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ABSTRACT

Daily interaction of society members in a given locality depends on their level of acceptance and recognition of one another as distinct and unique individuals. Thus, coexistence of communities in disregard to administrative boundaries, clans or ethnicities is quite instrumental in realizing the goal of development. However, the introduction of devolved units of government in Kenya since 2013 following the promulgation of the 2010 constitution has generated politicized resources and boundary conflicts between different counties. A part from political and economic factors, this phenomenon could be linked to underlying socio-cultural and historical developments exacerbating broad distributive effects. Without objective investigation into these conditions, the relations between counties in Kenya will continue to deteriorate and the principle goal of sustaining national unity through decentralization of power will be difficult to attain. This study examined these developments in light of the conflict over Keroka between the Kitutu and the Nyaribari clans in Kisii and Nyamira County since 2013. The study discussed the settlement of dominant Abagusii clans in Keroka area; traced the
establishment of boundaries in Kenya during the colonial period, with specific implications on the Abagusii in Keroka. Investigated possible factors influencing boundary and resource conflict over Keroka town; examined the impact of boundary conflict on relations of Abagusii communities in Keroka and explained possible intervention mechanisms that could be applied to resolve the conflict between Kisii and Nyamira counties. The study contributes significantly in providing greater understanding of boundary and resource conflicts in Kenya based on examination of historical relations. It informs part of the strategies in managing subsequent inter-county resource and boundary disputes in Kenya; provides policy makers and researchers with reliable sources of reference to evaluate the influence of clanism in undermining the stability of the state. Johan Galtung’s conflict theory seeks to understand the causes, structure and dynamics of conflict, was used to interpret and analyze data. Descriptive survey design was used to guide the study as care was taken to ensure good representation, thus probability and non-probability sampling methods used. A sample size of 100 households randomly selected from both Kitutu and Nyaribari clans in Keroka. To ensure clan representation, 50 individuals from each clan randomly picked, interviewed face-to-face basis using a structured questionnaire. Key informant interviews included two members of county assembly, town clerk and Member of Parliament Kitutu purposively selected. Focus group discussion conducted with nine-community elders randomly selected using focus group discussion guide. The target population involved both adults and youths with special attention on gender representation, thus 63.3% of men and 36.7% of women interviewed and majority of the respondents interviewed were between 40-80 years. To analyze the history of boundary and resource conflict, thematic and content used to develop comprehensive description of data and interviews recorded in tapes transcribed, divided into meaningful analytical units to allow their content analyzed and interpreted. Information from primary (archival records) and Key informant reports and secondary data corroborated for authenticity and validity. An investigation on the causes of this conflict revealed that, until independence the Kitutu and Nyaribari clans in Keroka had no conflicts over boundary, however, tension began after the establishment of county governments, separating Nyamira and Kisii. Competition over control of scarce resources (taxes) and politics were other major causes. Investigation on the consequences of the conflict revealed that there were high possibilities that, politicization of the underlying causes of this latent conflict escalated and transformed the conflict into violent conditions, thus need for urgent interventions.

Background to the Study

According to Blanchard (2010), boundary conflicts are not limited to Africa; they are in the span of the whole world and pose a real threat. Only 60 states out of 194 nations and 71 auxiliary states in the world are free of border disputes while a great number among those 60 countries are islands, which are not all completely free of minor boundary skirmishes within their territorial or international waters. Blanchard,(2010) claims that boundary wrangles constitutes the majority of problems that escalates into feuds.

Nations go to war for several reasons, among them disputes over interstate boundaries and associated competition over resources along frontiers. According to political scientist Jorge, statistical studies illustrated that, “Territorial border disputes have increased the probability of war than other kinds of disputes” (Jorge, 2010).

Nindi (2007), Gledinch (2006) and Guo (2004) claim that resource scarcity generates hostility between neighboring nations, more than any other cause. In essence, rivalry over limited resource, coupled with a population explosion, could escalate a border dispute into an armed conflict. The trio argues that the situation calls for the pragmatic management of resources in areas with border disputes.
Borders have always existed in Africa as a social phenomenon that governs inter-human and inter-communal relationships. African pre-colonial, socio-political structures and institutions were treated as functional categorizations that are equated to present-day borders (Okumu, 2009). Pre-colonial settlement patterns in Africa were concluded through conquest and pacification, have therefore remained symbolic in the history of different ethnic communities. Some of these pre-colonial rivalries have been extended to post-colonial times affecting relations between ethnic communities as different regions where communities continue to express obsessions and exclusive claims over certain real or imagined resources in specific territories.

Shah (2010) and Anyu (2007), however argue that the effects of colonialism specifically the creation of Africa’s state borders have created prolonged border disputes. Anyu claims that a majority of the 103 ethnic and interstate conflicts in Africa were as the result of artificial boundaries drawn by colonial powers during the scramble for Africa in the mid-1880s. Prescott and Triggs (2008) confirm that interstate boundaries in Africa are the prominent reason d'être for conflicts in the region, because their delimitation lacked important information about Africa’s inhabitants and geographical data. These conditions have been escalated by boundary and resource conflicts since borders define control over specific resources within each region (Newman, 1995). Every attempt to revise borders, whether for strategic, national or religious reasons inevitably triggers conflict, due the sensitivity of both sides in regard to the loss of resources (Shimon Peres, 1994: 170-171).

In recent years, negative developments in terms of border-relations have emerged in Kenya, highlighting anew, the relevance of the border question and the measures being taken to address it by the government. According to Okumu (2009), such tensions hold a high potential for escalating inter-county conflicts in Kenya due to growing discoveries or rumors of existence of natural resources on borders or in borderlands. Natural resources on borders or in borderlands have not only enhanced possibilities of inter-county conflicts but have also increased the values of territories that were hitherto, neglected and marginalized by the government (AUBA, 2013).

Internal boundaries were demarcated according to river courses or imprecise, perfunctory or outdated boundary-marking techniques or purely on the ethnic status at that point in time. Sometimes, boundary commission officials demarcated borders by merely following local tracks or marking trees (Okumu, 2009). As a result, the majority of Kenya’s districts, even where there was no territorial dispute, would not be considered to be demarcated. Furthermore, very limited follow-up in terms of the physical demarcation of internal boundaries have been done since the colonial period, thus the creation of new administrative districts and counties in Kenya have been linked to struggles and conflicts over the imprecise nature of the delimitation descriptions particularly in terms of how they affect resource allocations (Yamano and Deininger, 2005).

The absence of visible boundaries on the ground has become a challenge in Kenya. In some cases, it has hampered the coexistence and trade activities that drive Kenya’s demographic and economic dynamism. Furthermore, Kenya being a society characterized by unequal and dysfunctional legal, political, social, environmental and economic structures, inter-county boundary irregularities is increasingly becoming a potential recipe to a deeply embedded structural violence (Yamano and Deininger, 2005).

In much of the country, there also exists tangible competition for access to land and contest over administrative boundaries because of politics of ethnicity, resource control and distribution (Wamwere, 2008). This is because most boundary change procedures established in the colonial period applied particularly to local government units like city or town councils and not to the present county structures. In most cases, legal descriptions pertaining to boundary change between different counties in Kenya remain unclear. The bearing and distance from different sections between districts and today’s counties have not
been published, while bearings and distances for land around county boundaries have not been clearly described (Shipton. 1998). Due to the challenge of unclear inter-county boundaries in Kenya, there have been claims of poor annexations because of extension of boundaries of particular counties outside its previous service area. This includes extending services over the entire boundary of another county and claims over delayed annexations, targeting strategic areas in the adjacent counties. Despite the increasing incidences of boundary disputes, previous studies on this topic have been limited to some specific incidences that are related to large-scale civil strife or politically motivated conflicts. Recent developments, however, shows that inter-county resource conflicts is raising serious concerns a part from rural small-scale land conflicts with relatives, neighbors and or local governments (Deininger & Castagnini, 2005).

Land is a key basis of livelihood for county economic development because Kenya is an agriculture-based economy into the counties, especially depending on the size and tenure of land that is available to a county and her individual citizens (Wakhungu and Nyakuri, 2008). It also follows that the boundaries of a taxing county are a major factor in determining the amount of the counties’ taxes, where such properties will pay those taxes. Furthermore, the geographical extent of the forty-seven county governments in Kenya marks the territorial extent of their specific rights, powers, duties, liabilities and constituencies (Takashi and Deininger, 2005). Moreover, the economic, social and political pillars of Kenya Vision 2030 recognizes land reform, human resources, development, security as well as public sector reforms as key agents of development. Thus in the development agenda of counties in Kenya, land and land based resources, remain the single most important economic factor (Malobe, 2010).

Before the Constitution of Kenya promulgated in August 2010, the country had survived a five decade legacy of underdevelopment where misuse of power and bad governance under a powerful presidency under centralization, raked havoc on the people leading to gross human rights violation (Malobe, 2010). The enactment of the Constitution offered the nation a platform to pursue new levels of economic and democratic development by locating political and economic power at sub-national levels, which are controlled democratically by the people in the clans or villages and not the national or central government. Those included political devolution, administrative, fiscal, service delivery and the opportunity for the participation of the people effectively and directly through their elected representatives at the County Assembly level. However, those reforms have not adequately responded to issues of economic and social democratization in terms of ownership of the factors of production like land and access to better opportunities against a rapidly growing population (Nyamwamu, 2013).

The inability to appreciate the fundamental shift that has taken place in Kenya since the promulgation of the new constitution continues to be a major challenge. Even though, the transitional processes and mechanisms put in place through the ‘Transition Devolved Government Act (2012)’ to facilitate a smooth transition from the centralized to the devolved system were in place. Many issues especially in delimitation of inter-county boundaries have not been resolved in as much as the Intergovernmental Relations Act (2012) outlined the mechanisms and modalities of managing the relations between the national and county governments.

From the current dynamics on devolution in Kenya, it appears that the coming days will be marked by prolonged power and resource tensions that will be driven and shaped by the emerging forces of counter reform. Due to these considerations, inter-county boundary changes can be controversial because of their effects on properties both inside and outside a boundary, especially when such changes may affect taxation leading to misunderstanding due to loss of revenue or a counties’ inability to make a boundary change to access particular contested resources (Nyamwamu, 2013).
Statement of the Problem

The current conflict between the Kitutu and Nyaribari over Keroka remains unclear, however oral information trace their development to the history of settlement and occupation of territories in Gusii land. According to Ochieng (1974), the Abagusii pioneer clans moved into Gusii land around 1820, however from 1850 the Sweta clans that consisted of Kitutu and Nyaribari joined the pioneer clans in Gusii land and settled in Nyagoe forest through Nyangarore settlement scheme from the Kano plains shortly after.

Relations amongst the clan-community on intra-clan conflicts since then have increased much because of different characteristics instigated politically by competitions of resources, institutions, administrative boundaries and after independence 1963. There have not been any notable recent revivals in the Gusii community for the last five decades like in the aftermath of 2013 devolution incidence. While dispute persisted in Kitutu versus Nyaribari over land, social relations between Nyamira and Kisii counties have been tainted over Keroka and their sub-clans, which have no cordial relation henceforth. There is transformation of negativity by politics over a growing town as a resource over a boundary, controlled by the two counties.

History of conflicts over succession developed was traced to between two brothers in Nyagoe forest as Nyakundi and Bari that forced Bari to migrate to South East of Keroka. Nyakundi represented Kitutu while Bari, Nyaribari clans respectively. Conflicts however continued between the two clans over borders and cattle in the pre-colonial period. With the settlement of the British in Gusii land 1907, the colonial government put up a stop to the intermittent conflicts between the two clans. Through boundary determination by constructing the Sotik-Keroka-Kisii highway on the conflicted area. With the creation of the new boundary, a few Nyaribari families were closed into Kitutu territory behind river Gucha and they continued to co-exist amicably until 2013 following the creation of Kisii and Nyamira county governments not even during the district creation.

