment of a Hausa to serve as coordinator for a federal government poverty alleviation scheme for Jos North. His appointment resulted in acrimonious exchanges between indigenes and Hausa and that September, riots erupted.

**Research Methods and Data**

This study is based on fieldwork conducted in Jos between 2015 and 2017. Because, as Brass (2004:4839) stated, “quantitative, statistical analyses cannot demonstrate the existence of a dynamic process,” I pursued an ethnographic approach that could capture processes at a disaggregated level. Data sources include interviews, primary school common entrance registers, and election results, alongside informal discussions I held in neighborhoods, motor parks, and other public places. This ethnography marks the first time primary school registers were used to systematically approximate Jos neighborhoods’ ethnic composition and how it changed during the study period.

**Interviews and Discussions**

The article draws from forty-seven interviews. Respondents included local politicians, neighborhood leaders, representatives of ethnic associations (tribal and religious), youth leaders, taxi and bus drivers, eyewitnesses, survivors of violence,
and residents of the two neighborhoods as well as of the adjoining areas; eighteen interviews took place in Angwan Rogo, fifteen in Nasarawa Gwong, and fourteen in adjacent settlements. I sampled informants through an innovative search system that combined elements of snowballing and purposeful sampling. Since my primary goal was to examine the trajectory of transformation that goes back about a decade, length of residence and keen understanding of the dynamics of associational life, politics, and violence in the neighborhoods were crucial considerations in the sampling process. All the people interviewed experienced the violence of 2001 firsthand and many were either perpetrators or victims of violence.

The interviews focused on the various aforementioned events that took place between the 1990s and the early 2000s. Thematic analysis was used to distil interviews and archival material. For each event, responses to the four questions were coded into four categories. The first category sought to capture how negatively or positively groups experienced the event. The second noted positive or negative effects on intergroup relations, including whether the event had a polarizing effect or some other influence and any impact on intragroup dynamics (e.g. if groups become more cohesive). The third category detailed the event’s implications for social networks’ dynamics, form, operations, and activities; also considered were implications for social groups such as residents’ associations, vigilantes, and campaign teams. Finally, the fourth category documented the event’s effects on ethnic composition, particularly whether segregation levels in a neighborhood rose. For the discussion concerning 2001, violence patterns and levels in the neighborhood were noted (e.g. if violence took the form of pogroms, clashes, or sporadic isolated incidents). After organizing interview responses into coherent themes based on the negative or positive effect an event had on group relations, I ordered them chronologically and re-contextualized them into a coherent story. The interviews were analyzed in a manner that directly addresses this article’s central concern: to empirically demonstrate the changes neighborhoods underwent in the lead-up to large-scale violence. The approach seeks to reveal each event’s effect on intragroup and intergroup dynamics. Moreover, it aims to understand how group relations degenerated to the point that
residents who co-existed peacefully for many years rationalized picking up arms and attacking each other.

**Primary School Common Entrance Registers**

Because the Nigerian census does not include ethnic categories, I used public primary school composition as a proxy for the ethnic composition of the neighborhood in which the school is located. I took the graduating class as a representative sample of the school since these pupils all sit for the common entrance examination. I analyzed registers for the classes of 1990, 1995, 2000, and 2005, seeking any remarkable patterns in the buildup to the 2001 violence and afterwards. I began by categorizing the pupils as “Muslim” or “Christian;” in Jos and much of Nigeria, names are usually an accurate reflection of individuals’ religions.

**Election Results**

The 2015 general elections provided a general idea of variations in voting patterns in ethnic strongholds and frontiers. I used the 2015 presidential election since records for elections in 1999 and 2008 were either inaccessible or unavailable; LGA elections, moreover, were not held in Jos North after 1999 and until 2008.

The datasets had inevitable biases and limitations. An ethnic group might have been overrepresented or underrepresented in a school or a class by chance or for various other reasons. In interviews, respondents might have twisted events to suit their own narratives and memories of some occurrences, from several decades back, might have been fuzzy. And, as mentioned, most elections results proved inaccessible. To address these concerns, I conducted a robust “ground truthing” process that involved visits to the neighborhoods, close observation, and discussions with a cross-section of residents. Additionally, I assessed the veracity of seemingly outrageous claims by triangulating different sources of data.

**The Evolution of an Ethnic Stronghold**

To explain an ordinary residential area’s transformation into an ethnic stronghold, I begin with a description of this type of socio-spatial setting. At its basic level, a
stronghold is a segregated settlement where one ethnic group predominates and controls the prevailing way of life. A Muslim stronghold, for example, has a visible presence of mosques, Koranic schools, and other Islamic institutions, while Christian institutions are few or nonexistent. The ethnic stronghold may be surrounded by areas of similar ethnic composition, though at least part of its boundary is shared with an ethnically mixed area, which, in turn, shares a boundary with a stronghold that rivals the ethnic stronghold. The ethnic segregation in the stronghold masks other peculiarities, such as high level of ethnic solidarity that becomes manifested in collective behavior such as voting for the same political party or candidate (Olzak 1983:357).

The stronghold helps conceptualize how identities are constructed and reconstructed (Nagel 1994) within a spatialized emergent subculture. Olzak (1983:356) explains the type of solidarity in the stronghold as “the conscious identification with a given ethnic population” that “includes the maintenance of strong ethnic interaction networks and institutions that socialize new members and reinforce social ties.” Mobilizing co-ethnics for collective violence is more feasible in a stronghold setting (Fearon 2006), which breeds opportunity for cost-free intragroup communication (Weidmann 2009). Mobilizing residents into mobs is easier in the safety of segregated areas where “contentious claim making gains protection from routine surveillance and repression because of terrain, built environment” (Tilly 2000:144).

But segregation and solidarity are not the only elements. A stronghold is characterized by the presence of politicized and militarized social networks comprising local politicians, self-proclaimed ethnic activists, gangs, thugs, and ordinary residents. These actors play complementary roles, crucial for accomplishing collective goals, though they are also driven as individuals with personal objectives, such as securing money, jobs, and favors. Within the networks are social subsystems analogous to riots systems (Brass 2004) and patronage networks (Berenschot 2011) that fuel and sustain violence. They are characterized by “complex webs of exchange, obligation, and reciprocity… sustained over a long period of time” (Kitschelt & Wilkinson 2007:19). For local criminals, gaining local politicians’ patronage may motivate riots, though the chaos also provides
opportunities to loot and get away with crime. Looting has long been recognized as a key activity in the dynamics of ethnic riots (Mac Ginty 2004; Dynes & Quarantelli 1968).

These characteristics apply to the Muslim stronghold of Angwan Rogo, a poor neighborhood north of Jos’ city center. After the 2001 violence, the settlement’s population became homogenously Muslim (see table 3.1), with over 100 mosques and Koranic schools (a figure counting the many garages and verandas used for praying and teaching); the only two churches that once stood were both destroyed in the violence.

Table 3.1: Ethnic composition of Angwan Rogo, 2000-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</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>1990</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Angwan Rogo’s demographics mean that its civic structures and all social networks, both formal and informal, are comprised entirely of co-ethnics. Residents’ associations and vigilante groups are intra-ethnic—not a single network member is non-Muslim.28 Consequently, voting patterns reflect strong ethnic allegiance (see table 3.2). Political “black sheep” are discriminated against or harassed, as illustrated in the 2015 elections, when arsonists set fire to the house of PDP chieftain Adams Alkali, a resident of the APC-dominated29 Angwan Rogo.30

28 Visits and discussions with residents of Angwan Rogo, February 2016.
29 The All Nigeria Peoples Party (ANPP) merged with two other political parties in 2013 to form the Action People’s Congress (APC), which is heavily supported by Muslims in Jos and northern Nigeria. It won the 2015 general election against the ruling People’s Democratic Party (PDP).
The arsonists were part of the violent network that helps the neighborhood self-maintain as a stronghold.

Table 3.2: Ethnic composition and voting patterns in Angwan Rogo and nearby settlement of Ali Kazaure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood/polling unit</th>
<th>Predominant group</th>
<th>Number of votes</th>
<th>Number of APC votes</th>
<th>Percentage of APC votes</th>
<th>Number of PDP votes</th>
<th>Percentage of PDP votes</th>
<th>Percentage of other party votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angwan Rogo I</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angwan Rogo II</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali Kazaure I</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali Kazaure II</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Violent networks present more than a security challenge for the neighborhoods in which they are embedded. They also pose a major threat to adjoining neighborhoods, especially when ethnically mixed. During all major episodes of violence in Jos, armed mobs from Angwan Rogo marched into the nearby ethnically mixed area to fight against Christian groups from there and from the adjoining Christian strongholds. Because of this and despite no major incidents of violence within Angwan Rogo since 2001—there are simply no Christians to fight within—the neighborhood is still a notorious trouble spot. Along with a few other neighborhoods in the city center, it is an area frequently featured in media and official reports of riots in the city.

But Angwan Rogo was not always an ethnic stronghold. Although Muslims seem to have long dominated the settlement, Christians comprised up to 34 percent of the population in 1995 and 25 percent before the 2001 violence, as indicated in table 3.3. Regardless of its precise ethnic composition, Christians and
Muslims once peacefully coexisted, as many residents affirmed. An elderly former resident, now living in Furaka, contrasted the congeniality of the 1970s and 1980s to the present-day discord.

I remember how we used to celebrate Christmas there. Muslims would come to our house and eat whatever we had to offer. During their Salah [Muslim festivity], we would visit them and also eat with them... That is how it was, but something really went wrong and here we are. Today the situation is very different. I can’t feel safe there and they can’t feel safe here.31

So what changed? Between 1990 and 2000, Angwan Rogo’s ethnic composition transformed. Muslims grew from 64 to 75 percent, while Christians dropped from 33 to 25 percent. Everyday migrations may account for some changes, though three major events could well have spurred the demographic shift.

First, Jos experienced waves of in-migration as people fled the firestorm of violence engulfing parts of northern Nigeria in the 1980s and 1990s. Riots sparked by the Maitatsine fundamentalist group led to thousands of deaths and many more displacements in Kano, Adamawa, Gombe, and elsewhere. Christian-Muslim clashes in Kaduna in the late 1980s devastated communities and displaced thousands, some of whom sought refuge in the slum areas of Jos such as Angwan Rogo (Nyam & Ayuba 2016). It is also possible that—as personal discussions and one source suggest—some Maitatsine extremists settled in Angwan Rogo during military actions against them in northern Nigeria.32 These fugitives could have propagated their ideology of violent extremism among some residents of the neighborhood.

Second, once Jos North was created in 1991, the Hausa felt the new LGA belonged to them. Its emergence was mainly the result of lobbying by the JDA on behalf of the Hausa community. Once created, many Hausa who had no indigene status where they lived relocated to the new LGA, imagining they could easily gain status there. Many came from other parts of the metropolis, such as Bukuru;33 others came all the way from Bauchi. Once in Jos, these newcomers found Angwan Rogo a convenient place to settle down because of pre-existing social ties

31 Interview with former resident of Angwan Rogo, 12 March, 2017
32 Interview with security officer, May 1, 2012.
33 Discussions with pickup driver in Bukuru, May 18, 2017.
and cultural and linguistic affinity. Another event that affected the demography of Angwan Rogo was the low-level violence in parts of Jos in 1994. Four Muslim individuals were killed in these riots. The fact that all four killed were Muslims was a source of major grievance. Of the 104 people arrested in connection to the violence, twenty-one were Christian and eighty-three were Muslim. The disparity in number of arrests was also a source of frustration for many Muslims. A former Gada Biyu resident told me that a number of Muslims relocated from the area to seek safety in neighborhoods, such as Angwan Rogo, where their co-ethnics were in the majority.

Alongside the shifting Christian-Muslim ratios, social network dynamics were being shaken up. The ethnicization of neighborhood-based social networks in Angwan Rogo provides a salient example. Before the new LGA, residents’ association had no concrete religious or ethnic links. After its creation, however, the JDA found new prestige among residents of Angwan Rogo because it fulfilled Hausa wishes for Jos North. As a local politician noted of the JDA, “its role in the creation of the new LGA made the people have confidence in it.” The organization thus earned greater credibility and control over neighborhood-based civic structures in areas with a Hausa majority. In Angwan Rogo, prominent JDA members took lead roles in the residents’ association and, in turn, neighborhood association leaders became more involved in the JDA. This marked an important stage in the ethnicization of the residents’ association and, in time, vigilante groups. Furthermore, it all fit within the broader politicization of ethnic identities and associations, catalyzed by the SAP along with other factors at the national level.

Although the 1994 violence was low-level and Angwan Rogo remained nonviolent, it marked a crucial formative stage in the neighborhood’s militarization. It was the first time that some residents organized themselves into aggressive mobs on the basis of ethnic identity within Angwan Rogo. Brass (2004) noted how, in the Indian city of Meerut, violent riots in 1961 brought about the development of

34 Discussions at Bauchi Road Motorpark near Angwan Rogo, May 19, 2017.
35 Interview with resident of Angwan Rogo, 13 February, 2017
36 Interview with resident of Angwan Rogo, 12 March, 2017
37 Interview with former resident of Kabong, February 18, 2017.
38 Interview with resident, May 17, 2017.
39 Interview with local politician, May 18, 2017.
“riot systems,”—violent networks enabling large-scale violence—decades later, in 1982. In Jos, the 1994 violence similarly readied the ground for the horrendous acts of 2001. Several informants, including former residents, recalled that although Angwan Rogo was technically violence-free during the fighting, tension was palpable and almost led to physical confrontations in some instances when dozens of young men mobbed around and threatened Christians. A former resident looked back on 1994’s implications for future group relations in the neighborhood.

It was simply because of God’s grace that there was no fighting in the area. The young people were moving around in groups angrily as if ready to attack. Fortunately, some older residents called some of the young men and cautioned them against engaging in violence... violence did not happen, but I can tell you some of us knew that it was only a matter of time. You can say that was the time that an army for future fighting really started building up.40

Nigeria’s return to a democratic system in 1999 heralded another phase in the evolution of Angwan Rogo. Research on the Banyamulenge of South Kivu in the DRC has demonstrated how clamor for political participation in Africa’s new democracies not only ossifies ethnic boundaries, but also facilitates “the shift to massive violence as an enticing strategy of control and resistance” (Vlassenroot 2002:499). Campaign rhetoric in Jos was strongly framed in ethnic terms. The PDP ran with the narrative that the ANPP was a political instrument for the takeover and Islamization of Jos by the Muslim Hausa. Christians bought into it, and soon churches provided platforms to campaign against an imminent “Islamic takeover” and for support of PDP candidates at various levels. In turn, ANPP stalwarts in Jos embraced a narrative of victimhood, saying that Muslims (and not just the Hausa) in Jos have been marginalized by Christians, who have monopolized positions of power and distributable resources.41 The reversal of Mato’s appointment and the resultant riots in which all four people killed were Muslims were commonly cited pieces of evidence to support the narrative. Muslim clerics championed the narrative and, analogous to what the churches were for the PDP, mosques were for the ANPP.42 Krause (2011:30) observed that “both politicians and religious

40 Interview with former resident, April 14, 2016.
41 Interview with politician in Jos, April 21, 2017.
42 Interview with politician in Jos, March 17, 2017.
leaders” urged “their followers to vote along religious lines.” A respected religious leader, speaking before the 2015 elections, echoed the mood of Angwan Rogo back in 1999.

By the grace of Allah, Jos North cannot be rigged. Come to think of it, was there an election somewhere that was won and not announced? When it became apparent that we had won and they had to announce, did they not cancel the elections? For your information, this upcoming election cannot be cancelled and by force we shall win, Allah willing. Look, we are Muslims, over eighty percent of the people of Jos North are Muslims. We are not Christians. Do you think we shall vote a Christian to lead us in Jos North?43

Expressing solidarity with their co-ethnics around the city, Angwan Rogo residents did not leave onlookers to doubt which political party they supported. Several neighborhood-level party offices were located there, and they, along with many other buildings, were painted in ANPP official colors and flaunted the party logo. Almost four years after the ANPP merged with two other parties to form the APC, its green, white, and blue still showed on some walls in Angwan Rogo. But more than the aggressive campaigns that preceded the 1999 elections, an embargo on issuing indigene certificates to Hausa is what worsened Christian-Muslim relations and further polarized social networks in Angwan Rogo.44 Discussions suggest this development was particularly hurtful to the Muslim residents.45 Having lost the elections and being denied indigene certificates, the Hausa turned to what they were left with—their neighborhoods46—and feared these too could be taken away. Further exacerbating these fears, rumors that the Plateau State government was planning to relocate residents of Angwan Rogo started gaining traction.47

44 The indigene certificate is issued by LGA authorities to differentiate between indigenes and the migrants or settlers. It lets individuals benefit from scholarships, school admissions, employment quotas and tenured positions as heads of government ministries and agencies.
45 Discussions with residents, May 18, 2016.
46 Interview with NGO representative, July 13, 2012.
47 At this point in time, this was a rumor lacking government substantiation. The rumor later proved to have some truth when Jonah Jang, who assumed office as governor of Plateau State in 2007, initiated plans to implement the Jos Master Plan, an urban renewal project that sought to remove and relocated some sections of the city’s populations.
The Making of the Frontier

When popularized by Kotek (1999:228), the notion of the frontier was identified as something foremost located “on fault-lines between ethnic, religious or ideological wholes.” Second, it is a disputed area characterized by contestations and struggles for political control between rival groups. Third, it symbolizes greater conflicts, being “emblematic of larger disputed areas or zones” (Kotek 1999:231). Struggle for control in the frontier is thus not restricted to residents within the socio-spatial setting, but also involves actors from adjoining areas. For this study, I define the frontier as an ethnically mixed neighborhood between two rivaling segregated neighborhoods. Determining the dominant group is difficult, on paper anyway, because the two ethnic identities are proportionally represented. Jos’ frontiers have a presence of both Christian and Muslim institutions. The frontier is analogous to a contested boundary wherein the presence of the rival group is perceived as a threat (Legewie & Schaeffer 2016). This resonates with Jarman and O’Halloran’s (2001) “buffer interface,” used to argue that in Belfast’s contested landscape, ethnically mixed areas located between segregated settlements experience more violence than homogenous neighborhoods divided by sharp boundaries.

The frontier of Nasarawa Gwong has three elemental characteristics. It is ethnically mixed (see table 3.3). Christian and Muslim residents are represented by parallel civic structures and social networks. And it is located between two segregated settlements, each dominated by one of the rival groups. To the north is Angwan Rukuba, a Christian neighborhood, and to the south are the contiguous Muslim settlements of Dilimi and Gangare.

Table 3.3: Ethnic composition of Nasarawa Gwong, 1990-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</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>1990</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Apart from rivalry within, Nasarawa Gwong is characterized by struggles between rivals from adjoining strongholds, seeking to dominate Nasarawa Gwong. Ordinarily, mixed areas are plagued by internal conflicts, while the frontier suffers from struggles between rivals inside and outside its territory. In all major episodes of violence experienced in Jos, armed mobs from the Christian strongholds of Angwan Rukuba and Tina Junction axis marched into Nasarawa Gwong against advancing fighters from the Muslim strongholds of Dilimi and Gangare along with their co-ethnics in Fillin ball and Yan Shanu areas. Comparatively, more incidents of violence have occurred here than elsewhere in the city and it is recognized as one of the most notorious battlegrounds (Human Rights Watch 2009: 9).

But Nasarawa Gwong was also once a bastion of peaceful co-existence. Christian and Muslim residents belonged to the same neighborhood-based networks. Although ethnic identity determined social ties to some extent, the general sense of neighborliness and friendship transcended ethnic boundaries. As one elderly resident recalled: “It was not uncommon to find Christians and Muslims exchanging visits and, during elections, Christians voting for a Muslim candidate or Muslims voting for a Christian.”

So what went wrong? The same events and political developments that made Angwan Rogo a stronghold made Nasarawa Gwong a frontier. Jos North’s 1991 creation was one of the foremost causes of dissonance between Christian and Muslim residents in the area. Ethnic antipathy that befell the city was acute in Nasarawa Gwong and, according to one resident, polarized the neighborhood’s residents’ association.

At a point everyone knew we had to part ways. Muslims had their agenda and Christians had theirs. There was no way we could work together because there was no trust. The Muslims were celebrating the creation of the new LGA and Christians were very sad about the development. We just parted ways. Christian residents started having their meetings and Muslims also started having their meetings. But it was different before then, we used to have our meetings together... but that was before the creation of Jos North.

---

48 Interview with resident, April 17, 2016.
49 Interview with former neighborhood leader, May 13, 2016.
Besides going separate ways, social networks started aligning with their co-ethnics in the adjoining segregated settlements.

It was a situation where the Muslim in Nasarawa Gwong was closer to his Muslim brothers in Yan Shau, Dilimi and Gangare than his Christian neighbors. The Christian in Nasarawa Gwong abandoned his Muslim neighbors and associated more with his Christian brothers in Angwan Rukuba and Tina Junction. Even the associations did the same thing. So you find vigilantes from here working with their brothers in the nearby settlements; no one wants to work with their neighbor who is of a different religion.  

Appointment of a Muslim as management committee chairman for Jos North, the 1994 riots, and acrimonious 1999 election campaigns all exacerbated the already worsening group relations between the Hausa and the indigenes in Nasarawa Gwong. The 1994 violence marked a crucial stage in the neighborhood’s polarization and militarization. Co-ethnics banned to form small armed groups and did a lot of surveillance work around their homes. Future events would illustrate just how the 1994 riots let groups in Nasarawa Gwong rehearse what would come seven years later.

During the 1999 election campaigns, Nasarawa Gwong was divided into two main political camps. Christians aligned with the PDP and Muslims with the ANPP. During the elections, youth networks were coopted to become campaign organizations. ANPP youth wings comprising Hausa young men staged campaign rallies and road shows in Fillin Ball, Yan Shau, and elsewhere in the neighborhood. The politicking involved display and dissemination of political posters as well as directly engaging with residents. One former youth wing member who doubled as a vigilante described how he and his peers became part of ANPP’s campaign machinery.

The older and more established members of the party know that they need the youth to succeed. That is why they approached us as a group to enlist our support. But before working with them we gave them conditions. For example, we told them that we wanted employment, school admissions, and small loans to start businesses. These are some of the things that the youth needs and that is why we joined ANPP, because we saw that the

50 Interview with neighborhood leader, March 27, 2017.
51 Interviews with residents, March 14-15, 2016.
52 Interview with resident, May 17, 2017.
party members were the kind of people that would provide us with these things.\textsuperscript{53}

Indigene youth networks in Nasarawa Gwong also had major roles in organizing campaign activities for the PDP. One local politician said it was at the height of the 1999 elections that he and many Christian peers joined the youth wing.

PDP was new then and they were looking for members. It was one elder in this area who approached me. I immediately agreed to join because he was a man I respected. I told some of my friends about it and they also joined. That was how we joined the campaigns. We started in this neighborhood, traveled to other towns, and still brought back the campaigns to this neighborhood because ANPP was also strong here, very strong.\textsuperscript{54}

Transboundary alliances existed between ethno-political networks in Nasarawa Gwong and its adjoining areas. PDP loyalists in Nasarawa Gwong organized joint campaigns with their counterparts from the adjacent Christian stronghold of Angwan Rukuba. ANPP supporters in Nasarawa Gwong collaborated with their co-loyalists in the Muslim strongholds of Yan Shanu, Dilimi, and faraway Gangare.\textsuperscript{55}

This cross-border politicking led to skirmishes best described as turf wars between youth wings of the rivaling political parties at different stages of the campaigns.\textsuperscript{56}

Although I could not access any 1999 voting records for Nasarawa Gwong, my discussions with local politicians and eyewitnesses painted a picture of what happened. Ostensibly, the neighborhood proved to be a frontier where rival ethno-political networks from the adjoining areas competed to gain control of the polling units. Political activists and thugs working with local politicians from the Christian stronghold of Angwan Rubuka invaded and controlled those polling units nearest to them, notably those around Chwel-Nyap public primary school. Similar networks from the Muslim strongholds of Yan Shanu and Fillin Ball invaded and controlled the polling units around them. Table 3.4 shows voting patterns in some segregated and mixed areas of Nasarawa Gwong.\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{53} Interview with party official, May 17, 2017.
\textsuperscript{54} Interview with self-proclaimed political activist, March 18, 2017.
\textsuperscript{55} Interview with local politician, May 17, 2017.
\textsuperscript{56} Interview with resident of Nasarawa Gwong, May 16, 2017.
\textsuperscript{57} Election results were provided by Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) and Plateau State Independent Electoral Commission (PLASIEC) in Jos, Plateau State.
Table 3.4: Ethnic composition and voting patterns in ethnically mixed and segregated polling units of Nasarawa Gwong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood/polling unit</th>
<th>Predominant group</th>
<th>Number of votes</th>
<th>Number of APC votes</th>
<th>Percentage of APC votes</th>
<th>Number of PDP votes</th>
<th>Percentage of other party votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ungwar UNA I</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungwar UNA II</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yan Shanu I</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yan Shanu II</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although this data is based on 2015 elections, I was told by local politicians and other individuals that prior voting patterns were similar. Candidates’ ethnic identity was the biggest consideration for most voters. Polling units Ungwar UNA I and II formed the highly contested middle ground where each group struggled to extend the frontier of their political dominance. One eyewitness said that during the 1999 elections, he saw at least two fistfights and several heated verbal confrontations involving political thugs from neighboring areas. Is it surprising that this area provided the arena for some of the fiercest clashes barely two years later?

Patterns of Violence in the Stronghold and the Frontier

Barely two years after the indigene certificate embargo, an incident animated the acrimony surrounding the question of indigeneity. In July 2001, the federal government of Olusegun Obasanjo appointed LGA coordinators for the National Poverty Eradication Program (NAPEP). Mukhtar Usman Mohammed, a Muslim Hausa, was appointed to head the agency’s Jos North branch. The indigenes rejected the appointment; the Hausa insisted it must stand. Bitter correspondence, posters, and handbills were the vehicles to swap threats. In different
neighborhoods, countless posters were slapped on walls or dropped in public places, bearing messages of hate and group’s claims to be the more powerful.\textsuperscript{58} Nasarawa Gwong was a hotspot for the printed matter, with several residents recounting how posters and handbills were flying about in the weeks before violence erupted.\textsuperscript{59} One resident said about five posters were put up on the wall of his house.\textsuperscript{60}

After an interlude of uneasy calm—during which inflammatory exchanges still continued—the storm hit. Ethnic violence erupted in Jos on September 7, 2001. The triggering incident is well documented in academic and official reports (see Human Rights Watch 2001; Best 2007; Ostien 2009; Higazi 2011; Krause 2011), though a recap here suffices. That day, a young Christian named Rhoda Haruna Nyam was on her way to lunch and insisted on passing a group of Muslims who had blocked the road as they usually did during Friday prayers. An altercation ensued following an attempt to prevent the woman from accessing the route. Accounts differ on what happened from this point onwards, but one account, consistent with what one resident of the neighborhood told me, is that she ran back to the Christian-dominated part of the neighborhood and shouted for help.\textsuperscript{61} Shortly afterwards, Christian and Muslim residents of the neighborhood engaged in a series of attacks and counterattacks that, within surprising swiftness, spread around the city. Once the violence was underway, it was clearly no longer indigenes versus Hausa, but rather Christians and Muslims attacking each other.\textsuperscript{62}

Researchers and NGOs have documented the violent events that transpired from September 7 to 12, 2001, and in some instances, highlighted their spatial patterns (see Human Rights Watch 2001; Best 2007; Higazi 2007; Ostien 2009; Krause 2011; International Crisis Group 2012). Higazi (2007: 17) described the mass killing of Christians in the Muslim-dominated areas of Angwan Rogo, Angwan Rimi, Bauchi Road, Sarkin Mangu, and parts of Nasarawa Gwong as well

\textsuperscript{58} See Niki Tobi White Paper on the report of the judicial commission of enquiry into the civil disturbances in Jos and its environs, September 2002, 50-1.
\textsuperscript{59} Interviews in Nasarawa Gwong, April 13, 2016.
\textsuperscript{60} Interview in Filin Ball, April 13, 2016.
\textsuperscript{61} Versions of the story vary but all of them suggest there was an altercation between a group of Muslims and a Christian woman.
\textsuperscript{62} Discussions with a cross section of residents in Nasarawa Gwong, 14 April, 2016.
as the mass killing of Muslims in the Christian-dominated areas of Angwan Rukuba, Jenta Adamu, Bukuru Road, and Zaria Road. Krause (2011) noted similar patterns of violence, how Angwan Rogo became “exclusively Muslim” after the attack on the Christians there, and how Christians attacked and drove Muslims out of Apata. Further, she observed how the ethnically mixed area of Ali Kazaure “became a battleground between both groups” (Krause 2011:36).

These accounts in the literature and my research help illustrate how patterns of violence varied between ethnically segregated and mixed neighborhoods. Drawing from established understandings of “patterns” of violence (Tilly 2003; Kalyvas 2006, 2012; Gutiérrez-Sanín & Wood 2014, 2017), I adopt an interpretation that distinguishes between two types of “patterns”: pogroms in the form of asymmetric attacks by the majority on a defenceless minority; and clashes in the form of symmetric combat between groups. Patterns of violence can be categorized into far more forms, but these categories here suffice.

In segregated areas and neighborhoods that were clearly dominated by one rival group, members of the dominant group attacked the minority in a series of pogroms. Fighting was principally asymmetric, with the minority mainly on the defensive. As the literature documents, in Angwan Rogo, large mobs of Muslims attacked Christians. Armed with sticks, knives, machetes, bows and arrows, guns, and petrol bombs, the irate crowds moved from one Christian home to another, killing, maiming, and burning. They spared women and children in only some instances. The Christians, who were heavily outnumbered, did not fight back. Two churches, homes belonging to Christians, and other properties were destroyed. Casualties included many University of Jos staff and students residing in the area because it was close to campus (Human Rights Watch 2001).