Before the creation of counties, Keroka was a town council and her revenue collections were managed by Gusii county council and had no conflicts over those resources in Keroka neither a boundary. Now with the creation of County Governments of Kisii and Nyamira 2013, deep-seated latent claims and conflict over the resource and boundary featured over Keroka town at a section of the boundary valued as a resource center to the communities together with those who have became town dwellers as investors. However, this boundary based resource conflict is linked to other deep-rooted causes, which needed investigation within the clans.

Even though this conflict of 2013 had been highlighted in the local newspapers and indicated that governors James Ongwae of Kisii County and John Nyagarama of Nyamira County met on April 12th 2016 in fresh bid to resolve a boundary row, the root causes of that conflict have not been determined and no management intervention has been adopted.

Today Keroka is a major resource of Nyamira County, however Kisii County government has developed interest over the town resources therefore high demand to own or have an equal share of the town revenue collections. Those demands appear to affect the social relations between the Kitutu and Nyaribari clans today, hence need for urgent investigation of the underlying causes and management of this cause of conflict within the sister clans.

No research existed on intra-boundary and resource conflict over Keroka and or between Nyamira of Kitutu and Kisii of Nyaribari clans between 1963-2017 and therefore was need to contribute and add knowledge by studying the subject matter. Intra-clan conflict over towns or urban growth sections on boundaries had not been researched earlier in any other part of Kisii and Nyamira borders’ wrangles and more particularly Keroka area.
Objectives of the Study
The general objective of the study would be, to establish the causes of boundary and resource conflict between the Kisii and Nyamira counties over Keroka town from 1963 to 2017.

Specific Objectives
The study
i. Discussed the historical settlement and relations of Kitutu and Nyaribari in Gusii area from 1850
ii. Traced the establishment of boundaries in Kenya during the colonial period with specific implications on the Kitutu and Nyaribari clans in Keroka from 1900
iii. Investigated possible factors influencing boundary and resource conflict over Keroka town
iv. Examined the impact of boundary conflict on relations of Kitutu and Nyaribari clans in Keroka
v. Explained possible intervention mechanisms that were applied to resolve the conflict between Kitutu and Nyaribari clans in Keroka.

Research Questions
This study focused on the following pertinent questions
i. How did the Kitutu and Nyaribari clans relate before independence?
ii. How has the social relation among Kitutu and Nyaribari clans in Keroka area changed since 1963?
iii. Which factors were attributed to the latent struggle over Keroka Town between Kitutu and Nyaribari clans?
iv. What impacts has this conflict had on the two clans of the Gusii community, along the contested boundary?
v. What strategies have been put in place to manage the boundary and resource conflict over Keroka?

Significance of the Study
Intra-clan conflicts as well as boundary disputes are increasingly becoming a social phenomenon. That being the situation, this study may have contributed to the greater understanding of boundary and resource disputes in Kenya by examining the case of Keroka. The study may have provided useful information on how to manage subsequent inter-county resource and boundary disputes in Kenya. In addition, the study hopes to provide policy makers and researchers with reliable sources of reference to evaluate the influence of ethnicity in undermining the stability of the nation state. The study may also help in emphasizing the seriousness of research on ethnicity and boundary disputes and propose effective management of its related causes and consequences.

Inter-clan conflicts as well as boundary disputes increasingly became a social phenomenon where scholars who studied conflicts such as (Okumu 2009, Dawa 1992, Isajiw 1994) have underscored the relevance of ethnicity as a social identity in many conflicts in Africa. Due to this underlying significance, this study contributed to the greater understanding of boundary and resource disputes in Kenya by examining historical disputes between Kitutu and Nyaribari clans at Keroka. The study provided useful information on how to manage subsequent inter-county resource and boundary disputes in Kenya arising at clan levels. In addition, the study provided policy makers and researchers with
reliable sources of reference to evaluate the influence of ethnicity in undermining the stability of the nation state. Based on its findings, the study emphasized the seriousness of research on intra-clan conflicts and boundary disputes by proposing an effective management of its own related causes and consequences. Due to limited mechanisms in dealing with the issue of ethnicity, this study finding contributed in forming policies on how to harness ethnic cultures to bring about harmonious coexistence, which in turn leads to development. The study has contributed knowledge on the need of coexistence between clans and even ethnic groups in development. This study is viable as it established whether the government was involved or participated in programs that contributed in managing boundary and resource disputes. Thus, it contributed in encouraging the government to design mechanisms to manage future disputes related to boundary and resources. This study was hoped to embrace community cohesiveness and improve communication between the two clans, reduce animist perceptions and build trust in each other.

Limitation of the Study
The study had limitations due to a variety of factors, including limited information on the underlying factors on the Keroka dispute being a recent development, which has not been researched on extensively. Archival data to provide information on historical background of the competing communities of Kitutu and Nyaribari was not much available. The study therefore relied much on oral information from elders, which was not easy to authenticate. In addition, the sensitive political implications of this research affected the provision of objective information from informants of the competing clans.

Scope and Delimitation of the Study
This study specifically examined the migration, settlement and historical relations between the Kitutu and Nyaribari clans in Keroka from 1850. Conflicts arising from these relations were examined as well as the implications of boundary determination in the colonial period. Contemporary relations of the two clans were analyzed in respect to changing perceptions over boundary claims and resource conflict following the creation of county governments in Kenya since 2013. Those were analyzed from a historical perspective-paying cognizance to social and political dynamics before and after the enactment of the new constitution that introduced devolution in Kenya. Investigations on the impact and management of the conflict based specifically on the conflict situation itself and not on general observations of similar developments in Kenya.

Methodology
Methodology dealt in this work was for a data presentation in an organized manner, which explained procedures and methods used in the fieldwork. Those methods were organised as followed, description of the study area, research design, population analysis, sampling procedures, data collection procedures, data processing and analysis, validity, piloting, relevance of data and chapter summary about the area studied.

Study Area
Gusii region consists of different administrative units that are Kisii and Nyamira in the former Nyanza province. According to (Ochieng’1969) Kisii was founded as an administrative unit by 1907 when the British Administration in the District had become convinced that to bring the whole South Nyanza under control the administrative post (boma) would have to be moved from Karungu, by then under ‘Northcote’ as a District Commissioner to Getembe (Kisii town).
The District today is divided into two counties of Nyamira and Kisii. The whole of Gusii land is located to the east of Lake Victoria and bordered by six districts now counties as Narok county to the south, Kuria
to the south west, Migori to the west, Homa Bay to the north west, Kisumu to the north and Kericho to the south east. Before county creations, the area was composed of eight sub-districts as South Mugirango, Kitutu, North Mugirango, Masaba Settlement Area, Nyaribari, Bassi, Wanjare and Machoge Districts as constituencies (Fig.1) back page.

The whole of Gusii Highland District as per (National census, 2009) covers an area of 1,317km² with a total population of 1,152,282 by then and a population density of 874.7 people per km² and contributing to the national population stood by 2.9 percent. By the time, the area had an annual growth rate of 2.75% with 51% of its population living below poverty line and a managed dependence ratio of 100:94. The region has equatorial climate receiving rainfall almost throughout the year with at an average annual rainfall of 150cm-200cm.

Nyahira County was hived from the larger Kisii District in the era of President Daniel.T.A.Moi 1989 as a district and during the town center Census 1999, had a population of 10,000 people. The County shares same climatic conditions with Kisii County since they are on the same altitude and climatic conditions. Nyamira County has four constituencies West Mugirango, North Mugirango, Kitutu Masaba and Masaba (Borabu) North Constituency. The Kitutu Masaba has three divisions as Gachuba, Gesima and Rigoma Divisions, where majority the Kitutu sub-clans are living around Keroka town bordered by the Nyaribari clan of Masaba South and as the Kitutu Masaba North who extend to Kisii County Government of Kitutu Chache. Keroka town is largely in Kitutu and has been ranked a town by Nyamira County Government through the national government as the second largest one in the whole of Nyamira County.

The bordering Counties of Nyamira are pastoralists to the South that is Narok, to the East-Kericho and the North-Homa Bay and to the West- Bomet, who practice fishing as their major economic activity, although they try practicing small-scale farming. The two Counties experienced historical background on conflicts at one time with the Kalenjin community. For example, the 1992 Molo-ethnic clashes at Chebilat market center between the Gusii of Nyamira and the Kipsigis of Sotik to the East, because of political leadership problem on the use and management of natural resources and then the Maasai to the South Mugirango, of the Kisii County.

The clans in conflict Nyaribari from Kisii County borders the Kitutu Masaba North of Nyamira County and are located at Keroka town 15kms from Kisii town, in the midst of Kisii –Sotik highway. According to the 2009 census report, the town of Keroka in Nyamira County had 50,000 inhabitants (Appendix: III) well managed in the household levels.

The Keroka area is rolling with hilly landscapes on several plains, reaching altitudes of 3,900 feet (1,190 meters) above sea level in the far southwestern corner of the territory, at Kiabonyoru peak of Keroka, which reaches 6,990 feet (2,130 meters) above sea level in the central highlands. Average maximum temperatures range from 83°F (28.4°C) at the lowest altitude level to 73°F (22.8°C) as at the highest elevations. The average minimum temperatures are at 61.5°F (16.4°C) lower levels and 50°F (9.8°F) on the higher levels respectively. Rain falls throughout the year with an annual average of 60 to 80 inches (150-200 centimeters cubed). In the nineteenth century, much of present-day Gusiioland was covered by moist upland forest but today all forests have been cleared, remaining with very little indigenous (native) plants and have no large mammals found (Alan, 1995) due to land resource scarcity. In the study table, respondents included:
Note that the Gusii people are very reserved, polite and in many ways suspicious about others’ intentions. This section concluded a represented demographic characteristic of respondents on the Kitutu and Nyaribari relations, in their age bracket, gender, professionalism and educational background unto and over the 2016 conflict on one to one’s information (Tables 1-5). In table 1, most frequently asked questions from the questionnaire available were (60 years and above) and the elderly posted 37%, then 20% of the respondents had reached saturation point on giving similar answers or information as the best-informed group. The other ages 40 years to 60 years, were well versed with the conflict while the very aged group on the clan cultural activities, in that order.

**Research Design**

The research used and outlined all activities pertaining to the research problem from the beginning to the end. This research was a design-based on the research question (Cooper and Schindler, 2003), guided by the selection of sources and types of information. The study used Descriptive Survey Research Design and since survey involved was acquiring information about one or more groups of people in the field (Table 1). It was perhaps about their characteristics, opinions, attitudes or previous experiences, which were used by asking questions (Appendix VI) and tabulating their answers (Kothari, 2009). The applied Descriptive Survey Research Design was relevant in the study for it allowed generalizations of results due to the ease of administering, recording questions and answers. Furthermore, the researcher had the abilities of tapping into latent factors and relationships with conflict (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003).

**Target (sample) Population**

The general population of the area under study was approximated at 50,000 people according to 2009 census where population according to (Kombo and Tromp, 2013), was a group defined and comprised of individuals, objects or other items from which samples were taken for research purposes. In this study, population was referred to those who could provide the required information (Peil, 1995). However, key informants were selected using purposive sampling in the community where amidst them in the sample population included opinion leaders for the locations of Nyaribari and Kitutu clans among others. They were arranged in categories where one included assistant chiefs who represented various sub-locations with village elders, clan elders, Members of County Assemblies, Members of Parliament, Governors, County, Sub-county government officials and business-people, then category two were the general inhabitants of the town of different households. This target group was useful in order to obtain data that was representative with detailed analysis in the two categories of the informed and none informed groups.
Sampling Procedure and Sample Size

There were different ways of determining a sample size for the study where both probability and non-probability sampling methods were used. The population was divided into different clusters as in all (Tables 1 to 5) representing different units of both urban and rural people informed on conflicts for example, the executive officers, residents of the town and elders from among the four hundred and twenty five sampled population (table 2). Their ages, education, gender and frequency of availability was tabulated for the questionnaire to be answered fully and correctly without an oversight.