Violence assumed a different pattern in ethnically mixed Nasarawa Gwong. One neighborhood resident described it as “a war where groups stood at a distance and shot at each other and occasionally engaged in close combat.”63 This is consistent with Krause’s depiction of the violence unfolding “along improvised front lines” (cited in Human Rights Watch 2001: 9). Different parts of Nasarawa

---

63 Interview with resident, April 17, 2016.
Gwong including Duala, Bulbula, and Angwan Keke were battlegrounds where Muslim and Christian mobs from the adjoining areas clashed repeatedly. These clashes resulted in hundreds of killings, injuries, and massive destruction on both sides.

After six days of fighting, the military restored order. It is estimated that at least 1,000 people were killed (Human Rights Watch 2001:9), though some sources claim it may have been 3,000 (see Danfulani & Fwatshak 2002). Angwan Rogo, alone, saw hundreds murdered and the destruction of dozens of houses. In Nasarawa Gwong and surroundings, over a hundred people were reportedly killed and countless homes, businesses, vehicles, and other properties demolished. The most obvious aftereffect of the violence in the stronghold was increased segregation. Survivors fled to temporary camps for displaced persons that dotted the city in the following months; later they found shelter in co-ethnic-dominated areas. The Muslim neighborhood of Angwan Rogo hence became homogenous, as did the Christian neighborhood of Apata (Krause 2011:36). The ethnic composition of the residents’ association, the vigilante groups, and other neighborhood-based organizations thus also became homogenous, further blurring the boundary between civic structures and ethnic associations. The frontier neighbourhood of Nasarawa Gwong also experienced displacements and relocations, with Christian and Muslim residents each receding into the adjoining strongholds. Many Christians relocated from the neighborhood’s north to seek refuge in the Christian strongholds of Angwan Rukuba and Tina Junction or even farther towards Furaka. Some Muslims around Angwan Rukuba junction and Dutse Uku also relocated south, towards Fillin Ball, Yan Shanu, and deeper into Dilimi and Gangare areas. The proportion of Christians to Muslims decreased but not significantly, as table 3.5 shows.

Table 3.5: Ethnic composition of Nasarawa Gwong, 2000-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</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>
</table>

64 Interview with youth leader in Congo-Russia, March 11, 2016
Insecurity and fear are known to precipitate segregation (Rodgers 2004:113). Members of both groups, especially those living in more ethnically diverse areas, showed some unwillingness to leave. Even some who fled these areas later returned. As a result, some parts of the city remained ethnically mixed and were the main battlegrounds for violence in 2008 and 2010.

**Conclusion**

Scholars have devoted attention to the SAP's devastating ramifications for Nigeria, creation of Jos North LGA, the country's return to a democratic government, and an embargo on issuing indigene certificates to the Hausa in Jos. This article, however, focused explicitly on how these events transformed Jos’ neighborhoods from mundane residential areas into spaces of ethnic differentiation and violence. It provided a fine-grained analysis of the dynamics of violence within and across neighborhood boundaries. The article thus builds on existing literature and adds value to the practice of responding to ethnic violence in several important ways.

To start with, in ordering neighborhoods into ethnic strongholds and frontiers and tracing the processes that underpin their emergence and development, the article elucidated a useful conceptual framework for coherently investigating, understanding, and explaining variations in the spread and patterns of violence in a divided city. Rather than conceiving of violence as completely chaotic, haphazard, and decontextualized from its socio-spatial context, the concepts uncovered how patterns of violence recursively interrelate with the demographic and physical environment in which they occur. Thus, as demonstrated, ethnic strongholds and frontiers are both a consequent and a predicator of particular violent forms.

Moreover, the cross-sectional approach of most studies on spatial patterns of violence offers a snapshot, failing to capture the dynamic socio-spatial conditions that support and shape violence. The processional approach adopted in
this article focused on the spatial as well as the temporal dimension of how neighborhoods transformed. Doing this brings into sharp relief how ethnic composition, social networks, and location of the neighborhood all interact in space and over time. In unearthing how Angwan Rogo became progressively more segregated, I also uncovered how its social networks became increasingly intra-ethnic. Accordingly, as group relations deteriorated in Nasarawa Gwong, residents’ associations and vigilantes became decentralized and parallel networks emerged along ethnic lines.

Tracing these processes of transformation revealed how a neighborhood’s ethnic composition and location can affect its evolution. Nasarawa Gwong’s ethnic composition and its location between segregated settlements contributed to transforming into a frontier. This insight has important implications for policy. It calls for peace-builders to examine a neighborhood’s location vis-à-vis adjoining neighborhoods and to respond in ways that consider group solidarity in the stronghold, multilevel competition and contestations in the frontier, and their developments over time.

Additionally, exploring the very events and processes that helped transform the neighborhoods has revealed possible inroads for managing conflict and mitigating violence. This exploration shines a light on milestones that mark strategic points for intervention. For example, it is clear that periods preceding elections are characterized by hikes in ethnic activism and at these critical times violence is most likely to erupt. It is also clear that political appointments negatively impact social networks. This understanding can help authorities design context-sensitive proactive strategies for preventing violence. Such measures could include civic structures to monitor and check use of divisive rhetoric by politicians within neighborhoods during electoral campaigns.

This article is a first step in exploring the spatial patterns of violence in a riot-ridden city. To further understand the concentration and persistence of violence in particular socio-spatial contexts, we need to zoom in on frontiers. Understanding in detail the causal mechanisms that make frontiers sites of persistent violence will, besides advancing knowledge on the dynamics of ethnic violence, contribute meaningfully to finding effective response to violent riots.
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CHAPTER FOUR

Frontiers of Ethnic Brutality in an African City: Explaining Violent Conflict’s Spread and Recurrence in Jos, Nigeria

K.L. Madueke & F.F. Vermeulen

Abstract

There is considerable consensus among scholars of ethnic riots that ethnically mixed areas are more prone to collective violence than segregated ones. The conclusion is based on studies that compare levels of violence between segregated and mixed localities. While this addresses disparities between settlements of dissimilar ethnic composition, variations in spread of violence across ethnically mixed areas remain a mystery. Seeking to explicate these variations, we propose an approach that not only examines the ethnic composition of a neighbourhood, but also its location in relation to adjoining neighbourhoods of similar or dissimilar ethnic makeup and their shared boundaries. Based on ethnographic fieldwork in Jos, a violence-ridden Nigerian city, we demonstrate that ethnically mixed areas located between segregated ones experience more incidents of violence than mixed neighbourhoods not comparably located. Our findings have both academic and practical implications.

Keywords: Ethnic conflict, mobilization, territoriality, collective violence, wars, neighbourhoods
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Introduction

Once considered one of Nigeria’s most peaceful regions, the city of Jos recently became troubled by ethnic violence of enormous scale. Over one thousand people were killed in a series of Christian-Muslim riots that lasted six days in September 2001. After a momentary calm within the city – during which hundreds were massacred in the rural districts of Plateau South – urban violence resumed in November 2008.\footnote{Plateau South is one of the three senatorial zones into which Plateau State is subdivided into. The other two are Plateau North and Plateau Central.} This time it claimed over 700 lives within two days. Hostilities once again engulfed the city in January 2010, during which at least 200 people were killed within Jos metropolis and, from March onwards, over 400 were murdered by armed militias in the outlying Local Government Areas (LGA) of Jos South, Barking Ladi, and Riyom. Overall, more than 5,000 people were killed between 2001 and 2010, distinguishing the Jos riots as some of the most atrocious and persistent in Nigeria’s modern history.

Experts on Jos have quite exhaustively analysed the political and social factors that led to these hostilities (see Best 2007; Higazi 2007; Ostien 2009). At the heart of the conflict are contestations over indigene rights and political representation between the predominantly Christian ethnonlinguistic groups of Berom, Afizere and Anaguta collectively considered indigenes and the mainly Muslim settler Hausa.\footnote{Hausa in Jos is a social category that in addition to the original Hausa includes Fulani, BeriBeri, Nupe, Kanuri and other groups from northern Nigeria that have adopted the Hausa language and culture and are mainly Christian.} Against a background of intensifying ethnic competition following Nigeria’s transition from military rule to democratic system in 1999, discriminatory policies, weak institutional capacity and apathy on the part of government led to the infamous “Jos crises” in 2001 and subsequently (Ostien 2009; Krause 2011; Higazi 2011). Though the conflict is essentially between so-called indigenes and settlers, violence took on a religious colouration because tribal and religious boundaries tend to overlap. As a result, many groups that are not part of the indigene-settler dispute became entangled in the riots.
Besides these underlying causations, Jos-focused researchers, like their counterparts in other violent cities, have become interested in the spatial dimension of riots. The general discourse on demography and collective violence highlights ethnic segregation as an important variable in a neighbourhood’s vulnerability to violence. Views are conflicting, however, on how this relationship works. One perspective emanating from contact theory holds that ethnically segregated environments are more prone to violence (Boal 1972). An argument from conflict theory runs in the opposite direction, maintaining that ethnically mixed areas are more prone to violence (Kauffmann 1996). Empirical evidence is conflicting, supporting one position in some contexts and suggesting contrary in other instances (Bhavnani et al. 2014: 226).

In trying to address this puzzle, experts on Jos have turned to poverty, civilian-violence prevention networks and power-sharing as explanatory factors for violence and nonviolence (Krause 2017; Bunte and Vinson 2016; Nyam and Ayuba 2016; Madueke 2014, 2015; Scacco 2012). These works provide useful insights on violence and nonviolence in particular areas. However, they still do not account for variations in the spread of violence in many demographically similar neighbourhoods. Moreover, some of the ideas are suitable for explaining variations at higher spatial scales such as cities, towns and districts but not across neighbourhoods.

Building on these works, we propose that in addition to a neighbourhood’s ethnic composition, its location in relation to adjoining neighbourhoods of similar or dissimilar ethnic composition account for its vulnerability to violence. Specifically, we argue that ethnically mixed neighbourhoods that are sandwiched between rivalling segregated settlements experience more incidents of violence than mixed areas not comparably located. We develop our argument in four steps. First we discuss relevant perspectives in related literature and then situate our argument. Second, we provide a sketch of incidents of violence from 2001 to 2010 followed by a note on research methods. Third, we scrutinise the case of Ali Kazaure and how its ethnic composition and location contribute to making it a site of recurrent collective violence. Specifically, we show how spatial adjacency and social networks that crisscross the shared boundaries of Ali Kazaure and the rivalling
adjoining neighbourhoods make it easy for external actors to infiltrate the neighbourhood transforming it into a frontier of sorts. In doing this, we also show that despite the changing ethnic composition of the neighbourhood, levels of violence remained fairly constant, indicating that ethnic composition alone cannot account for variations. Fourth, we cross-validate our findings in Ali Kazaure by surveying four other ethnically mixed neighbourhoods, two of which are sandwiched between rivalling segregated areas.

Related Literature

Scholars agree that a locality’s ethnic composition affects its susceptibility to violence, but they disagree on how the two variables interact. One perspective holds that ethnic segregation promotes violence (Peach 2007); the other maintains that ethnic diversity is the culprit (Kaufman 1996). Empirical evidence is conflicting, supporting one perspective in some instances and disproving the same in other contexts. For example, according to Bhavnani et al. (2014: 1), increased levels of segregation that followed frequent violent unrests in the 1960s and 1970s in Belfast helped prevent resurgence in the coming years. In Baghdad, Weidmann and Salehyan (2013) similarly noted that a sharp decline in group violence corresponded to a sharp rise in residential segregation. But evidence from other cases suggests the opposite. It was in ethnically diverse areas that race riots in the UK were found to be more prevalent (Peach 2007) and, in Afghanistan, that the occurrence of violence was more likely (Bhavnani and Choi 2012).

In Jos, both ethnically segregated and mixed settlements experienced some form of violence as the riots raged. Higazi (2007: 17) and Krause (2011: 34) highlight how Christians were attacked and driven out of predominantly Muslim neighbourhoods and Muslims out of areas with majority Christian populations. Evidence also suggests violence was particularly horrendous in partially segregated areas where the dominant group felt it needed to “prove” who owned the neighbourhood (Madueke, 2014, 2015). But there was also violence in mixed neighbourhoods. Human Rights Watch (2001: 9) described violence in some mixed localities as being waged “along improvised front lines.” Higazi (2007: 17) and Krause (2011:32) point out instances of violence in mixed areas. However,
incidents of violence significantly declined in segregated neighbourhoods as they became over time totally homogenous (Krause 2011: 32). This indicates that complete ethnic segregation does curb violence, at least in the short term, if not permanently. Moreover, it in some way addresses the variations in spread of violence between ethnically mixed and homogenously segregated settlements as far as Jos is concerned.

Nonetheless, a good part of the puzzle related to ethnic composition and collective violence is still unsolved. There is no adequate explanation for why some mixed neighbourhoods become perpetual battlegrounds while other equally diverse areas remain relatively peaceful. Experts on Jos have made important contributions towards understanding this enigma. In her analysis of variations in levels of violence, Krause (2017) found that what distinguished nonviolent neighbourhoods from those that experienced violence was the presence of a civilian violence-prevention network. In other words, neighbourhoods that were equally vulnerable but stayed unscathed have civilian networks to thank. Based on a paired comparison of a violent and a nonviolent violent neighbourhood, she empirically demonstrated how a joint Christian-Muslim patrol and influential community leaders contributed to making Dadin Kowa an oasis of relative calm even when nearby areas were boiling. Varshney (2001) has similarly noted the role of interethnic civic engagement in dousing tensions and preventing violence in India.

Further, Jos-focused literature emphasises power-sharing and poverty as important explanations for violence and nonviolence. Comparing Jos and Chikun, Bunte and Vinson (2016) observed how localities with a power-sharing arrangement are less likely to experience ethnic violence because the tone of politicians is more conciliatory and there is more mutual trust among members of the public than in areas without such arrangements. Similar observations have been made regarding the spread of violence in India (Wilkinson 2006). Krause (2011) and Higazi (2007: 18) stress the role of poverty in shaping the spread of violence noting that violence mainly happened in poor neighbourhoods while ‘wealthier areas such as Rayfield and the GRA where the elite live were unaffected.’ Explaining why poor neighbourhoods of Jos experienced higher levels
of violence than the wealthier ones, Scacco (2012) empirically illustrated how poverty increases the likelihood of riot participation, arguing that in circumstances where authorities cannot protect their citizens, poor residents of deprived areas will pick up arms to defend themselves in the face of riots.