Purposive Sampling

A randomly purposed 100 resident-sample group was used in order to obtain data that was representative and selected from the two location-clan levels of the Kitutu and Nyaribari together with those others living within and around the contested boundary precincts became helpful. The researcher applied a 10% formula of the sample size reducing the figures to 5,000 people selected randomly from the 50,000 people; however, a further random fifty household in each sub-location divided by 5,000 to form sampled from 100 households. Out of the fifty households from Kitutu and Nyaribari, each family gave four mature informed adult family members, where the four family members from each household unit, literally led to four hundred respondents from the sample population and the twenty-five purposed officers in table two, formed four hundred and twenty five representatives.

Category 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Category ‘a’</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief who directed aiders</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistants aided researcher to places</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clan Elders support on locations</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of County Assemblies(MCA)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Parliament</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Administrator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessmen</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Officers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Category ‘b’

Informed House Hold representatives per a village

\[4 \times 2 \times 50 = 400\]

| Total purposed Sample Population | 425 |

Table 2. Purposed Sample size categories in the field

To justify the process, the researcher used another method used as Nyumba Kumi Concept as a Policy, which did literally mean ten households as a basic smallest level of security arrangement for protection (Usalama) or as a foundation of Kenya’s national security policy 21st Century, to support the random on the purposed sample size.

The researcher formed an opinion that the figures could be based on the ideology of Kenya’s program intended to curb threats and activities from any person-suspected or associated with criminal or terrorist groups in the world, for example the Al-Shabaab based in Somalia, who either rent or visit family friends in the country. This is currently in use countrywide where clans are vigilantes through selected village elders,
who provide information to the national security agents over suspected visitors or community people suspected to be involved in any illegal or criminal activity in any given place within the country. In cases of terrorist attacks or threats in a hosting family-friend, assumed to accommodate ten people at a time, the house owner or an in charge, has a duty to identify the culprit(s) as head of a household when asked. The roles of the village elders in sub-locations are assumed to take daily monitoring data of any family member(s) away and at home from people who are visitors and residents in villages. Normally ten to fifteen village elders are selected to be in charge of one hundred people at any given time in the ratio of 1:10 people as Nyumba Kumi policy, according to Mrs. Kemunto in the field, a village elder. According to (Mark Leting and Josephine Chepchirchir, 2017) on the concept of Nyumba Kumi, states ‘it as a community based strategy’. They wrote on it is impacts on curbing crime in Kenya, in Kibabi University 2017. In a newsletter in the star magazine by Cyrus Ombati (2013), argued that the Kenya state tightened community policing through Nyumba Kumi initiative. He narrated on how the interior cabinet secretary Joseph Ole Lenku told security chiefs in Nairobi to ensure that the current system of villages under a village elder were restructured into a ten household unit, with a clear leadership structure that would be responsible for the security of the concerned households. He agreed that the concept had been tried in Tanzania with positive impacts in terms of improved security. In Kenya, it would be done through implementations of Personal Identification Secure Comparison and Evaluation Systems (PISCES) at the country’s international airports and any other very important specific points. The policy has features of the written constitution that, ‘all community policing shall have a written constitution to address various issues. It includes but not limited to the committee composed of households or any other generic clusters and its the basic level with most critical of all, the committees’. A notice from the cabinet secretary of the ministry of National Government Mr. Joseph Ole Lenku, gazetted the National Task Force on community policing on the November 7th 2013. The national task force on community policing formed by the government was to oversee the implementation of the Nyumba Kumi Initiative aimed at restoring security in the country. Membership of Nyumba kumi was composed of members of households or any other generic clusters and every member within the cluster is entitled to attend meetings and participate in decision-making. The household democratically elect office bearers and the chairperson would represent the cluster in the sub-location committee policing. In the daily nation of the 21st April, 2015, Deputy or Vice President William Ruto urged Kenyans to embrace the Nyumba Kumi initiative to boost security where he conclude that, ‘Kenya is taking security issue very serious’. This policy was applied on the 5,000 people from the 50,000 population on 10% selected randomly were divided by one hundred elders in the location from villages of ten households appointed out by the area chief and therefore its division formed a downsized figure to the random 50 household head representatives in the town selected from Kitutu and Nyaribari, clans. Then from each household unit family, at least four respondents preferably father, mother and at least two siblings of ages 18 years and above selected for interview from each clan of Kitutu and Nyaribari by the elders. Mathematically calculated arrived that four (4) people in a house unit, times one hundred (100) clan elders of the households formed four hundred (400) sample respondents. That seemed a manageable figure for interview-representation from the two clans proportionately and then added twenty-five government officials as part of the target group (Table 2), who formed four hundred and twenty-five-(425) sample size. However, at 100 (table 1) respondents (table 1) on the questionnaire, responses became saturated thus necessitated a stop to the research for tabulation and analysis.
Research Instruments
To ensure validity and reliability of the data collected, primary, archival and secondary materials from both journal and written sources of data collection were applied for this purpose. Primary data engaged in oral interviews for those who were knowledgeable and informed age groups (Table 1) and tabulated in tables for their educational levels. Second, referenced materials were found at the Kenya National Archives Nairobi, the National Library, Internet and JOOUST University Library equipped with the research approval letter of NACOSTI (Appendix IX) and from county authorization institutions (Appendix X-XII). While secondary data specially was from history books of different scholars, journals, theses, dissertations and internet material (References pg. 123-127).

This study adopted a cross-sectional survey that was without discrimination and was successful regardless of their physical or intellectual characteristics where the questionnaire was studied orally by the respondents regardless of their age, education or gender differences. To a limited extent, a descriptive approach was used to every respondent who was allowed to explain or discuss their feelings on the conflict, based on the sample groups and described the situation in the conflict areas 1963-2017.

Structured Interviews
Due to its outstanding flexibility of the questionnaire, the idea was that the respondents would be having information on issues of conflict with their different experiences in life, therefore the structured schedule interview (Appendix VI: a & b) was adopted. Face-to-face discussions through question-answers were applied and then interpersonal role participation by individual characteristics differently analyzed. Where the interviewer asked respondents questions designed to elicit answers pertinent to research thesis (Nachmias and Nachmias, 1996 p. 232). The structured questionnaire used secured standardised results, well tabulated and treated numerically to the causes, actors of conflict, impacts and intervention mechanisms for the Keroka conflict. The objective of the questionnaire used collected data, which was scattered from a wide area of the sample respondents (Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Categories in Ages</th>
<th>Frequency(f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bellow 30 years</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30- 40 years</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50 years</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 years and Above</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Source: Field Survey 2017 in ages

The respondents were well spread from 47% to 8% on the availability of respondents and their knowledge about the conflict. However most participants were the youth bellow 40 years whom seemed to be participants of conflict and as true actors, totaling to 51%.

Key Informant Interviews
This involved getting in-depth information from the Key Informants (Table 1), where sample population had privileged information. The 100 respondents were the Key Informant Interviewed (K. I. I.) who assisted in assessing consensus among the inhabitants of 50,000 in the contested area and identified further problems.
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causing despondency. Face to face, open and unstructured discussions using (K.I.I) guide was an important activity (Appendix VI, section ‘b’) in receiving the required information by the researcher. Their gender and education level was of value to the understanding of the questionnaire in the community (Table 4) activities from the purposed sample size of the 425 people were educated regardless of their age groups, who narrowed to the 100 respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category in groups of Males and Females</th>
<th>House-hold Heads</th>
<th>Home-stead Elders</th>
<th>Village Elders</th>
<th>Frequency(f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary and Bellow</td>
<td>M-16 F-09</td>
<td>M-07 F-07</td>
<td>M-27 F-03</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘O’ Level</td>
<td>M-25 F-13</td>
<td>M-14 F-08</td>
<td>M-187 F-27</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘A’ Level</td>
<td>M-03 F-02</td>
<td>M-02 F-Nil</td>
<td>M-01 F-Nil</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>M-18 F-08</td>
<td>M-02 F-02</td>
<td>M-03 F-02</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>M-05 F-01</td>
<td>M-04 F-04</td>
<td>M-16 F-09</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>275</strong></td>
<td><strong>425</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Source: Field Survey 2017 sample size

Focus Group Discussions
An in-depth discussion with twenty-five leaders (Table 5) from the two-clans of Kitutu and Nyaribari included government officers, politicians and business-people were used to gain knowledge and elicit views and opinions of the interview about the nature of inter-clan and co-existence between the two clan-groups of Kitutu and Nyaribari between 1963-2017 (table5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category one</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 40 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 years and Above</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Source: Field Survey 2017, sample of category one

The twenty-five focus group guided the researcher on key issues in their understanding of the conflict and government direction as officers on their different age groups. All ages were useful to their guidance and participation on conflict and causes and resolutions to its success.
Data Collection procedure
Data collection began first with secondary materials on the subject of research as literature and it included university letter of approval, national commission of science technology, innovation and government approval letters. Other approvals were from the two coordinating National Ministry of Interior Governments in Nyamira and Kisii; then the Ministry of Education within Nyamira and Kisii County Governments (Appendixes VII, IX, X, XI & XII) for the primary data to be collected in the field.

Data Analysis
Answers from the Interviews were recorded in audio tapes and later transcribed carefully, read into paper work and divided into meaningful analytical units. They were allowed in their content to be analysed and at translation level of interpretation, the researcher applied them in the thesis writing. Being a qualitative study, thematic and content analysis, the ideas were used to develop comprehensive descriptions of the phenomenon under study. Open coding process was used to identify concepts and key ideas hidden within textual data, which were potentially related to the phenomenon of interest (Katherine, 2010). Data then was classified and then categorised into text data-segments as a set of codes (concepts), categories (constructs) and on how were related towards an intra-clan conflict at Keroka.

Primary and Secondary data
Secondary data was obtained through desk-review checklists by consulting different libraries, journals, published and unpublished work, internet and Kenya National Archives were references. Later, informative interviews from primary data and among the purposively selected informants were applied and interpretations of the archives used carefully as primary data, were all assistants to this work to its fullness.

Piloting
Piloting was used to minimize flaws that might have prevailed in the construction of the instruments. A purposed two expertise from Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology then from Maseno University, two colleagues from JOOUST and four opinion leaders from the neighboring counties of Kisii and Bomet used to validate the items. It was helpful to the researcher since confidence and clarity of the research, was achieved.

Validity and Reliability
The items of instruments were presented with significant aspect of the purpose of investigation and then piloting, which helped to check the measuring instruments of the primary and secondary data. Item construction was developed to be in line with the objectives making the research valid and reliable for use. Colleagues and the experts tested the pilot for consistency where other leaders outside the county commended further instruments for the study. To ensure reliability, a second schedule introduced and compared with the first respondents, prior to the administering of the pilot study, (Brown & Dowling, 1998). In the second piloting that was done, fostered a good response where the researcher observed whether there would be any significance of the variation in the responses of the respondents and then modified the items that had discriminative powers. That allowed the pilot to be used for the actual data collection procedure.

Ethical Considerations
The researcher was objective so as not to manipulate data collection, analysis and interpretation procedures to advance any personal agenda. Ethics refers to respect to the standards of conduct of a given profession or group according to (Katherine, 2010).
In the process of collecting qualitative data, the researcher adhered to the principle of voluntary participation of respondents. The participants in this study were made aware that, their participation in the study was voluntary and that they had the freedom to withdraw from the study, at any time without any unfavourable consequences. An introductory document given out to the respondents on the intent of the study (Appendix VI, section ‘a’) and were assured of anonymity and confidentiality of the information they provided. The identity of the respondents were protected to allow them participate freely in this research based on their interests and their future well-being.

**Literature Review**

In this review, I dealt with literature-related to the research problem investigated and assessed what other scholars have done in the past. The research highlighted the knowledge gaps filled by the study through collected and analyzed data from the field. The literature review is arranged systematically bearing in mind the objectives of the study and sub-divided into four sub-topics, causes of boundary disputes globally and in Africa, boundary disputes in Kenya, consequences of boundary disputes in Africa, management of boundary and resource conflicts and theoretical framework.

Even though the artificiality and arbitrariness of African borders were products and reflections of the rivalries between the imperial powers in the world in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, those rivalries had been extended to post-colonial times affecting relations between countries and ethnic communities. In Kenya, different regions and communities have expressed obsessions to claim certain real or imagined resources, whose affects not been examined extensively. In recent years, negative developments in terms of county relations were beginning to emerge in a number of counties for instance Maseno-Vihiga boundary and Keroka boundary, highlighting anew the relevance of the border question thus the need to manage such emerging developments.