Such perspectives advance our understanding of factors affecting spread of violence, but there is still room for investigation. To start with, while presence of a civilian-violence prevention network does suggest why some neighbourhoods were violence-free during some riots, an unanswered question is why other neighbourhoods with similar civilian violence-prevention arrangements, though initially non-violent, at some point did experience riots. For example, reports indicate that “in some areas, Christians and Muslims set up joint patrols in a bid to limit the spread of violence, but it became difficult to maintain these once the fighting had escalated” (Human Rights Watch 2001: 9). Such civilian networks fall within Keegan’s (1993) “contingent” factors as opposed to “permanent” operating factors like physical terrain. Contingent factors are important for determining violence and nonviolence circumstantially. For example, Anglo Jos is considered to have experienced violence in 2010 because an influential neighbourhood leader who contributed to preventing violence during previous episodes of riots left the neighbourhood (Krause 2017: 272). We propose that neighbourhood location and boundaries affect vulnerability to violence in a more permanent sense. In relation to power-sharing, we agree with Bunte and Vinson’s (2016) argument that it explains variations in spread of violence at the levels of LGAs and districts. However, there are also variations within LGAs and districts (e.g. across neighbourhoods and even streets) that power-sharing at these higher spatial scales cannot account for. We consider poverty, as argued by Scacco (2012), a crucial factor to consider in accounting for riot participation; for our purpose, however, it serves more as a control variable than an explanatory one.

We maintain that variations in spread of violence across demographically identical neighbourhoods remain a mystery because research has not adequately considered the location of a neighbourhood in relation to adjoining areas. Bridging perspectives in the broader literature on ethnic composition, location, and collective violence, we propose that when considering susceptibility to violence, it is not just
the neighbourhood’s ethnic composition that matters, but also its location in relation to surrounding neighbourhoods of similar or dissimilar ethnic composition.

We are not the first to consider how locational attributes affect a neighbourhood’s propensity for collective violence (see Calame and Charlesworth 2011). Jarman and O’Halloran (2001) observed that in Belfast the “buffer zone” – a type of interface where a mixed settlement falls between two segregated neighbourhoods – is more violence-prone than homogenous neighbourhoods divided by sharp boundaries. This is consistent with findings in New York where Legewie and Schaeffer (2016) found mixed neighbourhoods sandwiched between rivaling segregated neighbourhoods to be more disposed to conflict than fully segregated neighbourhoods with clearly defined boundaries. Apart from being sites of contestation over shared resources, such boundary neighbourhoods are contentious because they are spatial contexts where the homogenous community life that characterises the segregated neighbourhood is threatened (Legewie and Schaeffer 2016). Although the horrendous violence in Jos does not neatly parallel “The Troubles” of Belfast or New York’s neighbourhood scuffles, the dynamic that underlies buffer zones and contested boundaries is similar.

The notion of the frontier sheds light on the sociospatial setting discussed in this article. Defining the frontier, Kotek (1999) noted that, first, the frontier is an area located “on fault-lines between ethnic, religious or ideological wholes” (Kotek 1999: 228). Second, it is characterised by contestations and struggles for political control between rival groups (Kotek 1999: 229). Third, the frontier symbolises bigger conflicts, being “emblematic of larger disputed areas or zones” (Kotek 1999: 231). To these distinctive features, we add a fourth: at the frontier, the struggle for control is not restricted to residents within the neighbourhood, but also involves actors from adjoining areas. Although Kotek’s frontier originally referred to higher spatial levels such as cities and regions, it has gained currency in characterising battleground neighbourhoods or settlements known to experience intense violence in conflict-ridden cities. Boal (2002) used the concept to explain Belfast’s contentious geography and the spatial patterns of Catholic-Protestant violence.

Figure 4.1 shows segregation and diversity across neighbourhoods in Jos city centre. As a result of political developments, violence over the years, increased
segregation and militarization of the populace, many of these neighbourhoods have transformed from mundane residential areas to strategic spaces of ethnic dissention and combat. This transformation led to the emergence of two types of sociospatial settings: ethnic strongholds and frontiers. Strongholds, referred to in Jos as either “New Jerusalem” or “Saudi Arabia” (Trovalla, Adetula, and Trovalla 2014: 67) depending on the dominant group, are locales of ethnic exclusivity, characterised by ethnic homogeneity and territorial dominance. Frontiers are sites of fierce competition, contestations, and tussle for territorial and political control (Kotek 1999). The central argument of this article, thus, is that frontiers are not only subject to internal wrangling – they also become more strained as external social networks in the adjoining strongholds exploit their trans-neighbourhood ties to extend the frontier of their territorial and political control. The ethnically mixed neighbourhood located between rivalling segregated areas serves as a frontier for competing political and territorial interests. It is highly vulnerable to violence because ethnopolitical networks from the adjoining segregated areas compete to dominate it. The key objective is to expel rival group members so as to establish territorial and electoral dominance. Using violence to expel residents who are likely to vote for an opponent has been well documented in Kenya (see Kasara 2014). Through their connections with co-ethnics in the ethnically mixed areas, ethnopolitical networks from segregated areas may invade the mixed localities when violence erupts. Riots, moreover, present opportunities, as well as cloaks, for individuals to commit atrocities based on economic, personal, and other motivations (Kalyvas 2003).

Recounting a Bloody Decade
Different scholars have examined the underlying causations of violence in Jos (Best 2007; Higazi 2007; Ostien 2009; Krause 2011). As such, before explicating patterns of violence, this subsection provides just a sketch of the events that precipitated the three major incidents of violence in Jos within this period. Although the trajectory of deadly violence in Jos dates back more than half a century (see Plotnicov 1971), September 2001’s fatal riots are what caught world attention. In July that year, LGA-level coordinators were appointed for the National Poverty
Eradication Programme (NAPEP), a federal government agency for economic empowerment schemes. For Jos North, Alhaji Mukhtar Usman Mohammed, a Hausa, was appointed. The indigenes vehemently opposed the appointment. They insisted such a critical position belonged to the indigenes. The Nikki Tobi commission of enquiry report recounts ensuing inflammatory exchanges between indigenes and Hausa.67

Figure 4.1: Ethnic Segregation and Diversity in Jos City Centre (Source: created by author).

---

In response, the state government scheduled 10 September for an intergroup dialogue to find a consensual solution to the fracas. But the dialogue did not transpire, as the city exploded in violence on 7 September, a Friday. The riots started in Congo-Russia, a deprived, densely populated and ethnically mixed neighbourhood. The incident that sparked the violence involved a young Christian woman trying to gain passage while a group of Muslim worshippers were praying on the road. There are different versions of how it all started but what is important is that violent clashes soon ensued, and within a very short period spread elsewhere in the city in response to exaggerated accounts of killings going viral (Human Rights Watch 2001).

The violence of 2008 began over an elective position, the chairmanship of Jos North LGA. For background, local elections were held across the 17 LGAs of Plateau State on 27 November 2008. The ruling PDP’s candidate and that of the main opposition ANPP were the foremost candidates for the Jos North LGA chairmanship. Christians mainly aligned with the PDP and Muslims with the ANPP based on the candidates’ religions. The elections were largely peaceful, with no major disturbances recorded. Later, however, skirmishes began at the collation centre, which was at the last minute relocated to a Christian suburb. ANPP party agents and loyalists started protesting what they suspected was an attempt to rig election results by PDP officials who doubled as top government officers at the time. The police used teargas to disperse the crowds of protesters. As they made their way back to their neighbourhoods, the crowd looted and destroyed shops while alerting co-ethnics via phone and word of mouth to come out and fight (Ostien 2009). Before dawn, many neighbourhoods had erupted in violence (Human Rights Watch 2009).

The violence of 2010 was sparked by an event seemingly trivial in comparison to that of 2001 and 2008, which were both related to political positions (whether elective or appointive). On 17 January, a Muslim arrived with labourers to start renovations on his home, which was destroyed during the 2008 violence in Dutse Uku. Accounts differ on how the violence started. The Muslim-sympathetic version claims the brawl began when neighbourhood Christians attempted to stop the Muslim labourers from renovating the house and threatened to destroy it again
if they did. Shortly afterwards, the Christians allegedly started throwing stones and calling other Christian residents to come out and fight. The Christian-sympathetic version claims that the Muslim labourers blocked the road and that morning called churchgoing passers-by derogatory names, such as “infidels.” Allegedly, the Muslim labourers had sophisticated weapons and started the fight (Higazi 2011: 24-25). Whoever started it, wild tales of massacres and killings soon went viral, presumably after Plateau State’s police commissioner went on state television to blame “some Muslim youths” for starting the attack (Higazi 2011: 25). Other neighbourhoods erupted in violent clashes.

In each of these incidents, the scale and intensity of the violence was astonishing. Rampaging mobs moved around the city, killing or maiming anyone of another faith. Youth mounted roadblocks and killed motorists who could not prove themselves co-ethnics (Human Rights Watch 2009). People were killed if unable to recite a particular prayer (Krause 2011). In other situations, they were killed on the basis of their dress (Trovalla, Adetula, and Trovalla 2014). Landed property with homes, offices, and business was massively destroyed. Religious institutions were disproportionately targeted. Cumulatively, over 5,000 people were killed (including casualties in the villages), over 200,000 displaced, and an incalculable worth of property destroyed.

Research Design and Data
This article is based on an in-depth case study of levels and patterns of violence in Ali Kazaure. This ethnically mixed neighbourhood in the city centre of Jos is located between two segregated settlements, bordered on the north by the large Muslim area of Angwan Rogo and on the south by the Christian settlement of Apata (See Figure 4.2). Inasmuch as this in-depth study zooms in on one neighbourhood, we pay close attention to Ali Kazaure’s adjacent neighbourhoods. In addition, we worked with a selection of four ethnically mixed areas that are demographically, socially, and economically similar though differ in terms of location and the ethnic composition of the adjoining settlements.
Like Ali Kazaure, two of these neighbourhoods are sandwiched between segregated settlements; the other two, although also ethnically diverse, are not. These secondary cases are only briefly examined to achieve the kind of control required to avoid spurious claims and to cross-validate findings. The populations of all the neighbourhoods considered fall between 15,000 and 25,000.

We started by comparing recurrence and persistence of violence across all the aforementioned ethnically mixed neighbourhoods. We did this by scanning official reports of violence and hospital records to determine which of the neighbourhoods experienced violence and which did not. We did this for each neighbourhood for all three episodes of ethnic riots. To identity and differentiate patterns and levels of violence, we relied on extensive interviews and discussions with participants of riots, surviving victims, eyewitnesses, and other residents. Comparing and combining information from the official reports, hospital records, and our interviews, we created three categories for classifying each neighbourhood’s distinct experience of violence: MV = major violence, prolonged clashes lasting several hours and involving a large group of people; NV = no violence; and SV = sporadic violence, isolated and often sporadic violent incidents.
involving much smaller groups and lasting only a short while. Table 4.1 presents two neighbourhood samples.

Table 4.1: Samples of Violence Levels in Two Neighbourhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farin Gada</td>
<td>Not sandwiched</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>SV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasarawa Gwong</td>
<td>Sandwiched</td>
<td>MV</td>
<td>MV</td>
<td>MV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 shows how Nasarawa Gwong, an ethnically mixed neighbourhood sandwiched between rivalling segregated settlements, experienced major (persistent) violence in all three episodes of ethnic riots. Contrastingly, Farin Gada, an ethnically mixed neighbourhood not sandwiched between segregated settlements, experienced no violence in 2001 and only isolated, short-lived incidents of violence in 2008 and 2010. Based on this, we can say Nasarawa Gwong experienced more recurrent and persistent violence because it was violence-ridden in all three episodes of riots; in all three instances, fighting was prolonged and involved a large number of people.

We relied on a variety of datasets from fieldwork conducted in Jos between 2015 and 2017. During this time, besides gathering significant archival materials and official reports of violence, research visits were frequent to Ali Kazaure, its adjoining areas, and several other neighbourhoods. The many interviews and other forms of formal and informal discussions conducted with a diverse group of informants are elaborated later in this section.

We used the ethnic composition of public primary schools as a proxy for the ethnic composition of the neighbourhood in which they are located. We analysed common entrance examination registers for the graduating classes of 1990, 1995, 2000, 2005, and 2010 as representative samples of the school since these pupils all sit for the common entrance examination, a final written test taken in order to graduate from primary school and gain admission into secondary
school. The class register carries the full names of the pupils, year of graduation, and other information. To analyse the data, we scanned the names and categorised them as either “Muslim” or “Christian.” In Jos and across much of Nigeria, an individual’s name is usually an indicator of his or her religion.

The choice of public primary schools was informed by two considerations. First, children who attend them come from poor families unable to afford to drive their children to school. These pupils thus reside in the neighbourhood where the school is located. Private primary schools would not have been an apt data source because their pupils tend to have parents with cars and can therefore be driven to school elsewhere. Secondary schools, public or private, would also be unsuitable because their students usually converge from different neighbourhoods. As a second consideration, public primary schools have very comprehensive records that go back decades, whereas most private schools in Jos are recently established.

We also collected hospital records of victims of violence and police reports to determine spread of violence. Hospital records of violent clashes comprise demographic information such as the name, ethnicity, religion, and address of a victim. They also contain forensic information on the nature and severity of injuries, sites on the body where injury occurred, and any weapon used. For this study, we collected records from four hospitals that received and treated victims of violence within and around the city of Jos from 2001 onwards. Police records specify dates, times, and neighbourhoods or streets where violence occurred; sometimes, numbers of casualties and arrested suspects are also included.

For the purpose of this article, we conducted and analysed about 86 interviews concerning the three episodes of violence that occurred in the city between 2001 and 2010: 23 in the ethnically mixed neighbourhood of Ali Kazaure; 19 in the Christian stronghold of Apata; and 24 in the Muslim stronghold of Angwan Rogo. Five interviews were conducted in each of the four other ethnically mixed areas: Nasarawa Gwong, Congo-Russia, Farin Gada, and Mister Ali. Most of the interviews were conducted between 2015 and 2017, but others were conducted between 2010 and 2013. Interviewees and informants were sampled mainly through snowballing because of the sensitive nature of the study. However,
geographical representation, length of residency, and proximity to and knowledge of the issues discussed were important considerations in the sampling process. Because violence forms the core of the study, we were particularly interested in hearing directly from riot participants, victims, and eyewitnesses.

The interviews stemmed from three main discussion prompts: 1) describe how you experienced violence in your neighbourhood; 2) tell us about the main participants in the violence and where they came from; 3) describe how the violence affected your neighbourhood in terms of social networks (inter-ethnic/intra-ethnic relations, neighbourhood associations, etc.). Each of these discussion points was complemented with several follow-up queries that sought to dig beyond ritualised narratives that may have been rehearsed and told over the years. The duration of the interviews varied, with the longest just under 90 minutes and the shortest only 15 minutes.

We employed a thematic system in analysing the data. On the basis of the data and existing literature, we created four coding categories: how violence started (the main instigators and their origin – from within or outside the neighbourhood); patterns of violence (pogroms, clashes, or sporadic isolated incidents); and effects on intergroup and intragroup relations (civic and quotidian networks). After disaggregating the transcribed text into these categories, we ordered them into themes. We then identified patterns where they exist before sequencing them in a chronological account.

The datasets are not without some biases and limitations. In relation to ethnic composition, it is possible for a group to be overrepresented or underrepresented in a school or a class simply by chance. We believe, however, that these chance possibilities have a way of balancing each other out. There are widespread allegations that the police force favours Christians since it is controlled by the state government. But since we are not interested in casting who is the aggressor and who is the victim, but rather being able to corroborate the spread of violence, police bias has little consequence for the outcome of our study. Ultimately, to circumvent these problems – and recognising the possibility of memory fuzziness or deliberate mischief in interviews – we conducted a “ground
“truthing” exercise that involved visits to the neighbourhoods and extensive informal discussions with residents.