**Causes of conflicts on Boundary and Resource at International level**

Conflict globally became problematic when societal mechanisms and institutions for managing and resolving conflict brake down, giving way to violence. They could have fragile political systems and divisive societal relations, which oftenly drew into cycles of conflict and violence. Increased scarcity of renewable resources or grievances over their governance and or cross-border nature, drive, reinforce or compound existing stress factors thus play a contributing role in decision making resorting to violence. According to (Bush, 2016) for example, the terms of the Declaration of Principles (DOP) signed by representatives of Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in Washington DC in September 1993 caused postponement with those negotiations, but commenced later in two years after the implementation of the first stage. Bush (2010)stated that, ‘Palestinian autonomy in the Gaza Strip and Jericho’, at the international stage and the aftermath of the implementation of the first stage of the Israel-Palestinian peace accord, specific attention was turned to negotiations, concerning a permanent territorial solution as war escalated.

Further, Israel’s formal negotiation over Palestine 1993 indicated that, her stand remained that she did not yet recognize the establishment of a full and separate sovereign state of Palestinian (Newman, 1995). It appeared to be an inevitable outcome of the continued implementation of the current peace process on the negotiated demarcation of the territorial entity. Both Israel and the Palestinians were likely to represent their own respective territorial-demands. As it is Palestinians’ demand would be no less than the whole of the West Bank and Gaza Strip, would be their minimal requirement for an independent state. Whereas this was likely to be rejected by Israel who would argue for a re-demarcation of the West Bank boundary in line with their own political and territorial agenda (Catherine Bush, 2016).
However, the geographical focus for the commencement of negotiations was that of the ‘green line’ boundary which separated Israel from the West Bank 1948-1967. Since that period, the boundary has passed through a number of phases: from an imposed sealed boundary to the one which had been removed but retained certain boundary characteristics to one, which may be re-imposed at a future date under the terms of a permanent territorial solution (Bush, 2016). As such, the ‘green line’ constituted a boundary in formal and functional definitions undergoing constant change until a permanent and agreed process of delimitation is completed, is now a recurrent conflict.

Therefore, most trans-border conflict causes over some type of resource are perceived as scarce, the United Nations Intelligence Framework Team for Preventives Act 2012 (UNIFTPA) indicates. Border disputes are at least when the resource is a territory and are seen to be on the rise (Huth, 1996; Vasquez, 1993).

Nevertheless, with the decline of ideological conflict after the end of the Cold War, (Klare, 2001a and 2001b) states that competition for access to ‘vital’ resources are increasingly driving international relations and the danger of international competition for their inadequacy for example, water resources has grown inevitably over the last few decades.

Whereas international boundary and resource conflicts in essence are such a competition over water, land and high value natural resources include oil, gas, copper and alike. Kenya at international level, as any other African country at war like Sudan and Uganda’s conflicts, widely was evidenced after devolution of 2013. The Keroka town claim, seem to be due to colonial partition of boundary demarcation and became a resource center for the two clans, which is a new development in history as an intra-clan conflict in communities much respected in Africa, which have not been without disharmony since the nation’s independence.

In another observed cause of conflict is where an increased demand for water will produce ‘intense competition for this ‘essential’ substance in all resource areas, apart from a few well-watered places of the planet, (Klare, 2001a, pg. 57). By 2050, there would be such actions of fisticuffs. However, the management of land and natural resources are one of the most critical challenges facing developing countries to date and may worsen. The exploitation of high-value natural resources in oil, gas, minerals and timber are often cited as key factors in triggering, escalating or sustaining violent conflicts around the globe and just would increase competition over diminishing renewable resources like land and water on the rise.

Multinational conflicts for example, over the legal status of the Caspian Sea, attributed a significant share of the world’s energy and ecosystem resources and remained unresolved since the breakup of the Soviet Union in 1991, (Mehdiyoun, 2000; Peimani, 2001; Zonn, 2001; Bahgat, 2002; Blum, 2003; Madani et al., in press) led to serious conflict. Currently, redefining the Caspian Sea’s legal status becomes the subject of the world’s insurmountable dispute, which involves five littoral states of Azerbaijan, Iran, Kazakhstan, Russia and Turkmenistan.

In addition over land, the community involving the Hazara in Afgahstan has a population of 4 million people together with the nomadic Kuchi people, who are in an unsuitable land. Now, for most of their agricultural practices are done on the highlands and at the same time continues to seek access to the grasses of the highlands during the summer months for grazing their animals. However, they depend much on the high-elevation grazing land to support their livestock more oftenly and its when they corride with the Kuchi.

The two communities also rely on the supply of firewood needed to complement the meager profits from the farming activity. Access to the high pastures is essential to the survival of both the Hazara and the Kuchi inhabitants but that land has become the source of violent conflict between the two groups over and again, (Kabul-Afgahstan journal on an overlapped resource rights and discrimination, UNEP, 2009).

Copper mining in Bougainville, illustrated the role of resource degradation from pollution, play a role in destabilization of a community and often result into combats. The copper-rich island in the Panguna mines
came under exploitation in the 1960s by an international company Bougainville Copper Ltd. The operation of this mine became central to the violent uprising and civil conflict over the remaining useful land use in 1988-1997, which left 70,000 people, displaced and led the island to receive a degree of political autonomy (Conciliation Resources, Accord, No. 12 of 2002 special). Therefore, the above references served as some of the researched international boundaries and resource causes of conflicts globally, which guided the researcher to dig further for similar facts into conflict causes in Africa.

Causes of Boundary Disputes in Africa
Posner (2006) and Asiwaju (1985) observe that borders in Africa were arrived at largely without reference at all to the social, political or cultural characteristics of the people they partitioned. They argue that 104 intercontinental borders existing in Africa by 1984 and 1985 dissected 177 culture areas or groups. According to Posner (2006), a clear indication of the arbitrariness of the borders is the fact that 44 per cent of African boundaries follow either meridians or parallels and another 30 per cent follow other rectilinear or curved lines. These in his view confirm that boundaries linking different countries and regions in Africa have the potential of generating future conflicts due to their arbitrariness.

In addition to those rivalries, were the obsessions by the European powers that exclusively claimed certain real or imagined African resources, more oftenly the imperial powers were interested in one resource or another in the control of commerce and markets or access to trade routes like water transport way systems? The colonial states and the borders emerged out of those rivalries, which largely depended on how one imperial power outsmarted other rivals (Anene, 1970). The borders at Lake Chad region for instance, reflected the rivalries between and the intrigues of the three dominant imperial interests from the Germans, French and the British. In this case, the interests of the Borno and Mandara Sultanates and their people evidently did not matter at all. The artificiality and arbitrariness of African borders were also the products and reflections of the rivalries between the imperial powers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.

The artificiality and arbitrariness of African borders are also the products and reflections of the rivalries between the imperial powers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. In addition to these rivalries were the obsessions to claim certain real or imagined African resources. More often, the imperial powers were interested in one resource or the other, the control of commerce and markets or access to trade routes and rivers transport systems. For example, the colonial states and the borders that emerged out of those rivalries largely depended on how one imperial power outsmarted its rival (Anene, 1970). The borders around the Lake Chad region, for instance, were drawn to reflect the rivalries between and the intrigues of, the three dominant imperial interests: the Germans, the French and the British. In this case, the interests of the Borno and Mandara Sultanates and their people evidently did not matter at all. Similarly, the border between Nigeria and Benin reflected the interests and rivalries of the British and the French, especially over the control of the Niger bend area near Nikki (AUBP, 2013) at the time of their partition and scrambling for Africa.

Decentralization broadly defined is a process in which a central government’s organization changes in a manner that physically or procedurally gives power, resources or responsibilities to agents outside the capital (Boone 2003). Similarly, in the context of party systems, leaders could mobilize popular support by creating new resource bases for their people. This strategy was especially useful when support was territorially based on administrative units directly affecting residents living within the unit.

O’Dwyer (2006) finds that smaller parties with regional followings and little national-level accountability consolidated supporter through regional and local administrative patrons thus political parties that did not expect to secure the presidency but could win power at the sub-national level were more willing to agitate
for conflicts to eliminate local opposition. This study intended to investigate the role of politics and political parties in urban conflict and according to Mazrui (1994); ‘boundary conflict is strongly associated with the important role of ethnic or clans power brokers who try to outdo each other in the strength and extremity of ethnic rhetorics’ in his work.

According to (Green, 2010) he situates ethnic logic to boundary conflicts, as many ethnic groups are both geographically concentrated and protect their natural and human resources. Devolved units geographically placed are therefore, intended to create jobs for local populations and more especially to area elites whom then expected to distribute benefits. Stavenhagen (1995) argues that, like religion, ethnicity has the symbolic capability of defining for the individual the totality of his existence including embodying his hopes, fears and sense of the future. Consequently, any action or thought perceived to undermine the ethnic groups evoke very hostile and sometimes violent response by individual members of the reference group, even though the actions may not be directed at them individually.

Smith (1981) and Stavenhagen (1995) both argue that ethnicity influences boundary disputes because it basically centers on culture, which is central in determining the identity of people as groups or individuals and shapes the pattern of relationships that they adopt with other groups. On the contrary, the case study of Keroka may not be determined by ethnic or cultural differentiation, because it affects one community. Thus, it would be important to explore other dimensions of this conflict (Chukwu, 2000) for it has linked ethnicity and boundary dispute in Africa to the influence of political actors within a state who create, organize and finance previously dormant and unconscious ethnic groups for political action that favour their continued stay in power.

Realities on the African ground lands and testimonies from the key actors at the time is when the boundaries were designed and constructed, conclusively confirmed that the borders were indeed arbitrary and artificial (Hargreaves, 1963) as few examples are related to the Nigerian borders sufficed to demonstrate this. It explained that on signing the Anglo-French Convention on the Nigeria-Niger boundary in 1906, Lord Salisbury and then British Prime Minister credited, remarked:

‘We [the British and the French] have been engaged in drawing lines upon maps where no white man’s foot ever trod: we have been giving away mountains and rivers and lakes to each other, only hindered by the small impediments that we never knew exactly where the mountains and rivers and lakes were (Anene, 1970:3). In those days, we just took a blue pencil and a ruler, put it down at Old Calabar, and drew that blue line to Yola [...]. I recollect thinking when I was sitting, having an audience with the Emir of ʿAdamawa’, surrounded by his tribe, that it was a very good thing that he did not know, that I, with a blue pencil, had drawn a line through his territory (Anene, 1970:3)’.

Naturally, the result of this exercise common all over Africa was division of peoples bi-furcated political and social systems and fractured cultural areas, which eventually led to further dislocations and disorientation, particularly amongst the border populations (Touval, 1984). Boundaries drawn across well-established lines of communication included a sense of community based on traditions, which were concerning common ancestry, usually very strong kinship ties, shared socio-political institutions and economic resources, common customs and practices and sometimes acceptance in a common political control (Touval, 1984). In many instances during the pre-colonial times in the boundary creation, separated communities of worshippers from age-old sacred groves and shrines and in other instances well exemplified by the Somalis where water resources is a challenge in predominantly nomadic cultural area, were located in one state and the pastures in another (Asiwaju, 1985) Kenya.

Interestingly some of the highly sought resources of minerals in Africa include hydrocarbons, iron ore, bauxite/alumina, copper, manganese, molybdenum(moly), uranium, zinc and platinum group metals (PGMs) are located on borderlands (Okumu, 2009). On the eruption of war between Ethiopia and Eritrea over their
common boundary in 1998 and their subsequent failure to demarcate, it happened on the borderlands deposited with such mineral deposits of uranium. Currently the standoffs between Kenya and Uganda over the ownership of Migingo Island in Lake Victoria are among other border disputes like the Eritrea and Djibouti, the continued inter-Somali nationalism in the region and border skirmishes between Uganda and DRC over the oil-rich Lake Albert region. This indicates that border disputes are on the rise and some of them would result in full-scale armed conflicts as other forms of hostilities. Additionally, un-demarcated indefinite porous and unmanaged boundaries used for illegal cross-border activities are threatening national sovereignties and destabilizing regional peace (Okumu 2009).

There was therefore, evidence of the fact that since the attainment of independencies, the borders of African States were inherited from colonial times and have recurrent source of tensions, conflicts and even crises between and within several African countries (McEwen 1971). African leaders took up therefore, political and legal measures to address the question of boundaries in Africa.

The 1st Ordinary Session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), was held in Cairo Egypt in July 1964 and as well as Article 4(b) of the Constitutive Act of the African Union (AU) were the principles adopted in respect of the existing borders on an achievement of national independences. The 44th Ordinary Session of the Council of Ministers of the (OAU) held in Addis Ababa Ethiopia in July 1986, addressed the relevant provisions of the Peace and Security Council of the African Union and adopted the principle of negotiated settlement of border disputes (AUBP, 2013).

Despite the existence of civic and legal frameworks to deal with boundary and resource conflict situations, empirical studies indicated that animosity and conflicts continued unabated since conflicts and wars have manifested in-wholly by new ways around the globe (Liah, 1994). Development of new types as of inter-state boundary conflict-shape, gave way to internal boundary and resource conflicts, which bit different regions, ethnic groups, clans and religious sects against each other. This was because ethnic groups in most countries had become highly politicized in order to achieve unity, autonomy and group interests (Osaghae, 1994).

In Nigeria, there has been a conflict between the Ibo people and the Ife ethnic groups in the eastern region of the country, where for the Ibos unsuccessfully in all their recessional attempts aimed at forming their own Biafra-state, led to persistent confrontation. Another conflict in Rwanda and Burundi were reported as one of the intense inter-ethnic conflicts in the Third World, where a feud involved the Tutsi and Hutu ethnic groups. In both Rwanda and Burundi, the Hutu constitutes a numerical majority while the minority Tutsi dominated the country’s economic and political scene. Rivalry between the two was reportedly as so intense that each ethnic group had attempted genocide aimed at the complete elimination of the other. In 1972 for example, the Tutsi- controlled government in Burundi, killed between 100, 000 and 200,000 Hutus in one of such incidence of genocide (Barth, 1981).

In Ethiopia, ethnic conflict between the Amhara and Eritrea persisted for hundreds of years as the Eritrea's people sought independence from Ethiopia. After independence, their conflict had taken on a new twist from war of autonomy to border conflict because of similar members of the Somali ethnic group had sought independence from the Amhara who for years dominated the politics and the economy of Ethiopia. Other countries in Africa that had been involved in inter-ethnic conflict deteriorated into wars that claimed lives of hundreds of thousands of people who included Sudan, Mozambique, Somalia, Angola and the Democratic Republic of Congo (Sabine, 1971).

On the same note in Africa alone, 10 million people have been displaced to date and most of them in the countries of the Sub-Sahara region. In Southern Sudan, four million people internally displaced are due to civil wars that have afflicted the country’s activities besides becoming independent. Similarly, in Angola,
Liberia, Sierra Leone, Burundi, Ethiopia, Mozambique and Somalia, ethnic conflicts and political repression forced hundreds of thousands of people to uprooted from their traditional settlements (Dawa, 1992) to refugee camps and other states of the world included America as migrants, Canada et cetera. In a distinct category, 500,000 black South African people have remained internally displaced due to the legacy of the policies of the apartheid regime. However even after the decline of the apartheid regime, the region has continued to suffer from politics of identity and exclusion. Since 1998, there have been upsurges in ethnic nationalism throughout South Africa whose forms, muted and linked to political parties through her voting patterns. The Afrikaners are concerned with their language, cultural rights and what they perceive to be their economic and political marginalization in post-apartheid South Africa who mobilized themselves, to form their own party before June 1999 elections. This issue influenced virulent forms of conflict, which threatened the territorial integrity of South Africa (Isajiw, 1994).

Boundary conflict (Mazrui, 1994) strongly associated conflict with the important role of ethnic power brokers who try to out-do each other appear in the context of party systems where leaders would mobilise popular support by creating new resource-based ideas for their people. The strategy was especially useful when support-territory-based on administrative units directly affected residents living within the unit (O’Dwyer, 2006). He found those smaller parties with regional followings with little national-level were accountable on consolidated supporters through regional and local administrative patrons. However, (Stavenhagen, 1995) argued that like religion, ethnicity had the symbolic capability of re-defining an individual in totality; his existence included embodying his hopes, fears and sense of the future. Consequently any action or thought, perceived to undermine the ethnic groups or clans, evoked very hostile and sometimes violent responses by individual members of the reference group and even though action would not be directed at them individually.

In recent years, negative developments in terms of border-relations have emerged in a number of African countries, which highlight the relevance of the border question and the measures taken to address the boarder problem by the African Union. This ugly development is on the rise and said to be spreading as wildfire in resource-based border areas as already mentioned earlier. According to (Okumu. 2009) such tensions held high potentials for escalating inter-state conflicts in Eastern Africa due to growing discoveries or rumors of existence or natural resources on borders or in borderlands. Natural resources do not only enhance the possibilities of inter-state conflict, but also increases the values of territories, which were neglected and marginalized by the colonial officials. Some of those areas already partitioned into concessionary blocks awarded to the Chinese and Western companies were to prospect natural resources (AUBP, 2013).

**Boundary disputes in Kenya**

The government of Kenya has changed state institutions as an attempt to meet relative efficiency goals and improve governance and public policy outcomes. However, such institutional designs have failed to take into account the political contradictions emerging from leaders who are in charge of those devolved institutions. They try to protect their natural and human resources (Green, 2010) and whereby the devolved units in Kenya 2013 intended to create jobs for local populations, more especially to area-community elites were expected to distribute benefits have not performed exceptionally well.

The central government organizations changed in a manner that physically or procedurally gave power on resources or responsibilities to agents outside the capital The government of Kenya had changed state institutions as an attempt to meet relative efficiency goals to improve governance and public policy outcomes. This was away from the colonial governance, in which (Mungean, G.H, 1966, p.30) stated that after the Imperial British East Africa declared East Africa a protectorate, colonial officers boosted to 20
confirm their total powers. For instance, Hardinge once advised the Foreign Office in Africa, ‘that to have peace, one must first teach obedience and the only tutor who impresses the lesson is the sword’. Even-though the artificiality and arbitrariness of African borders were products and reflections of the rivalries between the imperial powers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century (Hargreaves, 1963). The Native Lands Registration Ordinance 1959 reinforced the 1954 Swynnerston Plan in Kenya granted secure individual land titles to African farmers and the plan further. Later was replaced after independence by the Registered Land Act 1963 and the Land Adjudication Act 1968 (Migot-Adholla & Place, 1998).

Odhiambo (2011) provided evidence on how oral traditions through symbolic place names have been used to authenticate identity and territorial occupation over Maseno area by the Luo and the Bunyore clans. It was not clear if the Keroka conflict could be motivated by clanism or control of resources. Thus, political parties that did not expect to secure the presidency for example, but could win power at the sub-national level were willing to agitate for conflicts to eliminate local opposition. The study intended to investigate the role of politics and political parties at Keroka town. In the researchers’ view, the resource town and clanism have logic to do with boundary conflicts, since many ethnic and clan groups are both geographically concentrated in an area of the specific region.

According to Odhiambo (2010), Maseno area of western Kenya had been engaged in boundary disputes and claims over institutions because of politicization of ethnicity and identified the Anglican Church as a key factor in the contest over the management of institutions in the area. Finally, the study underscored that even though latent conflict had persisted in that area based on those historical developments, the government did not do much to establish appropriate conflict management mechanisms. Its resolution and recommendations that an understanding of the history of ethnic relations of communities in Maseno and adoption of domestic policies, accommodated ethnic diversity to discourage ethnic competition and conflict, would be basic priorities were not implemented. Those recommendations further needed research points to the need to examine the significance of administrative boundaries in economic developments in Kenya and challenges facing boundary review processes and the creation of new administrative units, which served as a justification for this study.

According to Ochieng (1974), Western Kenya experienced ethnic conflicts as early as 500-1800 A.D and was a center of contact and clash between Cushitic, Bantu and Nilote clans. However, those conflicts were mainly based on competition over resources like water, grazing land and largely on territorial boundaries to accommodate the increasing population. He further observed that in the colonial period, new demands emerged due to the developments instituted by the missionaries and the colonial administration as well as the emergence of political movements which begun to consolidate ethnic consciousness and strengthen identity. However, from independence, inter-ethnic conflicts in western Kenya got additional impetus and had been directed by the need to review administrative boundaries motivated by ethnicity. Although his work provided good direction on the areas of conflict in western Kenya, during this point time and had however not addressed the phenomena in light of the new developments especially the devolved systems of government that this study aimed at fulfilling.

Ogot (1985), also observed that inter-ethnic relations in western Kenya changed in the Ogot (1985), also observed that inter-ethnic relations in western Kenya changed in the colonial period and that during this period, inter-ethnic and intra-ethnic conflicts were nurtured by the policies and conditions created by British colonial rule. First, he stated the division of the region into districts was done in a manner that did not take into account the interests of the communities concerned. Secondly, he argued that the imposition of foreign chiefs on some communities created mistrust and hatred among the communities concerned. For example, the appointment of Mumia’s relatives as chiefs of hitherto independent groups created hostility between the Wanga and other Luo and Luyiah sub-ethnic groups. Third, he expressed that inter-ethnic conflict was
nurtured by the economic policies of the British colonialists through their uneven pattern of economic development that resulted into disparities in resources and amenities between ethnic groups and districts. The findings of Ogot (1985) could guide this study especially in highlighting the impact uneven economic and social development in exacerbating ethnic and sub-ethnic divisions. While he did not mention boundary dispute, those observations could guide research on the link between ethnicity, colonial policies and boundary disputes in post-independence Kenya.

One of the colonial governors Cecil Rhodes, 1895-1914 was quoted saying, ‘I contend that we are the first race in the world and that the more of the world we inhabit, the better it is for the human race’. Ochieng’, (1971) narrated that while the Gusii people were busy settling down in their present homeland towards the end of the 19th century, the European powers had already embarked on the system of curving the continent of Africa racially and ethnically. In Kenya, the colonial government had settled their white farmers on the highlands of Kericho extending to Borabu settlement scheme, by then within Sotik highlands towards Keroka inhabited by the Kitutu and Nyaribari people. However, those two clans had no talcs of the European traders, slavers, adventures or hunters who had visited the area, so welcomed them warmly.

With that fact in place, the inability to appreciate the fundamental shift that took place in Kenya since the promulgation of the new constitution continue to be a major challenge and even though the transitional office has processed mechanisms and put them in place through the transitional devolved Government Act (2012). It facilitated a smooth transition from the centralised to the devolved system and many issues in delimitation of inter-county boundaries had not been resolved. However, the Intergovernmental Relations Act (2012) outlined the mechanisms and modalities of managing the relations between national and county governments did too little.

Despite the increased incidences of boundary disputes, previous studies by (Atieno, 2012) for example on this topic had been limited to some specific incidences related to large-scale civil strife or politically motivated conflicts. Recent developments however, showed that inter-county resource conflicts is raising serious concerns a part from rural small-scale land conflicts with relatives, neighbours or local governments (Deininger and Castagnin, 2005). Land scarcity and agricultural commercialization expected to increase land value, led to individualization in land rights, which created opportunities to establish institutions to better-defined and enforced property rights (Boserup, 1965).

In Kenya, the formal individualization of land had been in place since independence as the registration process increased tenure security from any landowner it had created, but as a new form of disputes such as challenges over registered land and conflicts over land sales (Shipton, 1988). Moreover, the high cost of registration has discouraged updating those registrations after land transactions including inheritance and sales, which led to man-to-man conflicts.