**Location and Cross-Boundary Violent Networks in Ali Kazaure**

Shortly after violence started in Congo-Russia on the afternoon of 7 September 2001, Ali Kazaure became engulfed in the pandemonium. Muslim residents barely completed the Juma’at prayers before having to hurry home. As crowds scurried through the neighbourhood streets, they took with them news of riots, killings, and the burning of a mosque by Christian youth in Congo-Russia. Christian residents frantically poured out of their homes to gather what was happening. Near the area’s Catholic church, two traders described how they narrowly escaped being killed by Muslim mobs around New Market. One of them had a cut on his arm, proving the ordeal they experienced in the hands of their Muslim assailants. A small group of Christians clustered to listen anxiously, and soon, angrily.⁶⁸

Two older Christian residents immediately took control of the situation before it got out of hand. Youth leaders were rallied, amongst them one of this study’s informants. They were told not to engage in any form of violence and ensure that potential troublemakers from outside the neighbourhood would be prevented from coming in. A large joint patrol was immediately organised. Although there was tension in the air and some people were seen leaving the neighbourhood out of fear, there was no fighting throughout that day.⁶⁹

Before dawn on Saturday, gunshots were heard around where the neighbourhood shares a boundary with Apata, a large Christian settlement. One resident said when he came out of his house, he saw four men. Three of them whom he identified as “fake soldiers” were dressed in military fatigues and were shooting randomly. The other persons were reportedly helping the “fake soldiers” identify Muslim homes. He knew them quite well. Both of them were Apata residents who had friends in and frequently visited Ali Kazaure. They were known troublemakers who had been in and out of police custody. On hearing the gunshots, other residents came out, some of them also armed, but by then the
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⁶⁸ Interview with neighbourhood leader, 16 May 2016.
⁶⁹ Interview with neighbourhood leader 16 May 2016.
“fake soldiers” and their accomplices had fled. At least four people were left wounded when the attackers retreated. Shortly after, another incident occurred farther north. Four men attacked a Christian trader near his home. An eyewitness identified two of the men who did the beating as “bad boys from Yan Kaji” and the two others who stood by as residents of Ali Kazaure. Some residents claimed that following these predawn events, calls for Muslims to come and fight were made through loudspeakers of the mosque around the Eid Square. Others claim that the calls came from a nearby church and it was for Christians to come out and kill Muslims. It is difficult to verify if these calls really happened. However, judging by the people who were out on the street before sunrise, some form of mobilisation took place.

At dawn, at least 500 people were out on the street, many of them armed. Christians kept to the southern end of the neighbourhood and Muslims to the north. There was no joint patrol. Tales of “fake soldiers” and infiltrators and their inside accomplices fed discussion on both sides. According to one informant, “people were running in and out of the nearby neighbourhoods and calling their friends to come and help them defend their homes.” By sunrise, fighters from the Christian areas of Apata, Chorbe Junction, and Busa Buji had marched into the neighbourhood and staged a front near the Catholic church. Muslims from Angwan Rogo and Yan Kaji camped on the other side of the neighbourhood around the Eid Square. As one man described it:

The real fighting started when some well-armed young men from the Christian side started shooting and killing the Muslims near them. That was when the Muslims here and from Angwan Rogo and Yan Kaji also started killing the Christians near them. It was a terrible sight. Even women and children were attacked and killed. I watched many people shot, stabbed, or beaten to death with big sticks, but there was nothing I could do. I was also busy trying to stay alive.

Some months after the incident, a woman described the day’s events in an interview with Human Rights Watch (2001:10):
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70 Interview with resident of Ali Kazaure, 14 July 2016.
71 Interviews with residents, 17 May 2016.
72 Interview with neighbourhood leader, 17 May 2016.
73 Interview with youth leader, 16 May 2016.
74 Interview with resident, 17 May 2016.
Muslim youths from Angwan Rogo came to Ali Kazaure. They set fire to the Fatima Catholic Cathedral near our house. They had guns and petrol bombs in bottles. Youths from Apata were fighting those from across the street. When the Muslims came with guns, most of them ran away. Some Christians then also got guns and launched a counter-attack. In Ali Kazaure both Christian and Muslim houses were burnt. There was a battleground in the middle. In Apata, most of the houses burnt were Muslim.

Like those in 2001, the riots of 2008 spread with remarkable speed. They started before sunrise on 28 November, in a suburb south-west of the city centre. Ali Kazaure was one of the first neighbourhoods to be hit and it formed the battleground for some of the fiercest clashes (Human Rights Watch 2009: 9). Residents were first awoken by sounds of gunshots around 4:30 am. One man said he heard the loud speakers from the nearby mosque around 4:45 a.m. calling on Muslims to come out. Another resident countered this, saying there were no such calls but there were sounds of whistles from all directions after the gunshots were heard. Whatever the case, large mobs armed with sticks, machetes, and firearms were already out on the street by the break of dawn, reminiscent of that Saturday morning in September 2001.

Some older residents intervened and violence was prevented at this stage. Obeying neighbourhood leaders, most of the youth returned to their section of the neighbourhood and kept vigil. Around 9:00 am, loud gunshot sounds were heard from Angwan Rogo. A Christian youth said they soon remobilised for fighting, having learnt that the gunshots were fired by a large group of youth from Angwan Rogo and Yan Kaji who were advancing to attack. One Muslim young man said they decided to fight when they saw mobs of Christians from Apata coming to attack them. Who struck first is unclear, though perhaps it is not as important as the fact that Christian and Muslim fighters from adjoining neighbourhoods had formed battlefronts within Ali Kazaure by late morning.

Armed with machetes, sticks and firearms, Christian and Muslim groups stood some distance apart and shot at each other. Fighting was a series of attacks
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75 Interview with resident, 18 April 2017.
76 Interview with Christian resident, 16 February 2017.
77 Interview with youth leader, 13 May 2016.
and counterattacks between the two camps. One side would charge forward and gain the upper hand over the opponent only until the retreating side regrouped and push back. At every advance and retreat, casualties were incurred. “It is when you stop running and turn back that you notice many people are lying on the ground bleeding, some alive some already dead,” said a man in the centre of the riots. While these clashes were taking place, another form of attack also ensued. Some fighters snuck through the narrow alleys behind the buildings and ignited houses. These people were also heavily armed and when they set houses on fire, they killed and maimed the occupants. On both sides, informants said, many of the arsonists were from the surrounding areas though they seldom worked without a local guide – a resident of the neighbourhood who told them which houses to burn and which to spare. A woman explained how one of the five men who burnt her house was a former neighbour. A man who narrowly escaped death but had two of his siblings killed said two of his former neighbours were among those who attacked his home.

There is no official figure of how many people were killed in Ali Kazaure, but some riot participants and eyewitnesses estimate more than 50 people could have been killed in the two days of the fighting. Many of these deaths – at least 27 – resulted from arbitrary killings by security forces. Aside these deaths and hundreds of injuries, some 133 buildings were destroyed, making the neighbourhood one of the most physically devastated (Human Rights Watch 2009: 19-20).

The same pattern of violence was repeated during the 2010 riots. Word about the violence came to Ali Kazaure around 11 am on Sunday, 17 January. Christian and Muslim mobs marched in from the adjoining segregated settlements. Earlier, some prominent individuals had intervened, and Christian and Muslim residents had agreed that peace should be maintained at all costs. Muslim youths were to watch their own part of the settlement to prevent troublemakers from the
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78 Interview with riot participant, 27 May 2016.
79 Interview with riot participant 27 May 2016.
80 Interview with residents, 16 May 2016.
81 Interview with resident of Ali Kazaure, 14 April 2016.
82 Interview with former resident of Ali Kazaure, 27 May 2016.
Muslim neighbourhoods of Angwan Rogo and Yan Kaji from coming in. Christian youth were to prevent potential fighters from Apata, Chorbe Junction and Busa Buji from penetrating. These efforts worked at first, but the barricades on both sides of the neighbourhoods collapsed and fighters from the surrounding neighbourhoods invaded. Christians claimed the Muslim residents were the first to let their co-ethnics from surrounding areas in. One Christian resident said some of his Muslim neighbours assisted the invading fighters by identifying the homes of Christians for attack. Muslims also made similar accusations. A Muslim resident said he saw two Christian residents of the neighbourhood leading fighters from Apata.\(^{83}\)

There is no indication that the change in ethnic composition in Ali Kazaure affected levels of violence. As indicated in Table 4.2, one outcome of the several episodes was an increasing level of ethnic segregation. Between 2001 and 2010, many Christians either fled the neighbourhood or relocated further south, closer to the Christian stronghold of Apata. From a fairly mixed area with a Christian-Muslim percentage ratio of 52-48 in 2000, the population became 91 per cent Muslim in 2010. Despite this huge change in ethnic composition, nothing indicated lessening or heightening ethnic violence. Levels of violence remaining fairly constant despite the change in ethnic composition point to factors beyond ethnic composition. The conspicuous role external groups played in instigating violence within Ali Kazaure suggests its location between two segregated settlements is crucial in explaining levels of violence.

Beyond the shift in ethnic composition, Ali Kazaure remains contested politically and territorially. The quest for territorial dominance hinges on the desire to control more polling units, among other things. Apart from this, one of the oldest and largest Catholic churches in Jos still stands there, attracting worshippers from nearby and distant areas to congregate there every Sunday. This Christian edifice stands within only two hundred metres of Eid Square where Muslims gather to pray. Ali Kazaure therefore remains a frontier, despite its ethnic composition becoming more segregated, its location between segregated settlements and what its religious institutions mean for people inside and outside the neighbourhood.

\(^{83}\) Interview with former resident of Ali Kazaure, 16 May 2016.
Table 4.2: Ethnic Composition of Ali Kazaure, 1992 – 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</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>1992</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From all indications, the different incidents of violence in Ali Kazaure were both instigated and sustained by external forces. Although residents of the area also contributed, the violence could have been managed and possibly mitigated before it got out of hand if not for the “bad people from these other areas that kept attacking,” according to a resident who was part of the joint patrols in 2001 and 2008. Several other residents also emphasise the role of external armed groups in fuelling violence in the area.84 Through alliances with co-ethnics in the frontier, politicians and local criminals from the adjoining segregated settlements found it easy to infiltrate and even invade whenever violence erupted.85 The boundaries Ali Kazaure shares with adjacent settlements make it easy for external groups to sneak in and out with the tacit support of their co-ethnics within.

**Cross-Validating with Other Ethnically Mixed Areas**

Juxtaposing official reports on incidents of riots, hospital records of victims, and interviews with riot participants, survivors, and eyewitnesses gives us a fair idea of spread and levels of violence across the neighbourhoods of Jos. Table 4.3 shows the recurrence and persistence of violence across five ethnically mixed neighbourhoods. The frontier settlement of Ali Kazaure is among the most violent areas of Jos. Along with Congo-Russia and Nasarawa Gwong – ethnically mixed
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84 Interview with residents, 13 March 2017.
85 Interview with politician, 13 February 2017.
areas that are similarly sandwiched between segregated settlements – it experienced major violence during all three episodes ethnic riots.

Table 4.3: Recurrence and Persistence of Violence across Ethnically Mixed Neighbourhoods
* MV = major violence NV = no violence; SV = sporadic violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Location of neighbourhorod</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ali Kazaure</td>
<td>Sandwiched</td>
<td>MV</td>
<td>MV</td>
<td>MV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo-Russia</td>
<td>Sandwiched</td>
<td>MV</td>
<td>MV</td>
<td>MV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farin Gada</td>
<td>Not sandwiched</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>SV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Gwong</td>
<td>Sandwiched</td>
<td>MV</td>
<td>MV</td>
<td>MV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mister Ali</td>
<td>Not sandwiched</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>SV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To further allay possible concerns that these claims were spurious, we crosschecked how dynamics played out in other ethnically mixed settlements. The two goals here were to check whether ethnically mixed areas that fit the profile of the frontier also experienced the same level of violence as Ali Kazuare and, conversely, that other ethnically mixed that are not frontiers did not experience similar levels of violence.

The frontier areas of Nasarawa Gwon and Congo-Russia show patterns of violence similar to those experienced in Ali Kazaure. To start with, these neighbourhoods, not unlike Ali Kazuare, experienced major incidents of violence in all three riot episodes. In all of them, Christian and Muslim residents had peace pacts and these arrangements prevented violence at some initial point, but later collapsed largely due to infiltrations by external groups. In our interviews with residents of Dutse Uku in Nasarawa Gwong, Christian residents blamed Muslims for allowing Muslim fighters from Yan Shanu and Filin Ball to enter the settlement. Muslims claimed the Christians first gave way to mobs of Christian fighters from Tina Junction and Angwan Rukuba.86 Figure 4.3 shows how fighters marched into

86 Interviews with residents of Dutse Uku, 13 March 2017.
Nasarawa Gwong from the surrounding areas. Congo-Russia also attracted large numbers of external fighters. Mobs of Muslims marched from Bauchi Road, Filin Ball, and Duala while many Christians came from Angwan Rukuba and parts of Dogon Dutse.  

Figure 4.3: Directions of movement by fighters from Angwan Rukuba to Nasarawa Gwong (Source: created by author).

The second category of neighbourhoods in the crosschecking process includes mixed neighbourhoods that are not sandwiched between segregated areas. Farin Gada and Mister Ali fall in this group. These areas are either bordered by other mixed settlements or physical (natural and artificial) boundaries in the form of main roads and open spaces. Comparatively, these neighbourhoods experienced far less violence than Ali Kazaure or any of the other frontier areas. Apart from looting and destruction around the market area, Farin Gada only experienced isolated attacks in 2008, which were quickly contained. There was also some low-level violence in 2010, but nothing compared to what happened in the frontiers. Mister Ali experienced a lot of tension and low-level violence in 2010, but this was as far
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87 Interviews with residents of Congo-Russia, 14 March 2017.
88 Interviews in Farin Gada, 31 March 2016.
as the riots affected the area. Neither settlement ridded itself of internal rancour. Many residents wanted to fight, but intergroup dialogues and joint patrols successfully prevented would-be troublemakers from plunging the area into chaos. However, more crucial to explaining the relative calm that reigned in these areas while other parts of the city burned was the absence of external influence because of their location.

Conclusion
This article explored the dynamics of ethnic conflict in one of the most violent areas of Jos. In doing so, we demonstrated that besides its ethnic composition, a neighbourhood’s location in relation to adjacent settlements is crucial for understanding why violence persists more in some areas. The article used the metaphor of the frontier to explain why Ali Kazaure, an ethnically mixed neighbourhood sandwiched between segregated rivalling Christian and Muslim settlements, experienced more recurrent and persistent violence than others. This concluding section reiterates some essential aspects of the argument, highlights their academic and practical relevance, and suggests possible directions for further study.