Amongst the West Pokot and Marakwet ethnic communities (Burden, 2002) states that, conflict was waged over cattle and pasturelands through their borders, while in Mai Mahiu (Naivasha) ethnic conflicts developed recently over water resources between the Kikuyu and Maasai communities living in the area. Inter-state ethnic clashes have also persisted in northern Kenya between the Pokot of Kenya and Uganda’s Karamojong’. In July 1998, the two groups clashed over cattle and 84 people were killed, therefore led the researcher think that there is a conflict problem in the nation or localized places in the recent times, for example the highlight of the recent Mwea irrigation scheme in the (Daily Nation April 8th, 2018) over land plot partitions and the on 1st September 2018 Saturday in the daily nation pp 9 highlighted on electoral zones.

Many households in Kenya have out-dated land registrations act, while most of the registered parcels are under the name of the household heads or spouse cultivating the parcels. In other words, the registered parcels bear names of the deceased parents, deceased husbands or other relatives. The situation of
disagreement arise when new landowners neglect to update the registration because of high costs or are prevented from doing so because they have not been able to reach an agreement amongst relatives over the inheritance (Wanyeki, 2003). The reporters Patrick Langat, Gaitano Persa, Erick Ruvanga, Kasungu Samwel, Lucy Mkanyika and Joseph Wangui (2018) indicated that there was uproar yesterday following an announcement by the electoral agency that the upcoming review of boundaries could lead to the merging, reduction or increase in the sizes of 27 constituencies. Whereas the neighboring Kiharu constituency is bigger than Kangema and Mathioya combined, noted Mr. Kigano. Where will we fit if the constituency is scrapped off was also remarked.

Therefore, the unregistered parcels of land have more pending conflicts for example; most households are more worried about future conflicts on unregistered parcels than the registered parcels (Wanyeki, 2003). Majority of land conflicts are over boundaries that occurred mainly with neighbours or relatives who lived close by each other. The second most common reason for conflicts is over inheritance, which exclusively occurred among relatives. In the past five years, it appeared that there were more conflicts related to land sales as the value of land increases due to population pressure on agricultural commercialization and urbanization. It is expected that land sale-market would develop overtime and if property rights not clearly defined, would influence more cases on land conflict-related-sales in society.

Moreover, the economic, social and political pillars of Kenya Vision 2030 recognizes land reforms, human resources, development, security and public sector reforms as key agents of development (Malobe, 2010). Thus, in the development agenda of counties in Kenya, land and land-based resources remain the single most important economic factor in Kenya he argues. Before the constitution of Kenya promulgated in August 2010, Kenya was partially underdevelopment, where misuse of power and bad governance under acts of powerful presidency and centralization raked havoc on the people, leading to gross human-rights violation (Malobe, 2010). The enactment of the Constitution offered the nation, a platform to pursue new levels of economic and democratic developments by locating political and economic powers at sub-national levels (counties) controlled democratically by the people and not the national or central government. However, it seemed to fail because there were emerging cases of intra-clan disagreements in certain county areas with same community relation interests, which led to conflicts as observed in the Kitutu and Nyaribari clans of the Gusii at Keroka, under investigation.

In the political devolution, administration, fiscal service delivery and the opportunity for the participation of the people effectively and directly through their elected representatives at the County Assembly level (Nyamwamu, 2013) were affected by the national government. Even so, those reforms had not adequately responded to issues of economic and social democratization in terms of ownership of the factors of production like land and access to better opportunities against a rapidly growing population, led to internal disputes. The inability to appreciate the fundamental shift, which took place in Kenya by the leaders and the promulgation of the new constitution, continues to be a major challenge. In addition, the transitional office process mechanisms put in place the ‘Transitional Devolved Government Act (2012)’, to facilitate a smooth transition from the centralization to the devolution system. Many issues in delimitation of inter-county boundaries have not been resolved yet the ‘Intergovernmental Relations Act (2012)’, outlined the mechanisms and modalities of managing the relations between the national and county governments have done too little.

According to Nyamwamu 2013 is that, from the current dynamics on devolution in Kenya, it appears that the days to come will be marked by prolonged power and resource-control, tension driven and shapes of the emerging forces of counter reforms. Due to those considerations he continued, inter-county boundary changes would be controversial because of their effects on properties both inside and outside a county
boundary, especially when such changes affect taxation. This led to misunderstandings due a loss of revenue for a county or counties’ inability to make a boundary change to access particular contested resources, where Keroka town was examined on that basis.

Against the general background of boundary establishments in Africa, Kenya has similar challenges, which equally affected different Kenyan communities in the colonial times. In the pre-colonial times, internal boundaries in Kenya were demarcated according to river courses or outdated boundary-marking techniques or purely on ethnic status at that point in time. However, the colonial government sometimes, boundary commission officials, demarcated borders merely following local tracks or marking trees (Okumu, 2009). As a result, the majority of Kenya’s districts, even where there were no territorial disputes were considered demarcated. Furthermore, very limited follow-ups in terms of physical demarcation of internal boundaries by the officers of the governments came up, thus the creation of new administrative districts, initially for example the larger Kisii District was made into two districts and finally became counties created in Kenya 2013 devolution systems.

**Consequences of boundary Conflicts**

According to (Agyeman, 1992) one of the prominent outcomes of boundary conflict in Africa has been civic wars or violence. Many countries in Africa dragged into the theater of wars due to perceived boundary claims were such examples as included in the civil wars in Nigerian (1967), Congo, Sudan, Liberia, Sierra-Leone, Rwanda and Burundi. Various economic operations usually get to a halt. For instance during the Liberian civil wars, the country’s economic production declined, while in Nigeria, dispute in the Niger Delta partially paralyzed economic exploration of crude oil in that zone. Going by the above-mentioned consequences, is clear that there was serious need for study or research on boundary disputes from a historical perspective in order to establish a foundation of knowledge for effective and timely management of their consequences, thus the possible effects of this boundary-needed investigation to determine its causes.

Social effects in a disagreement between the Luo and Luyiah communities 1962, there was a forced mass circumcision on the Luo in Etingare or Ruwe sub-location the present day Uholo area against their social believes. The officials of Luo Congress “Piny Owacho” had opposed the merger of Uholo and Tingare people in representing the Luo and Luyiah respectively. The issue was petitioned to the District Commissioner Central Nyanza, but those grievances were never addressed conclusively (K.N.A, 1963). On 25th February 1963, the Luyiah response was riots and burned houses belonging to the Luo in Maseno area beckoning in the Government forces to be sent to calm the situation in the area.

Further threats were expressed in the local media houses and the incident blamed on the people of Bunyore Location. Through their political leaders of the Kenya African Democratic Union (K.A.D.U) and Gem-Seme-Kisumu group, the Abaluyiah Union met in the outskirts of Lela station on the 25th February 1963 (K.N.A., 1963) over the matter. However, the government did not address this tension created by the people, therefore, the people continued to express themselves through memoranda and Petitions to the National Government. To proof their point right, they forced a mass Luo circumcision arranged secretly as a consequence against their traditions for the government to heed them.

In other ethnic latency to the run up of 1992 general elections (Ethno-Net, 2002) wrote on an up surge of ethnic lashes amongst certain ethnic groups that, ‘there was renewal of ethnic tensions during this period in Gucha and Migori districts of Nyanza province, in which several people were killed’. This incidence was linked to the crucial presidential and parliamentary elections of 1992 and according to the National Council of Churches of Kenya (NCCK), tensions in the region were not just a normal problem that resulted from other factors like cattle rustling which was a common phenomenon in the area. However, were due to
political problems that typically occurred during election periods and the conflict in that region were often linked to ethnicity over boundary disputes.

At the same period, some 3000 people were displaced by inter-ethnic conflicts in Isiolo, forcing many families to move from their Manyattas to camp at the local district headquarters for security. According to Bishop Luigi of the Diocese of Isiolo in his report, ‘fighting broke out when about 200 Borana attacked a Turkana Manyatta at Eremet’. A large group comprising mainly of Borana, raided several settlements, inhabited by the ethnic Somali Degodia clan, killing at least 142 and abducting around 50 people (Ethno-Net, 2002). Speculations were that the attacks had a political motive ahead of the 2002 parliamentary and presidential elections and because of the scarce availability of good pasture in this mi-arid region (Burden, 2002).

Management Strategies on conflicts in Africa

Africa’s boundary and ethnic problems were due to the failure of political institutions to accommodate diverse interests of different ethnic clan-groups, religious and linguistic cultures (Kimenyi, 2001); however, with devolution cultural identity and the empowerment of the people, were promoted. On top (Mazrui, 1994) posited that culture is rooted on ethnicity and would be used to reinforce pre-existing ethnic differences, whereas Kigo’ngo, (2002) says that, federalism has positive implications in the political spectrum and in the political management of ethnic conflicts. He argues that, ‘through it is a process people are afforded an opportunity to elect to the state machinery a bigger number of political leaders of whom they know and trust’ in their respective regions.

The leaders themselves being close to the people would develop a sense of obligation to them and serve their interests. In such a situation (Kigo’ngo, 2002) was of the view that citizens of different counties would not conceive their neighbours as competitors but instead engage them in development. This opinion did not explain why boundary disputes between Nyaribari in Kisii and the Kitutu in Nyamira Counties prevailed yet through devolution are independent units with financial allocations from the state for developments therefore need to be examined in that respect.

Constitutions do not provide sufficient conditions for management of boundary disputes instead propose the use domestic policies, which accommodate ethnic diversity (Slabbert and Welsh, 1979). He argued that, no single policy could respond to the varied dimensions of conflict or policy responses to boundary disputes that needed to co-ordinate and then carry out simultaneously in political, economic and cultural spheres. This work however, underscored the fact that constitutional measures involved by the government as interventions, in clarifying matters pertaining to the boundary locations, council domains, management and sponsorship of institutions would not be undertaken to shed light on emerging boundary controversies. Therefore, based on specific theory of ‘Galtung’s Structural Theory of Conflict 1996’, a framework was designed to explain the Keroka phenomenon by relying on the theoretical framework.

Natural Resources and Conflicts in Kenya

Land remains a key basis of livelihood for country economic development in Kenya; because she is an agricultural-based economy, where in the counties depend on the size and tenure of land that is available to a county and her individual citizens (Wakhungu and Nyakuri, 2008). It followed the boundaries of a taxing county, determine the amount of the counties’ taxes, which properties would pay those taxes and furthermore the geographical extent of the forty-seven county governments in Kenya marked the territorial extent of their specific rights, powers, duties, liabilities and constituencies (Takashi and Deininger, 2005). In Masana Sub-location (Tigoi) for example, Mr. Howard Williams placed the Luo living in the area in Western province following the 1963 regional boundary revision. Masana Sub-location was made part of
South Maragoli Location of Western province as the Luo in Masana, through the Aten’g Association of East Africa, who wrote to Ronald Ngala on 31/12/1962 demanding revision of the boundary. They expressed their fear of Luyiah domination over their land since they were the minority in Masana, although those requests were never addressed to conclusively. In 1963 the Luyiah of Masana area also claimed that the district commissioner Hermant, had imposed a Luo chief Petero Obiero on them and the government was not protecting their land (KNA, 1962), then found a claim that the Luo had robbed them off their traditional land leading them demand to be under a Maragoli Chief which caused fisticuffs.

So far in Kenya and after the revision of boundaries in 1963 and under the new constitution, however, in the colonial period ethnicity was a tool enhanced by government officials for easy governance as a policy. For one C.W. Hobley a Protectorate official of the Kavirondo region, in the process of extending his personal influence in the region, instigated inter-ethnic conflicts between the Luo and Luyiah around Kisumu by playing small sections off against another. That was between most of the Luyiah people and some of the Luo clans on the northern shores of Kavirondo Gulf (Ogot, 1976), over land. This later was followed by boundary disputes between the Wanga and their neighbours, particularly the Rubwe, Emanyira, Musanda, Tingare and the Maruma clans. The Rubwe/Ruwe, Emanyira/Emanyala and Musanda clans were all descendants of one ancestor and belonged to North Nyanza district, who were then transferred to Central Nyanza district. That then created ethnic animosity and conflict between the Luo and Luyiah (K.N.A., 1963).