We found ethnically mixed areas located between rivalling segregated settlements to be particularly violence-prone not only because they are mixed, but also because rival groups in the adjoining segregated settlements compete to dominate the area, generally considered a “no man’s land” waiting to be conquered. This insight can contribute to more effective responses to ethnic violence. On the basis of this understanding, authorities can predict where violence is likely to occur and act proactively.

Another key contribution of the article lies in showing that different sociospatial contexts – ethnic strongholds and frontiers – contribute differentially in the production of violence. Neither, arguably, plays a lesser role. Behaviour patterns of groups differ in the two settings, but it is difficult for violence to be instigated – much less sustained – without actors from the two contexts playing

89 Interview with resident in Mister Ali, 30 March 2016.
90 Interviews with vigilante in Mister Ali, 30 March 2016.
complementary roles. In the contested political landscape of Jos, the segregated settlements were conducive to forging ethnic solidarity and marshalling foot soldiers. The ethnic strongholds of Jos proved to be territories where ethnic egotism thrives and both formal and quotidian social networks fuse into fronts for pushing ethnic interests, both politically and violently. Complementarily, the frontier was a setting for whetting rivalry and contestations, and consequently became the battleground.

We also observed that although joint patrols by Christian and Muslim residents in some ethnically mixed parts of Nasarawa Gwong such as Duala and Angwan Keke initially helped keep the peace, these arrangements could not stand the heat when the violence escalated. The sustainability of joint patrols and other ad hoc civilian violence prevention efforts depends on the intensity of violence, with the success rate diminishing as violence intensifies. As such, civilian-violence prevention networks determine nonviolence only circumstantially. Neighbourhood location and shared boundaries are more permanent operating factors that explain vulnerability to violence in a more fundamental sense.

This article is an initial step in exploring how the ethnic composition of a neighbourhood, combined with its location in relation to adjoining areas of similar or dissimilar ethnic composition, affects its vulnerability to violence. We used the metaphor of the frontier to explain why ethnically mixed areas sandwiched between rivalling segregated areas experience more recurrent and persistent violence. To better understand riots at the frontier, we also need to examine the micro-level mechanics of violent networks. This would require looking at trans-neighbourhood social networks, their spatial patterns, and implications for the mobility of armed networks within and across neighbourhoods during riots.
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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.

Keywords: mobile interviewing, ethnic riots, violent conflict, Jos, Nigeria

* 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).
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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 ethically mixed areas, especially those between rivalling segregated settlements; and armed mobs prefer using alleys 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 KIIIs 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 recorded. 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 rivaling 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. One resident recalled a few instances of residents using fire arms. 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.

Figure 5.2: Directions of movement by fighters from Angwan Rogo to Ali Kazuare (Source: created by author).

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
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forward and engage the other in close combat. In these instances, swords, machetes and clubs were used.\footnote{Interview with residents, 18.02.17.} 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.\footnote{Ibid.} 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.\footnote{Discussions with residents, 17.02.17.} 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.\footnote{Discussions with residents, 18.02.17.}

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.\footnote{Discussions with residents, 15-17.02.17.}

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.\footnote{Discussions with residents, 17.02.17.} Residents attributed the high number on the second day to killings by MOPO.\footnote{Discussions with residents, 18.02.17.} Years later, the main street of Ali Kazaure still has ruins of burnt buildings, dwarfed by overgrown grass. This is
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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.  

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
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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.\footnote{Interview with riot participant, 20.02.17.}

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.\footnote{Ibid.}

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.\footnote{Mobile interview, 20.02.17.}

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
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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 cordonning 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
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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. Smoke clouds filled the air as residents mounted barricades and burnt tyres to keep intruders from entering their streets. 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.

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. 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. 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
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came in large numbers, ‘shooting, hacking and burning anything that stood on their way’.\textsuperscript{115}

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.\textsuperscript{116} 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,\textsuperscript{117} 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

\textsuperscript{115} Interview with resident, 22.02.17.
\textsuperscript{116} Discussions with residents, 08.06.16.
\textsuperscript{117} Discussions with residents, 23.02.17.
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.\textsuperscript{118} 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.

\begin{center}
Table 5.3: Points of mobilisation in segregated and mixed neighbourhoods
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textsuperscript{118} Interviews with residents, 17.02.17.
\end{center}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Number of points of mobilisation/gathering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segregated (Angwan Rogo)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed (Nasarawa Gwong)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Shana, 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 kilometer 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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CHAPTER SIX
Conclusion

Introduction

A series of large-scale Christian-Muslim clashes ravaged the central Nigerian city of Jos, killing over 5,000 people between 2001 and 2010. Scholars have to a significant extent already analysed the underlying causes of ethnic conflict and violence in Jos (see Best, 2001, 2007; Danfulani and Fwatshak, 2002; Higazi, 2007, 11; Ostien, 2009; Krause, 2011). More recently, however, an emergent strand of Jos-centred literature has begun unravelling the factors that shaped the spatial spread of violence across the neighbourhoods of the city (Scacco, 2012, 2014; Bunte and Vinson, 2016; Nyam and Ayuba, 2016; Krause, 2017). This growing interest in the spatial dimension of violence follows research traditions in other violent cities around the world (see Calame and Charlesworth, 2011; Jarman and O'Halloran, 2001; Varshney, 2001; Wilkinson, 2006; Kaufmann, 1996; Berenschot, 2011). Scholars in this subfield generally emphasise ethnic composition as one of the preeminent factors to affect a locality's vulnerability to incidents of violence (Weidmann and Salehyan, 2013). Views, however, differ on how the two variables are interrelated. One set of experts argues that ethnic segregation promotes violence by fostering in-group solidarity, out-group resentment and reducing the costs of intragroup communication and mobilisation for violence (Boal 1972; Cunningham & Gregor 2014). A second perspective contradicts this and submits that ethnically mixed localities are more prone to violence because contact between members of rival groups can engender competition, friction and, often, violent confrontation (Kaufmann, 1996). Empirical evidence has been conflicting, supporting the first position in some instances and the second in others (see Weidmann and Salehyan, 2013). Moreover, Jos’ neighbourhoods – some of which are segregated and some of which are mixed –
reveal levels and patterns of violence for which existing models do not provide adequate answers. Contrary to these views’ rather determinist stance, official records show that ethnically segregated and mixed neighbourhoods in Jos have both had their share of violence. The takeaway, thus, is that ethnic composition, alone, is not enough to explain violence and non-violence. Another source of bafflement, moreover, is that while some mixed neighbourhoods have become battlegrounds for recurrent violence, other areas characterised by similar ethnic diversity have stayed non-violent (see Krause, 2017).

This dissertation began with observations about the lack of clarity and consensus on how ethnic composition and violence interrelate. It then went on to trace that ambivalence to three oversights in the literature, namely: 1) a focus on a neighbourhood’s ethnic composition while not paying adequate attention to its location and the ethnic composition of adjoining areas; 2) a disregard for the shared boundaries of neighbourhoods and the roads, alleys and other demarcations that separate or link them; and 3) a neglect of the mobile nature of armed mobs, which causes a conflation of their origins with the destinations of their violent events. In an effort to fill in these gaps, the following overarching question guided this study: how does a neighbourhood’s ethnic composition in combination with its location shape the spread, patterns and recurrence of ethnic violence within and across different neighbourhood settings in Jos? This was broken down into the following sub-questions: what is the interrelation between neighbourhood ethnic composition and location and violence’s spread and patterns? How does a neighbourhood’s ethnic composition in combination with its location affect violence’s spread and recurrence? How does a neighbourhood’s ethnic composition in combination with its location affect mobilisation and mobility of armed mobs within and across neighbourhood boundaries? In addressing these questions, the dissertation argued that the ethnic composition of a neighbourhood is not enough to explain its vulnerability to violence; rather, the neighbourhood’s location and adjacency to surrounding areas of similar or dissimilar ethnic composition and their shared boundaries also affect its susceptibility to violence.

This conclusion chapter highlights the dissertation’s key findings, academic and practical implications, limitations and possible directions for further enquiry.

**Key findings**

Various crucial findings emerged from the study. Following chapter 1’s introduction, chapter 2 revealed how territoriality in particular Jos neighbourhoods is rooted in the social and political history of the city. It uncovered how the colonial administration’s segregationist urban policy helped construct competing ethnic categories that became attached to certain parts of the city. Apart from creating rival social categories and engendering territoriality, spatially separating groups on the basis of ethnic differentiation by the colonialists necessitated the creation of chieftaincies and administrative systems that were conflictive. The chapter expounded on how contestations over city ownership played out within neighbourhoods and how rival groups selectively appropriated aspects of Jos’ spatial history to bolster their own ownership claims. Finally, it demonstrated the role of ethnic and neighbourhood networks in forging solidarity and mobilising for active conflict, especially in segregated areas.

Building on chapter 2’s observations of the premises of ethnic competition, divisions and territoriality, chapter 3 showed how the neighbourhoods of Jos are all fragments of a single sociospatial mosaic, with shared boundaries and multifarious crisscrossing social networks. This approach departs from the, by now, traditional conception of neighbourhoods as spatial islands. The chapter examined two distinct neighbourhood settings in order to explain group dynamics and violence’s spread and patterns: namely, strongholds and frontiers. The stronghold is an ethnically segregated locality that shares boundaries with other similarly segregated settlements or is set apart by main roads or other physical barriers. However, it also shares a portion of its boundaries with an ethnically mixed area. The stronghold is comparable to what Doherty and Poole (1997: 522) described as ‘ethnic heartlands’ in Belfast’s contested landscape. The frontier is an ethnically mixed area that is located between rivalling segregated settlements and is also characterised by crosscutting social ties and spatial practices. Group dynamics also help differentiate strongholds and frontiers. The stronghold is characterised by
social networks that rank high on ethnic solidarity and capacity for collective action. The frontier is characterised by groups that are divided along ethnic lines and exhibit less capacity for collective action.

This chapter also traced the processes underpinning the emergence and development of strongholds and frontiers. It focused on how political developments and events at higher spatial and administrative scales (national, state and city) affected ethnic composition and social networks within and across neighbourhoods. It observed that the fall in oil revenue and the SAP of the 1980s shocked the Nigerian economy, leading to scarcity of resources, greater group competition and a surge in ethnic mobilisation. It was then that neighbourhood associations in Jos started undergoing processes of ethnicisation. Further, the chapter detailed how 1994’s low-level violence elsewhere in the city contributed to polarising group relations between Christians and Muslims in Angwan Rogo. Against this background, it described how the political appointment of a Hausa man as coordinator of a federal agency increased cohesiveness and solidarity in the ethnically segregated neighbourhood of Angwan Rogo but polarised groups in mixed Ali Kazaure. Furthermore, apart from intensifying internal rivalries, these events encouraged rival groups in the adjoining segregated areas to invade and dominate Ali Kazaure. These observations revealed how struggles to expand territorial and political dominance usually reach a crescendo during campaigns and elections.

Chapter 4 showed how a neighbourhood’s ethnic composition in combination with its location affects its vulnerability to violence. The location of ethnically mixed Ali Kazaure between Christian Apata and Muslim Angwan Rogo made it an opportune battleground, experiencing more incidents of violence than other ethnically mixed areas that are not similarly located. A close examination of group dynamics within the neighbourhood revealed that the area was particularly vulnerable to violence because, apart from being fraught with internal rivalries, it was consistently pressurised by struggles between rivalling ethno-political networks in the adjoining segregated areas. Each of the rival groups in the adjoining areas was bent on extending the frontiers of its political and territorial dominance. This fierce competition was displayed during elections. Ali Kazaure was considered a
'no man’s land’ and a prize to be taken by the stronger. Some of the polling units there proved to be the most contested during elections. The ethno-political networks contained criminals and gangs, who formed part of the armed mobs. These networks are analogous to Brass’ (2004) ‘riot systems’ in Meerut and Berenschot’s (2011) ‘patronage networks’ in Ahmedabad; both scholars saw riots as opportunities for conquering territory through killing and displacing the rival group.

Building on this, chapter 5 demonstrated that armed mobs are likelier to originate in strongholds, though ethnically mixed areas, especially when sandwiched between rivalling segregated areas, are more susceptible to violence. The ethnic concentration in the stronghold of Angwan Rogo translated to both cognitive and spatial proximity, which facilitated communication and movement, so residents and potential fighters could find their way to a congregation point in times of riots. In all the incidents of violence, residents of strongholds (Angwan Rogo and Angwan Rukuba) easily navigated from their homes to the main streets of these neighbourhoods; there they could meet other residents, get information about the security situation and, for some, physically participate in response. Even though most of the residents did not participate in the riots, it was from these crowds that armed mobs emerged, usually led and coordinated by a handful of local criminals and political activists. This is unlike what occurred in the ethnically mixed parts of Nasarawa Gwong and Ali Kazaure, where Christian and Muslim residences were interspersed. Residents could not move far from their homes for fear of encountering a rival just down the street or at the next turn. Moreover, physical barricades were mounted on streets and sections of these areas to prevent passage. This made movements difficult, so rather than a unified force, there were only small bands of armed men, who mostly stayed in their immediate vicinity. Apart from being unable to attack, the frontiers were thus, unlike the strongholds, unable to build lay armies formidable enough to thwart incursions.

As chapter 4 had noted, the frontier neighbourhood of Ali Kazaure experienced some form of violence in all three major episodes analysed within the study period. This indicates a high susceptibility to violence, notably when compared to most other areas that experienced only one or two incidents. A close
examination of group dynamics in the neighbourhood explained why this was so. Apart from being fraught with internal rivalries, Ali Kazaure was under pressure from struggles between rivalling ethno-political networks in the adjoining segregated neighbourhoods of Angwan Rogo and Apata, and they were bent on extending the frontiers of their political and territorial dominance farther into the area.

Chapter 5 additionally showed how the peace-maintenance efforts of joint patrols comprising Christians and Muslims were put to test in the frontier when riots erupted. Highlighting the importance of location, it found that such joint patrols were less likely to be effective in ethnically mixed areas sandwiched between segregated ones due to the infiltration pressures coming from two ends. Though the civilian violence prevention networks in Ali Kazaure and parts of Nasarawa Gwong initially succeeded in maintaining order, they eventually collapsed as violence escalated and pressure by external forces mounted. Conversely, civilian joint patrols proved more effective in ethnically mixed areas not located between rivalling segregated ones, such as Farin Gada and Mister Ali areas.

Further, the chapter uncovered some roots of the ambivalence surrounding the interrelation between ethnic composition and the spread of collective violence. For one, it is the tendency to overlook the mobile nature of armed mobs, thereby conflating their origins with the destinations of their violent events. Tracing the footsteps of armed mobs from the points at which they mobilised, along the routes they marched to the sites of past confrontations revealed that their origins and destinations were often quite some distance apart. Parts of the armed mobs who perpetrated violence in Ali Kazaure had their origins outside the neighbourhood, in the strongholds of Angwan Rogo and Apata. This confirmed one of the fundamental propositions of the dissertation: that location and adjacency influence whether a neighbourhood is vulnerable to violence. Another important revelation that came from tracing these footsteps was armed mobs’ penchant for narrow and unpaved back routes that are inaccessible to security forces. Fighters marching from Angwan Rogo to Ali Kazaure used very narrow alleys that were impossible for military or police vehicles to track. Similarly, fighters from the stronghold of Angwan Rukuba heading into Nasarawa Gwong used the complex network of alleys that
link the areas. Contiguous boundaries and a network of alleys between the Christian stronghold of Apata and Ali Kazaure facilitated the movement of armed mobs from the former into the latter. Armed mobs used main roads only when they had no alternative whatsoever.