**Consequences of boundary Conflicts in Kenya**

Besides war, loss of properties and death in 2002, was the same period that saw some 3000 people displaced by inter-ethnic conflicts in Isiolo, forcing many families to move from their Manyattas to camp at the local district headquarters for security. According to Bishop Luigi of the Diocese of Isiolo in his report, fighting broke out when about 200 Borana attacked a Turkana Manyatta at Eremet. A large group comprising mainly of Borana, raided several settlements, inhabited by the ethnic Somali Degodia clan, killing at least 142 and abducting around 50 people (Ethno- Net, 2002). Speculations were that the attacks had a political motive ahead of the 2002 parliamentary and presidential elections and because of the scarce availability of good pasture in this mi-arid region (Burden, 2002).

Kenya boundaries and ethnic problems were due to the failure of political institutions to accommodate diverse interests of different ethnic clan-groups, religious and linguistic cultures (Kiményi, 2001) however, with devolution cultural identity and the empowerment of the people were promoted. However (Mazrui, 1994) posited that culture is rooted on ethnicity and would not be used to reinforce pre-existing ethnic differences.

According to (Slabbert and Welsh, 1979) they argued that, no single policy could respond to the varied dimensions of conflict or policy responses to boundary dispute needed to co-ordinate and then carry out simultaneously in political, economic and cultural spheres. This work however, underscored the fact that constitutional measures involved by the government interventions in clarifying matters pertaining to the boundary locations, council domains, management and sponsorship of institutions would not be undertaken to shed light on emerging boundary controversies. Therefore, specific theory of ‘Galtung’s Structural Theory of Conflict 1996’, a framework designed to explain the Keroka phenomenon through the theory to come up with resolutions of the conflict.

**Theoretical Framework**

Theories of conflict are explanations put forward to explain causes of conflict where those causes of conflict were numerous and complex thus created a problem of analysis of specific conflict situations. The theories
advanced to simplify the causes were looked at in categories. There were theories explaining causes of conflict that included structural theory of conflict, Marxist theory, international capitalist theory, realist theory, biological theory and psychological theory of conflict. The broad theory of cosmological conflict, refers to the universe but in the perspective of this study implied to human society. For example instrumentalism theory model attempts to determine the causes of ethnic conflicts on political motives (Tilley, 1997) and rational choice model (Greertz, 1993) emphasizes on the decision of individual actors in influencing conflict factors through principles of primordialism, instrumentalism and constructivism. However, Galtung’s structural theory attempt to explain conflict as a product of the tension that arises when groups compete for scarce recourses. The central argument in this sociological theory explains that conflict builds in a particular way, where societies are structured or organized. It describes a condition in a community or society and their conditions are that create a conflict. Structural conflict theory identifies such conditions as social exclusion, deprivation, class inequalities, injustice, political marginalization, gender imbalances, racial segregation, economic exploitation and the likes, all of which often lead to conflict (Oakland, 2005). Structuralism maintains that conflict occurs because of the exploitative and unjust nature of human societies or because of domination of one class on another. The theory of structuralism is however, deficient in its on-sidedness of looking at causes of conflict because it does for instance see the bright sides of the racial, ethnic, clan or sub-clan diversity and the strengths that a society may derive from pluralism, but only flaws. The structural theory thus makes sense only when conflicts viewed from the broadest possible perspective and only if the observer opts to ignore alternatives. Therefore, the broad theoretical background of this work provided that of Galtung’s Structural theory of conflict (1996), looks at the non-violent and creative handling of intra-conflicts in details. The conflict theory involved a critical investigation into the causes of the conflict, structures and dynamics of the conflict, actors in the conflict and the outcomes in detail. It proposes a historical analysis and background of the contesting community as inter-clans to understand the genesis and dimension of the current intra-clan events. Different perspectives of the conflict is analyzed and as well as different actors involved while the theory holds on those personalities and personal perspectives of individuals who usually are informed of the understanding of any conflict situation in the conflict. This is because in any conflict, interests, positions, feelings and outside pressures on the parties sustain conflict. The theory asserts that whoever is involved in the conflict need a deeper understanding of the conflict and get a factual account to be of value. The root causes of the conflict, the parties in the conflict, their roles and interests, therefore were investigated in order to bring to an end or reduce the conflict. The application of those concepts helped in explaining the possible processes that characterized intra-clannish boundary and resource conflict in Keroka between Kitutu and Nyaribari clans. All those stated concepts were important to this work since they provided a wider choice of analysing changes in clan relations and on contentious issues in the intra-clan-communities within a historical framework, through data presentation.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS
This chapter gives an overview of the past, present and future reflection on natural resource-based conflicts within the inter clan and intra-clan societies in different communities under different environments in different counties, especially Gusii land. Specific projections about the extent or location of future conflict risks, driven by boundary and resource scarcity as a highly complex and either resistant to specificity were examined. In part, this was because as just noted, boundary and land scarcity effects would ever be rare and if felt in isolation from the impacts of the other risks on the scene.
The extent of the impacts caused by boundary and land scarcity depended on social, institutional, economic and ecological vulnerability as on the magnitude of the threats themselves. Above all, projections of the future effects of boundary and land scarcity issues were highly uncertain and unpredictable. Given not only limitations in the current scientific outlook and particularly at more granular levels of geographical focuses; but also the non-linear nature of many of the climatic changes involved and the complex feedback loops between different scarcity issues within Keroka area and extension to the 47 counties with the 42 clans in kenya.

**Historical Summary and Perspectives of Keroka Sub-Clans**

Since the Sweta settlement-dates back to the two clans as a group in the 1850s, their conflicts have been rising since then, therefore escalation of conflicts was nothing new to the same clans of the Kitutu or Nyaribari or their sub-clan groups. Even after independency conflict had been increasing with consequent increases in the number of casualties and looted properties, destruction of the settlements and abandonment of entire areas, were right in even at the family level. Boundary relations are still relatively intensive and this consists of family relations in both areas on intermarriages, the marketing of commodities, hiring of government officials and the smuggling of stolen goods, especially shop looting (Meir, 1994).

Political pride would dictate the desire to demonstrate Nyamira as an independent County, best characterized by total non-dependency from the former Kisii County by acquiring and occupying power should be a point of priority. A politico-economic perspective and the maintenance of the existing functional situation perceived by Gusii County Governments constituted a form of neo-colonial set up in their relations and could ensure that the continued dependency of the two clans of Nyaribari and Kitutu on them, excited. Alternatively, for political reasons, Nyamira county government would decide immediately to close the boundary between Kisii and herself an absurd scenario.

While this scenario had a certain political logic, it would result in a number of major functional problems, mostly affecting the economy and form a functional separation, between the two communities. This necessitated the decentralization of town management to the neighborhood level with only few powers remaining for town-wide administration and mostly relating to the joint maintenance of physical and infrastructural networks (Kollek, 1988) of the town market. However, neither side accepted the notion of national administration, which would wrest the control away from the local populations as per the 2010 constitution.

The Gusii Sweta community history is that they had been united in their practices and forms and that seemed to contribute to the practices as of other Africa people’s cultures, does. Among the aspects of popular practices in summary were: cattle herding, harvesting, house construction, child naming, hunting and gathering, grain grinding, burying the dead, war times, natural calamities, circumcision and marriage, which integrated the clan’s social lifestyle and indeed the Kitutu and Nyaribari throughout their life. Other areas where the community integrated include rituals performed in times of prolonged drought, illness, impending disasters and certain disorders caused by diseases. Emergencies in the traditional life of the Abagusii in particular the Kitutu and Nyaribari clans, included cattle raids, crop destruction by pests, attacks by wild animals and warning for an invading enemy. For example, the Maasai or the Kalenjins as their daily activities since, their migration 1890s and the Molo clashes 1992 were similar.

Functional Characteristics of a future boundary are highly speculative at this stage, because it is important to consider the functional scenarios for a future boundary separating Kitutu market and the Nyaribari side, be it along the ‘highway line’ or along an alternative route. Two contrasting scenarios present themselves here: One possibility is that the new boundary would remain open; enabling the transfer of goods and people from one side to the other and on the economic significance of such an arrangement would be the continued
employment of both Kitutu and Nyaribari workers within the town market centre, albeit in menial and underpaid jobs. Goods would be enabled to pass through the boundary in the open market area, but will likely become a very beneficial process to one county, if not well intervened with better resolution management skills.

Tariffs are more likely to be requested by Nyamira County Government owing to the higher producer costs, both in agriculture and industry while, without tariffs, goods originating in the Nyaribari or neighboring counties such as (Bomet) are likely to undercut the Kitutu producers in the open market place. Even today, there are many cases of agricultural produce, being smuggled into Keroka town, mostly by market vendors and the maintenance of open boundaries have a certain economic logic, in as much as it would prevent any short-term major dislocation for the fledgling Keroka economy. Nevertheless, it would result in the retention of an asymmetric pattern of economic relations, which favors the dominant town economy as per the time.

Concluding Comments on Keroka conflict
The nature of the autonomy, as implemented in the 2010 constitutional amendments act, is limited to both its territorial extent and in the degree of authority granted to the county government powers. Notwithstanding this, the central government takes many of the important symbols of county hood on including joint control of border transit countrywide, the operation of an independent police force within the autonomy areas, as well as the unhindered use of the national flag and the formulation of both country national travel documents and stamps. At the time of final revision of the constitution 2010, the question of the boundary had become even more critical following the calls for ‘separation’ of powers on the part of county leadership. The question of boundary demarcation and the functional nature of future boundaries have been transformed into an applied debate, concerning the geopolitical future of Keroka area and her population, on the raise that Nyaribari may be divided to town.

Whether or not a boundary is formally demarcated between Nyamira and Kisii counties, it is largely dependent on the Central government, finally agreeing to the establishment of Keroka Town or in other words the repartition of Kitutu and Nyaribari purely would be a national government issue. While the official County Governments’ negotiating stance, continued to reject the notion of an independent Keroka Town Monopoly by either government; it is difficult for neutral observers to see the continuation of the current process of conflict, leading anywhere else. In such an eventuality, the course of the boundary is likely to follow closely the constitution of 2010 boundary and demarcations policy, which separates Nyamira County from Kisii County. However, the possibility of territorial redemarcation in Keroka-favour should not be ruled. This was to be the outstanding issue preventing the final Keroka peace in full between Kitutu and Nyaribari 2017 understanding. It is possible that the County governments would accept some territorial attrition, rather than risk the non-establishment of a monopolized state by one county government as indicated for the Nyamira County.

This discussion of the changing functional characteristics of the Keroka boundary during the past fifteen years has raised a number of questions concerning the way in which scholars are accustomed to studying boundaries. The impact of a disputed boundary on micro-landscape change is a relatively short period, 2010 and the paradoxes, which have been inherent in the country about boundaries, have contrasted with the implications of county government policies on the ground. They have served to strengthen, rather than weaken the perceived presence of Keroka resource boundary, while the contrasting images of boundaries as depicted not only in formal maps but also in popular images of in-caricatures and the stamps are indicative of the perceived presence of a line of separation. The importance of understanding the changing landscape and geo-ethnic or clan realities of a boundary-frontier area are the way in which each side was into conflict.
priority. That different component in its attempted demarcation foretells a future boundary that will be equally acceptable in a process of conflict resolution.

This short time boundary antagonism at Keroka is in the idea, which has been in existence for a lesser period existed as a form of political boundary for less than ten years (2010-2017). It has been shown to be rich in the diversity of problems of conflicts occurrences. Conflict-actors influenced patterns, causes and outcomes in those conflicts and since then have grown rapidly in Kenya especially on boundary and resource areas becoming among the most vulnerable sports.

For example in 1932, German subjects on a British territory committed a trespass on where the two sites was lime being burnt in about 200yards from the Anglo-German border and about 1000 yards east of the Lumi stone where the natural resource, caused conflict (Archives KNA, 1933). After independence, conflicts were now widespread in the most highly populated zones and often overlapped with extreme food insecurity. Nevertheless, many local civil society organizations have programs to manage conflict today and such as the likes of None-Governmental Organization (NGO). Intergovernmental organizations and donors being pre-occupied with the understanding of conflict and experimenting it with solutions in the affected areas worldwide, while in Kenya it remains to IEBC to re-demarcate for example Nyaribari into Keroka Town to the site of Masaba settlement scheme.