These chapters collectively clarified that ethnic composition, alone, cannot explain variations in the spread of violence across neighbourhoods in a divided city. In addition to a neighbourhood’s ethnic composition, its location and adjacency to areas of similar or dissimilar ethnic composition are crucial for explaining violence’s spread and recurrence across demographically identical neighbourhoods. Chapter 5 showed that apart from location, the shared boundaries of neighbourhoods – in terms of contiguity and the roads, alleys and other demarcations that link or separate them – contribute to facilitating or hindering armed mobs’ mobilisation and mobility, thereby affecting spread of violence.

**Academic implications**

The findings highlighted thus far have academic implications. To begin with, rather than treating segregated and mixed neighbourhoods as spatial islands in explaining their vulnerability to violence, this dissertation demonstrated the importance of considering the ethnic composition of adjoining areas and their shared boundaries, which also account for violence’s spread and patterns. Moving away from segregated/mixed and violent/nonviolent dichotomies, as reflected in contact and conflict theories, the study distinguished between strongholds and frontiers and found that both contributed to the dynamics of ethnic violence. By so categorising neighbourhoods and tracing the processes underpinning their emergence and development, the study provided a conceptual framework for systematically investigating, understanding and explaining patterns of violence in the divided city. Jarman and O'Halloran’s (2001) similarly used neighbourhood location to categorise Belfast’s interface areas into enclaves, splits and buffer zones. Boal (2002) also used the concept of the frontier to describe Belfast’s violence-torn landscape. Rather than conceiving violence as completely chaotic, haphazard and decoupled from its sociospatial context, the concepts of stronghold
and frontier emphasised how patterns of violence recursively interrelate with the demographic and physical environment in which they occur. These distinct sociospatial settings are thus both a consequence and a predicator of particular social networks and forms of violence. For example, the stronghold of Angwan Rogo was dominated by intra-ethnic armed networks, and violence mostly took the form of asymmetric attacks analogous to pogroms and massacres. Berenschot (2011a, 2011b) explained how conditions of poverty, deprivation and lack of resource access can encourage patronage systems, whereby residents support politicians in exchange for favours mediated through local criminals. These patronage networks are not unlike Brass’ (2004) riot system, essentially a network of politicians, government officials and local criminals who instigate, coordinate and sustain riots. Significantly, this dissertation has drawn attention to how a neighbourhood’s ethnic composition and location can contribute to shaping the development and patterns of such networks’ behaviour. Insights from classical scholars such as Foucault (1980), Goffman (1969, 1971) and Giddens (1984) emphasise the fundamentality of spaces and arenas in shaping social reproduction and human agency.

Some research has suggested that armed networks instigating violence are likelier to originate from strongholds. According to Tilly (2000: 144), the mobilisation of people into mobs is more feasible in ‘safe areas’ where ‘contentious claim making gains protection from routine surveillance and repression’ and individuals freely engage in ‘speech-making that would have brought rapid incarceration to their participants elsewhere in the metropolis’. In this way, the stronghold provides an opportunity for local politicians and activists to openly present themselves as champions of ethnic agendas without risking backlash from the rival group or regulatory authorities. Fuelling dissent is more feasible in these settings since it is easier to implement a reward and punishment system that can sustain the struggle (Weidmann, 2009: 7). Moreover, the spatial proximity that characterises these settings means co-ethnics can freely engage in the cost-effective communication needed for facilitating and coordinating conflict action (Lichbach, 1995). Toft (2005) also found that group concentration, which is a
feature of segregation, provides the political, economic and social networks that groups need to initiate and sustain fighting.

While the literature does acknowledge the role of these networks in the dispensation of violence, their mobile nature is conspicuously missing from most analyses. That perpetrators’ movement during riots contributes to violence’s spread may seem quite obvious, but it has escaped systematic scrutiny. Even if mobility is implicitly acknowledged (see e.g. Brass, 2004; Berenschot, 2011; Krause, 2017), it remains left out from examinations of the spatial distribution of violent events. Acknowledging fighters’ mobility and the factors that shape their movement helps explain why neighbourhoods whose internal dynamics do not necessarily make them violence-prone can nonetheless be plunged into violence by invaders. Tilly (2000: 140) posited that ‘costs and benefits that are spatially distributed and mediated by accessibility of one location to another strongly affect the character of contention, especially when movement of information, resources, or persons from place to place enter directly into the action’. Indeed, the very character of violent action within a locality depends on how accessible it is to armed mobs. Its accessibility, in turn, depends on its adjacency to surrounding areas and the nature of their shared boundaries. As exemplified in chapters 4 and 5, a significant portion of the violence in the ethnically mixed areas of Ali Kazaure and Nasarawa Gwong was by mobile armed mobs from the surrounding areas. They invaded the area and engaged in violence presumably to defend co-ethnics and extend the frontiers of their territorial and political dominance.

Focusing on spatial and temporal dimensions in examining neighbourhood dynamics proved an adept way to bridge structural factors signposted in the literature with meso- and micro-level dynamics at the neighbourhood level. At the same time, it emphasised the dynamism of the entire process. This contrasted with the snapshot view – a frozen image rather than a moving picture – that is the frequent outcome of the cross-sectional approach used in most studies on the spatial patterns of violence. Instead, a view emerged to show how ethnic composition, social networks and neighbourhood location interact over time. By uncovering how Angwan Rogo progressively became more segregated, the study shed light on how its social networks became increasingly intra-ethnic. It also
showed how the social networks that crisscrossed its shared boundaries with the ethnically mixed Ali Kazaure became intra-ethnic. Further, it found that as group relations deteriorated in Nasarawa Gwong, residents’ associations and vigilantes progressively became decentralised; this led to the formation of parallel networks emerging along ethnic lines and cross-boundary alliances with groups in the adjoining segregated areas.

The central proposition of this dissertation is that the spread of violence is contingent on a neighbourhood’s ethnic composition in combination with its location and how this facilitates or hinders the mobility of armed mobs within and across neighbourhoods. This idea, however, should not be confused with the diffusion theory of ethnic violence (see Lobell and Mauceri, 2004; Myers, 2000). Diffusion theorists emphasise imitation as the primary agent of violence’s spread. That is, groups in one country, region or neighbourhood instigate violence in their own setting because a similar group in another setting had done the same (Pitcher, Hamblin and Miller, 1978). The argument in this dissertation departs from this model, instead emphasising how the location of ethnically mixed areas between rivaling segregated localities make them sites of political and territorial contestations. Brought to light, thus, is the role of cross-boundary violent networks that originate from segregated areas but migrate to instigate violence in ethnically mixed neighbourhoods, often with active participation by their co-ethnics who live there. That said, diffusion remains important in explaining the spread of violence. In their study of xenophobic violence in Germany, Braun and Koopmans (2009: 111) found that social similarity explained diffusion of extreme-right violence, arguing that ‘the effect of geographical distance that is found in many diffusion studies may actually be caused not by geographical proximity as such, but by the fact that proximate areas tend to be socially similar’. Some aspects of the 2001 violence in Jos were consistent with this social similarity hypothesis. In spite of distance, most segregated settlements in Jos experienced similar patterns of violence, where the dominant groups orchestrated a series of pogrom-like attacks on the minority group (Higazi, 2007). The striking similarity in how the attacks were coordinated suggests imitation might have played a role.
This study also contributed to discourse on the interrelation between social capital and ethnic violence. From one perspective, violence is taken as an explanatory factor and social capital as the outcome. A second perspective swaps this arrangement, with social capital as an explanatory factor and violence as the outcome. Literature on the divided city has detailed the devastating effects of ethnic violence on intergroup relations and social capital. Alongside physical destruction, social scientists emphasise ethnic violence’s negative effects on the spatiality and social character of city (Shirlow and Murtagh, 2006). The litany of tangible and intangible woes that characterises the violence-ridden urban context is encapsulated in the notion of the divided city (see Bollens, 1998). In this type of city, contestations between ethnic identities or ideological rivals have assumed violent dimensions, with visible consequences for the city’s social and physical profile (Allegra, Casaglia and Rokem, 2012). Populations are segregated along ethnic or ideological lines, residential quarters become territorialised and the spatial practices of residents are restricted by fear or experience of actual violence (Bollens, 2000; Boal, 1996). The general conclusion is that these negative outcomes hurt and destroy social cohesion and erode social capital in the city and, for that matter, any other spatial unit (Fearon, Humphreys and Weinstein, 2009).

Conversely, the nature and dynamics of social capital can also serve as a window into why and how violence happens in particular sociospatial settings. One argument holds that whether a spatial unit is violence-prone or not depends on whether its civic networks’ members are ethnically homogenous or heterogeneous. In a comparative study of three violence-prone cities and three relatively non-violent cities in India, Varshney (2001) found that spatial contexts dominated by intra-ethnic civic networks are likelier to experience ethnic riots than those dominated by inter-ethnic networks. According to this view, crosscutting networks serve the purpose of dissipating rumours, incentivising mutual benefit through interethnic cooperation and ultimately forging collaborative fronts for violence prevention (Varshney, 2001). The distinction between intra-ethnic and inter-ethnic civic networks is consistent with ‘bonding’ and ‘bridging’ types of social capital (see Leonard, 2004). Varshney (2001) posited that bonding promotes conflict and increases the likelihood of violence, whereas bridging dissipates distrust and

While the consequences of violence on the cityscape and the social fabric that binds it are admittedly far-reaching and pervasive, city-level studies tend to paint a rather unvarying portrait that ignores crucial nuances and context-specific details. Shifting the focus to a lower spatial scale – the neighbourhood – this dissertation presented a far more complex picture. It showed how ethnic violence’s effects on spatial and social dimensions are much more multifarious, with negative as well as positive effects on social cohesion and social capital. Specifically, it demonstrated that the implications of ethnic violence for social networks in segregated and mixed neighbourhoods are differential and portend varied, often paradoxical, consequences in different settings. In the face of escalating violence, bonding social capital increases while bridging social capital collapses. This means segregated settlements develop more social efficacy, while diverse ones become more polarised. In both contexts, vertical social capital is enhanced. Ultimately, rather than destroying social cohesion and social capital, ethnic violence transforms them in various ways.

**Practical implications**

Ordering neighbourhoods into strongholds and frontiers and explaining how patterns of violence vary in the two settings has concrete significance for responding to violence and peace-building efforts in a divided city. It calls for authorities to pay special attention to the location of neighbourhoods in relation to adjoining neighbourhoods and to marshal responses that consider the group solidarity in the stronghold and the multilevel competition and contestations in the frontier. The sense of solidarity that pervades the stronghold should be a major consideration. Neighbourhood leaders play a key role in the dissemination of information when riots erupt. These established channels of communication can
serve peaceful purposes. The same solidarity that troublemakers hijack for violent ends can be leveraged to promote nonviolence as a viable alternative for responding to conflict. The very individuals who lead riots could be identified and conscripted for peace campaigns.

Correspondingly, authorities must also consider the peculiarity of group dynamics in the frontier. While working with a handful of neighbourhood leaders and influential individuals can go a long way in the stronghold, the frontier requires a more diffused approach that focuses on a cross-section of residents living in different parts of the neighbourhood. Peaceworkers must navigate the complex and often parallel channels of communication, using them to reach as many residents as possible. Furthermore, although a frontier is the site of recurrent violence, efforts at managing it must look beyond a neighbourhood’s boundaries. The fact that many of the fighters who perpetrate violence in the frontier actually come from nearby strongholds implies that besides resolving internal rivalries, it is imperative to address struggles and competition between rivalling groups in the adjoining strongholds. Peace-building efforts should thus target not only the neighbourhood where violence occurred, but also areas where armed mobs originated.

To reiterate, the nature of the shared boundaries shapes the mobility of armed mobs and, consequently, the spread of violence within and across neighbourhoods. It is easier for authorities to police neighbourhood boundaries that are separated by barriers, such as arterial roads or other street infrastructure. Monitoring movements of armed mobs who used narrow and inaccessible alleys between contiguously connected neighbourhoods is another story. Logically, security measures, such as curfews, are more enforceable where there is organised street infrastructure rather than a network of alleys and footpaths that are unfamiliar and inaccessible to outsiders and security forces.

Limitations and biases
Although the study accomplished its central objectives, some limitations and biases proved unavoidable. To start with, the absence of census data at the neighbourhood level meant the lack of official neighbourhood population counts.
Size is a crucial variable in explaining propensity for violence. A way around this hurdle was drawing estimates based on information from neighbourhood leaders, which were cross-checked with a cross-section of residents in instances of seemingly preposterous claims. The study used ethnic composition of a primary school as a proxy for ethnic composition of the neighbourhood in which it was located. Helpful as this was, a group could have, simply by chance, been overrepresented or underrepresented within a school or a class, although these chance possibilities tend to have a way of balancing each other out. When some neighbourhoods had no public schools or student records were unavailable, rough estimates of ethnic composition were based on discussions with neighbourhood leaders in these areas.

Police records can also have biases. There are widespread allegations that the religion of the police commissioner in Jos at any given time tends to influence police engagement and how events are interpreted and recorded. When a Muslim holds the role, attacks against Muslim neighbourhoods allegedly receive more attention, and when a Christian holds the role attacks against Christian neighbourhoods allegedly receive more attention. Generally speaking, Muslims in Jos are very sceptical and suspicious of the police. However, since this study was more interested in violence’s spread than details about its aggressors and victims, police bias may not have affected the findings in a major way.

Relying on interviews also came with a few concerns. One was the extent to which memory can be trusted. Since some of the events go back a few decades, their recounted details may have been blurred by the passage of time, trauma, repeated discussions and hearing the stories of others. Additionally, in relating highly politicised events, it is expected that respondents tend to perceive and convey accounts in a way that portrays them as victims and the other as the aggressor.

To minimise the effects of limitations and biases on the outcome of the study, two measures were taken. The first step involved a system of triangulating information from various sources by regularly comparing findings against archival material and other studies. This included an extensive review of official reports, memorandums and existing academic sources. The second step was a robust
‘ground truthing’ process that involved extensive informal discussions with a sizeable cross-section of residents that were randomly selected in each of the neighbourhoods. A few ‘ground truthing’ group discussions were also held especially in respect to neighbourhood boundaries, population size and ethnic composition. While these steps helped minimise the effects of these limitations and biases, they were not foolproof, and that should be kept in mind when reflecting on the study’s findings and conclusions.

**Final remarks and directions for further study**

Above all, it would be useful to subject the two main concepts the study inductively built around - ethnic strongholds and frontiers – to statistical tests and see how the different propositions hold up in other cities. Something that can be tested is whether mixed neighbourhoods sandwiched between segregated settlements are indeed more vulnerable to violence than mixed areas not similarly located. It would also deepen our understanding to compare the proliferation of violent networks in segregated areas that border mixed areas and those that border segregated areas.

The concepts – strongholds and frontiers - need refinement in terms of what constitutes their distinctive components and internal dynamics. This study relied on information from neighbourhood leaders and other residents to estimate population size and neighbourhood boundaries, though elsewhere less subjective information could possibly be derived from census tracks and official city plans from population commissions and municipal planning agencies. The extent of the generalisability of the study’s central arguments could be determined in research comparing other neighbourhoods across other cities struggling with similar conflagrations. No doubt, it would be interesting to examine neighbourhoods in the Global North and the Global South, examining how urban environments in different cultural and political contexts behave in the context of ethnic violence.

Another promising direction for study is a more fine-grained ethnography of armed mobs, their constellations and micro-dynamics. Such an academic venture would zoom in on the specific roles that actors – politicians, criminals, ethnic activists and ordinary residents – play in the production of violent outbreaks. It would be worthwhile to unpack these roles and unravel how they all interrelate. In
this same spirit, the study could take a further disaggregated approach to look at possible variations in the manifestation of strongholds and frontiers. It would be useful to develop typologies of these sociospatial configurations and the peculiarities that distinguish one from the other.

Given the available data and the various methodological constraints encountered in the course of the research, this study has been productive, and hopefully convincing, in its stated goals. This dissertation’s aim was to demonstrate that in addition to a neighbourhood’s ethnic composition, its location in relation to adjoining localities of similar or dissimilar ethnic makeup and their shared boundaries can either facilitate or hinder the mobility of armed mobs and consequently contribute to shaping spread and patterns of violence in a divided urban setting. Indeed, understanding the prevailing conditions that cause ordinary neighbourhood settings to morph into strongholds and frontiers – and how these emergent socio-spatial configurations shape violent events – can expand our scope of understanding ethnic violence and how to effectively respond to it. Grasping the finer details of how armed groups mobilise and move in different neighbourhood settings is invaluable for developing context-sensitive strategies to mitigate and even prevent violence.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Discussion guides

Chapter 3 interview guide
The interviews focused on particular events that are widely reported in existing literature as crucial in shaping intergroup dynamics in the build-up to large scale violence in Jos. These events and developments include, the creation of Jos North LGA in 1991; elections of 1991 and the victory of a Hausa at the polls as LGA Chairman; appointment of a Hausa as Secretary of Jos North LGA in 1994 and the resultant violence in April; the return to democratic system, campaigns and victory of indigene as Chairman of Jos North LGA in 1999; the order to stop issuing of indigene certificates to Hausa by newly elected Chairman in 1999; the appointment of coordinator for NAPEP in July 2001; and the violence of September 2001.

Discussions were formulated around four main questions in relation to each of these events:
- What is your experience and the general perception of the event in your neighborhood?
- What are the effects of the event on group relations; What are the effects of the event on social networks?
- What are the effects of the event on the demography of the neighborhood?
- How did you experience violence in the neighborhood?

Chapter 4 discussion guide
- Describe how you experienced violence in your neighbourhood
- Describe the main participants in the violence and where they came from
- Describe how the violence affected your neighbourhood in terms of social networks (inter-ethnic/ intra-ethnic relations, neighbourhood associations etc.).

Chapter 5 discussion guide
Chapter 5 has two sets of discussion points. The first set is in the form of mobile interviews:
Describe how the residents of your neighbourhood responded when they learned about the violence that started at the collation centre;
- Did residents of the neighbourhood gather at a single point or in separate groups at different points?
- Can you estimate the number of different points of gathering?
- Identify the point(s) where the groups gathered.
- Describe the type of people that led the rioters (youth leaders, vigilantes, local criminals, elders or other individuals?)

The second set of discussions involves KIIIs. The KIIIs were organised around the following points of discussion points and questions:
- Describe your neighbourhood in terms of population;
- Describe the neighbourhood in terms of levels of unemployment; describe the neighbourhood in terms of levels of poverty;
- Describe how you understand the violence of 2008 and the conflict in Jos in general
- Describe how the residents association responded when news about violence came in; and describe how other neighbourhood associations responded.

The discussions were open ended with the questions serving only as discussion guides. Each of these points of discussion was complemented with several follow-up queries that sought to dig beyond ritualized narratives that have been rehearsed and told over the years. The duration of the interviews varied with the longest lasting just under 90 minutes and the shortest lasting only 15 minutes.

Appendix B: distribution of respondents based on age and sex

Table 1: Distribution of respondents based on age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age bracket</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 – 28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 – 45</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 – 55</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 – 65</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 – 80</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Distribution based on sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C: Hospital records of victims of violence
Records of victims of violence were collected from four hospitals that received and treated victims of violence within and around the city of Jos from 2001 to 2010 onward. Hospital records on victims of violent clashes include demographic information such as the name, ethnicity, religion and address of victims of violence. It also carries diagnostic information on the nature and severity of injury suffered by a surviving victim of violence, the site of the body where injury was inflicted and weapon used to inflict injury. The four hospitals are:

1. Jos University Teaching Hospital (JUTH)
2. Our Lady of Apostles Hospital (OLA)
3. Plateau Specialist Hospital
4. Bingham University Teaching Hospital (BUTH)
All four hospitals are located within Jos North Local Government Area and were the government designated medical centres where victims of violence were taken for medical attention. The hospitals did not have a central database for victims of violent clashes. Case files were scattered in different wards and some in remote storage facilities where old files were dumped. After several weeks of combing the hospitals, I collected 1129 case files of victims of violent clashes in the first instance. Of the 1129 case files, 21 were not in good condition and therefore not legible so I was left with 1108 case files.

I isolated three episodes of collective violence: September 2001, November 2008 – March 2009 and January 2010 – March 2010. Of the 1108 case files that were both accessible and usable, 220 were from September 2001, 320 from November 2008, 340 from January 2010 and 228 from December 2010 – January 2011. For the breakdown of hospital records, see Tables 1 – 4 below:

### Table 1: Records of victims of violence for September 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Cut/Laceration</th>
<th>Gunshot</th>
<th>Burns</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angwan Rogo</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangare</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rikkos</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasarawa Gwong</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Hostel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Junction</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angwan Rukuba</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo-Russia</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unijos</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogon Dute</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali Kazaure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apata</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miango Junction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>139</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>220</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Records of victims of violence, November – December 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Cut/Laceration</th>
<th>Gunshot</th>
<th>Burns</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angwan Rogo</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angwan Miango</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angwan Rukuba</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi Road</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenta Adamu</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenta Mangoro</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudun Wada (Angwan Hausawa)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>Gunshot</td>
<td>Burn</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangare</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kataklo</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narraguta Village</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo Russia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Junction</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogon Dutse</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farin Gada</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>148</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>320</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Records of victims of violence for January 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Gunshot</th>
<th>Burn</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rikkos</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furaka</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yan Trailer</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angwan Rukuba</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angul D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abattoir</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogon Dutse</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mai Adiko</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel 7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gada Biyu</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenta Mangoro</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudun Wada</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mister Ali</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farin Gada</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasarawa</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>164</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
<td><strong>340</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Records of victims of violence for December 2010 – January 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Gunshot</th>
<th>Burn</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nasarawa Gwong</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angwan Rogo</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mister Ali</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gada Biyu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angwan Rukuba</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angwan Rimi</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangare</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rukuba Road</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudun Wada/ Angwan Miango</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Jos</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>228</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix D: Ethnic composition based on primary school common entrances examination registers**

Table 1: Ethnic composition of Ali Kazaure, 1992 – 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Ethnic composition of Kabong, 1990 - 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Ethnic composition of Angwan Rogo 1990 – 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Ethnic composition of Nasarawa Gwong, 1990 - 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Ethnic composition of Dadin Kowa 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Ethnic composition of Chwel-Nyap/Angwan Rukuba 1990 - 2010
Chapter Four, “Frontier Neighbourhoods in a Violent African City: Explaining Ethnic Conflict’s Spread and Recurrence in Jos, Nigeria” was co-authored with Floris Vermeulen. I conducted the fieldwork and analysis but the development of the central ideas of the paper and preparing it for submission was carried out collaboratively.
Summary

Contestations over indigene rights and political representation have led to large-scale Christian-Muslim clashes in the central Nigerian city of Jos. Over 5,000 people were killed in episodic violence between 2001 and 2010, distinguishing the riots as some of the most atrocious and persistent in Nigeria’s modern history. What are the factors that shaped the spread, patterns and recurrence of violence in the neighbourhoods of Jos? Scholars agree that the ethnic composition of a locality is crucial for explaining its vulnerability to violence. However, views are divided on the exact nature of the interrelation. One group of scholars argues that ethnically segregated areas are more susceptible to violence because segregation engenders in-group solidarity, out-group resentment and eases the communication costs of mobilising for violence. Another perspective runs counter, maintaining that ethnically mixed areas are more violence-prone because they foster friction, competition and confrontation. Empirical evidence is conflicting, supporting one perspective in some instances and suggesting the exact opposite in others. In Jos, both segregated and mixed areas have been associated with noteworthy of violence.

This dissertation proposes that the ambivalence surrounding the interrelation between ethnic composition and violence can partly be traced to three identifiable oversights in the literature: 1) a focus only on a neighbourhood’s ethnic composition without paying adequate attention to its location and the ethnic composition of adjoining areas; 2) a disregard for the shared boundaries of neighbourhoods and the barriers, roads and other demarcations that separate or link them; and 3) a neglect of the mobile nature of armed mobs, thereby conflating the origins of rioters with the destinations of their violent events. The dissertation argues that ethnic composition, alone, is not enough to explain a neighbourhood’s vulnerability to violence; other factors that shape the spread and patterns of violence are a neighbourhood’s location and adjacency to surrounding areas of
similar or dissimilar ethnic composition, their shared boundaries and how these boundaries facilitate or hinder the mobilisation and mobility of armed mobs.

The study is based on ethnographic fieldwork conducted in Jos between September 2015 and July 2017. It relied on a plethora of key informant and mobile interviews, visual documentation and other sources of data not previously explored in Jos, such as primary school registers and hospital records of victims of violence. The dissertation concludes that contrary to the determinism that dominates the ethnic composition-violence discourse, both segregated and mixed neighbourhoods in Jos contributed in the production of violence, albeit differentially. While segregated localities provided a hospitable environment for mobilising armed mobs, the mixed areas, especially those located between segregated settlements, served as the frontiers of collective violence. Moreover, locals-only pedestrian alleys linking neighbourhoods with contiguous boundaries enhanced the mobility of armed mobs, while major highways and other physical barriers hindered it. These findings have both scholarly and practical implications. Academically, they draw attention to the importance of analysing neighbourhood location and the mobility of armed mobs in the study of ethnic violence. Practically, they offer authorities deeper understanding of the mobilisation and mobility of rioters in different sociospatial settings – an insight that is crucial for developing context-sensitive measures to mitigate, and even prevent, violence.
Debat en onvrede over inheemse rechten en politieke vertegenwoordiging hebben geleid tot grootschalige gewelddadige confrontaties tussen christenen en moslims in de centraal gelegen Nigeriaanse stad Jos. Meer dan 5.000 mensen zijn tussen 2001 en 2010 gedood tijdens periodes van geweld. Enkele rellen worden gezien als een van de meest afschuwelijke en hardnekkige in de moderne geschiedenis van Nigeria. Welke factoren hebben geleid tot de verspreiding, patronen en herhaling van geweld in de buurten van Jos? De wetenschap is het erover eens dat de etnische samenstelling van een stad cruciaal is voor het verklaren van etnisch conflict en geweld. De meningen zijn echter verdeeld over de exacte aard van de onderlinge relatie. Sommigen stellen dat etnisch gescheiden gebieden gevoeliger zijn voor geweld, omdat segregatie leidt tot groepssolidariteit, sterke etnische identificatie en lage communicatiekosten voor het mobiliseren van buurtgenoten voor gewelddadige acties. Een ander perspectief is tegengesteld, etnisch gemengde gebieden zouden gevoeliger zijn voor geweld omdat ze eerder leiden tot wrijving, competitie en confrontatie. Bestaand empirisch bewijsmateriaal is tegenstrijdig, het ondersteun in sommige gevallen één perspectief en suggereert precies het tegenovergestelde in andere gevallen. In Jos zijn zowel gesegregeerde als gemengde gebieden geassocieerd met grootschalig geweld.

Dit proefschrift stelt voor dat de tegenstrijdigheid rond de onderlinge relatie tussen etnische samenstelling en geweld deels terug te voeren is op drie onvolkomenheden in de literatuur: 1) een focus op alleen de etnische samenstelling van een wijk zonder voldoende aandacht te besteden aan de locatie en de etnische samenstelling van aangrenzende gebieden; 2) een veronachtzaming van de gedeelde grenzen van buurten en de barrières, wegen en andere demarcaties die ze scheiden of met elkaar verbinden; en 3) een verwaarlozing van het mobiele karakter van gewapende bendes, waarbij de oorsprong van relschoppers wordt vermengd met de bestemmingen van hun gewelddadige gebeurtenissen. Het proefschrift stelt dat etnische samenstelling alleen niet voldoende is om de kwetsbaarheid van een wijk voor geweld te verklaren. Andere factoren die de verspreiding en patronen van geweld bepalen zijn de locatie van een buurt en de nabijheid van omliggende gebieden van vergelijkbare of ongelijke etnische samenstelling, hun gedeelde grenzen en hoe deze grenzen de mobilisatie en mobiliteit van gewapende menigten vergemakkelijken of verhinderen.
Deze studie is gebaseerd op etnografisch veldwerk uitgevoerd in Jos tussen september 2015 en juli 2017. Het baseert zich op een grote hoeveelheid aan belangrijke informanten en mobiele interviews, visuele documentatie en andere bronnen van gegevens die niet eerder in Jos waren onderzocht, zoals basisscholen en ziekenhuisregistraties. Het proefschrift concludeert dat zowel gesegregeerde als gemengde wijken in Jos hebben bijgedragen aan de productie van geweld, zij het op een andere manier. Hoewel gesegregeerde locaties een gastvrije omgeving vormden voor het mobiliseren van gewapende bendes, dienden de gemengde gebieden, vooral die tussen gesegregeerde nederzettingen, als de grenzen van collectief geweld. Bovendien verbeterden de voetgangersstraten van de lokale bevolking met buurten met aangrenzende grenzen de mobiliteit van gewapende bendes, terwijl grote snelwegen en andere fysieke barrières dit belemmeren. Deze bevindingen hebben zowel wetenschappelijke als praktische implicaties. Academisch gezien vestigen zij de aandacht op het belang van het analyseren van de locatie van een wijk en de mobiliteit van gewapende menigten in de studie van etnisch geweld. In de praktijk bieden ze de autoriteiten een dieper inzicht in de mobilisatie en mobiliteit van relschoppers in verschillende sociaal-spatiale omgevingen - een inzicht dat cruciaal is voor het ontwikkelen van contextgevoelige maatregelen om geweld te verminderen en zelfs te voorkomen.