The immediate trigger causes of the disharmony were mainly immediate incidences that resulted into violence, which were mostly associated with reactions to certain specific events that had impacts on peoples’ perception and required immediate response as to violent incidences, theft, Government operations and inflammatory public speeches. Specific violent incidences, theft of one group on another, government police operations and inflammatory public speeches like that of former MCA Francis Aburi of Nyaribari clan which led to an immediate response by the affected people (the Nyaribari).

After the conflict, the impact of at the household level was felt in terms of reduced access to food and interruptions in trade. Others like loss of life and property, degeneration of social relationships, forced migration of families had negative psychological and social impacts on the families, were serious implications to a people already experiencing low income per capita at Sh.29.265 daily (trading economies in the country 2017). In essence, there was need for a stocktaking of our present daily analysis of conflict and the lessons we can draw from experience of conflict, mediation and resource management in the country today.

The shared resource center ‘Keroka Town’ posed and would be having a particular management challenge because of competition and personal interest from the two counties. There were limited mechanisms for cooperation action and more so between the two Kisii and Nyamira counties, because the majority clan-people in the region are poor and hardly sustain their livelihoods. Therefore as a form of survival tactics, some of their strategies to cope with poverty in light of inadequate resources and viability income resulted into improper use of Keroka town. Collecting tax in some individuals, purported to be County Askaris from Kisii County, led to the discord with Nyamira collection revenue offices in the market Centre, posted further and future challenges.

**Recommendations on the Keroka Conflict**

In general, literature in conflict interchangeably is used with other terms such as recommendations, which are guides to positivity. They are a recap to refresh our memory as well as to capture the essence of our discourse; therefore, the researcher recommends that the report in the study, can aid the authorities at the central and county governments to control such future intra-clan disputes whenever they may arise. This is where it becomes pertinent to mention words or terms that represent synonyms of conflict words on use. They include contrast, disharmony, discord, struggle, contest, strife, antagonism, controversy, clash, rivalry,
contest, contention, brawl, fisticuff, fight, battle, feud, combat and war where in politics is not dissimilar either. However, conflict technically means an existing state of disconnect between two or more parties on a prevailing issue or circumstances pushing for policy follow-ups and uses. Further, the researcher added that governments restore peace through the following ways.

**Formulate Policy on Peace Building**
The government(s) should formulate and implement policies on conflict management and peace building. Such policies can provide frameworks for understanding some of those contests on how to manage them, institutionalize and legalize the role of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, check the proliferation of illicit arms, address the issue of displaced or migrating persons as well as strengthen the community policing. With the policy in place will provide guidelines for conflict management in the respective communities and entrench conflict management into existing and future national plans for better service delivery.

**Strengthen Service Delivery to Affected Areas**
Delivery of other services including health, infrastructure and provision of security services through deployments of county governments, are to reduce rivalry among people. Therefore, the poor State of the service delivery in the area was central to the discontent that destroyed them and promoted misunderstanding, therefore these should be strengthened henceforth.

**Promote Inter-Community Peace Building Activities**
That to develop peace-building activities to include youth empowerment projects and festivals will form the basis of inter-clan friendship to bring together communities or clans in a non-hostile setting. Eventually, those activities can be concluded in inter-clan negotiations over contentious issues and those negotiations should have traditional authority, structurally incorporated into peace committees, where other stakeholders from the government and civil society actors moderates and facilitates proceedings are to ensure compliance with the law.

**Promote Conflict Sensitivity and Inter-Sector Mainstreaming of the Feud Management**
A requirement for mainstreaming conflict and contrast is necessary to mitigate the planning and implementation process of all actors in Kisii and Nyamira Counties. Subsequently, there can be established local structures at county levels preferably under the County Commissioners Development Committee to review plans of each actor and suggest ways of ensuring maximum impact derived to the central authority.

**Mop out Illegal Activities in the area**
Basing generalizations further recommendations were that, Conflict on boundary and Resource areas be identified, put under the central government organization who should mop out illegal activities, for development to take place with the locals. This would enable the governments to maintain the existing boundaries without causing disputes and splitting citizens for the purpose of coherence. The understanding of the dynamics of the Kitutu and Nyaribari clans at Keroka be used to enhance unity at local, national and international scales through further research, promote unity and preserve their daily cultures.

**Further Research over counties Kisii versus Nyamira boundaries**
There is need to examine the significance of administrative boundaries in economic development in Kenya and challenges facing boundary review processes with the creation of the new administrative units within
Gusii land. This document showed political, economic, social, technological, environmental and legal factors (PESTEL) were contributors of boundary and resource conflict in the society of Keroka. Therefore, the government has reason to form inter-county policies in accordance with the law to oversee such crises whenever they arise and that more research be carried out to bring out clear alternatives on such matters in the country addressing the issue of nepotism. Those recommendations served as a justification for this study.

CURRENT RESEARCH
The study applied a detailed descriptive results obtained after data analysis. Figures and tables were useful in presenting the findings because they summarized a lot of information in a small place, well accompanied by explanations to highlight the content. Items expanded through clarification of table footnotes as additions. Objectives and question followed and represented the objectives, hypothesis or questions and then pertinent issues, as the researcher was careful not to confuse data presentation with the analysis. The research based on both, oral interviews and written collected materials, about the two clans’ history.

History of the migrations of the Sweta in the pre-colonial period 1850-1963
History of Sweta in the pre-colonial period (1850-1960) and their spread as sister clans at Keroka area, settled as Nyaribari clan and Kitutu. The origin of Kitutu and Nyaribari clans are the Abagusii who coined the name from the word Mogusii. In a brief history of the Abagusii, they claim that Mogusii was their founder of the clan therefore have taken their name from him as ‘Abagusii’. Mogusii’s great-great-great-grandfather was Kintu alias (Muntu, Mundu or Wantu) as their leader of the migration Bantu group. The ancestral Gusii population entered western Kenya from Uganda and later moved from the foothills of Mount Elgon towards their present lands (http://www.kenya-information-guide.com/kisii-tribe.html) years ago. Their language Ekegusii is the closest to the Ameru, a Bantu group that has similar culture and language pronunciations. As a result in comparison of the Bantu group, the Kisii tribe is one of the most economically successful tribes of Kenya along the Kikuyu tribe. They are thought to have moved from, Uganda then to the foothills of Mt. Elgon for two generations ago, further to Goye near L.Victoria.

Ochieng’ (1974) narrated the origin of Mogusii that, he was the founder of their society and his father was Osogo and Osogo son of Moluguhia, Moluguhia son of Kigoma, Kigoma son of Ribiaka and Ribiaka son of Kintu (Muntu or Wantu) who migrated from Misiri in the 1560 A.D. However, the Kitutu and Nyaribari clans were traced back to where they were at Kano plains as one clan at Goye. They were seen as the only two last clans of the seven larger Gusii communities, who split into further divisions of the Gusii between 1820s-1850s. In Gusii land the other distinct clans in the area include Bassi, Bonchari (Wanjare), Machoge, South Mugirango, Bogirango (West and North Mugirango) and Bonchari clans (figure 1), who were among the sole migrant clans on the dispersal times from the Kano plains as the latest and last movements or settlements among the Gusii community. Each migration from Kano to Gusii highlands was not in a mass migration but an individual effort (Onchoke, UCN/HD-RPA, A/2 / 3). Sweta Migrations as the last movements were to Kericho, then Kabianga from Kano, back to Nyangararo Settlement Scheme (Kenen), then finally to Nyagoe forest near Manga area and then spread back to Keroka hills as Kitutu and Nyaribari clans in the 1860s (fig.3) appendix XIV.

However, in another version, traditions trace Abagusii as those who migrated together as a team to Kisumu Location under Mogusii their leader and his mother Nyako’Mokamogendi assumed to have died and buried at Kisumu. Later, a section of the other Gusii people changed name to be known as ‘Abagusii’ and later broke out from Kisumu further south of the Kano plains, under the new leadership of Kimanyi, who was a brave warrior in the 1820s (Ochieng’1974. pg 45). At the Kano plains the advance of the Nilote-speaking
Luo, presumably fled them and finally moved them to the present location in the Gusii (Kisii) hills in the 1850s.

Further suggestions were that the Gusii came from the South of Lake Victoria settled for a while in the Kano Plains. They presumably merged with the Gusii community who had come from Mount Elgon and together then moved into the Gusii Hills through Kismu, River Nyando to Kericho and far as Kabianga and then pushed back to Nyangarore settlement scheme by the Nandi nilotic group.

Due to their history of almost and constant in their migrations, Gusii cultures are inevitably a mixture of various influences, combining the original Bantu elements with aspects borrowed from or imposed by contacts with Nilote-speaking peoples. Notably the Luo and to a lesser extent the Maasai and the Kipsigis, as they are largely today invested in the Keroka area parts of Gusii highlands.

Amongst the community’s migration, environment or clan conflicts were the causes of the migrations and had been either due to drought or to conflict with the other Nilote-speaking Kipsigis, a section of the Kalenjins. On their way to Gusii highlands, two generations of the Abagusi people stayed at Goye Bay on Lake Victoria after which they were headed to the Kano Plains which was disabling hot, humid flatlands that lied between Kismu and the western highlands. Here they lived for over a century, in scattered homesteads over the plains and it was when in Kano plains the clan structured itself into the present-day Abagusii community and a time when they began to take shape in their political organization. In the form of four large families, different warriors led their migrations to South Western part as the Bassi, Girango, Sweta and Wanjare. The head warriors formed the clans on the highland and acted as chiefs over them.

In the tales of a storybook ‘Okaba omochakano bw’Abagusii na Mogekoyo omwabo’, a Gusii writer, indicated that there was neither food, fruits nor crops at Kano plains but a terrible famine. The story goes that whomever had his brother got hold of his hand and started after another to the relatives who had gone earlier before them from the Kano plains. Now as each family started movements to other new places under recognized leaders, were in tiny units. They had started looking themselves in the 1820s as Mobassi, Machoge, Mogirango, Nyaribari, Monchari (Bonchari) and Sweta. However, the two clans of Kitutu and Nyaribari were the Sweta involved in the region as part of the Abagusii community.

From the time they migrated from Trans-Mara Triangle (Nyangararo Settlement Scheme), were under Mosweta Ngoge (Abasweta) group and established them-selves at Manga in the current Kitutu Chache area. Actually, seven generations ago the whole of Nyaribari among others were completely empty. At the time, normally a leader was a military person well known and a respected clan warrior as Sweta himself. He would be in charge of other warriors whose age was between eighteen and forty years, well trained in the art of warfare and on how to handle different weapons of war such as arrows, spears, clubs and shields (Ochie’ng 1074).

Eventually the Sweta clan at once, all of them migrated and joined each other from Kano since the Nandi warriors forced confrontations on them and at times collaborated with them to raid the Luo for cattle, which posed a big challenge to them. At Keroka as at Kano highlands, the Gusii realized the aggression of the Kipsigis raids for their cattle, which had made them start pulling out of Kano for the few clans who had remained there and after the stricken famine. The remnant Gusii people had then drove their remaining cattle to North Mugirango (Nyangarore Settlement scheme - Kenen) as Sweta group, where they erected their new settlement for a while before dispersing to Nyagoe forest.

In a new relation most of the training for worriers at Keroka was received in the cattle compound (Boma or Gesarate), where the clan warriors looked after their cattle lived for a span of life and kept their women off at the highlands. All women and men in one’s parents’ generations were called, ‘tata’moke’ (young-father) and ‘makomoke’ (young-mother). All members of the next generation are, ‘abana’ and one ‘omwana’ for a child. Grandchildren’s generation is ‘omochokoro (my grandchild) and for a grandparents’ generation is
sokoro (grandfather-male) while magokoro (grandmother-female). Gusii terminologies (Alan, 1994) distinguish links that had been established by a transfer of marriage in Keroka by cattle to the father and mother of the bride as ‘ababiare and one is omobiare’.

**The spread of the Kitutu clan to Keroka area in the pre-colonial times**

Sweta is a synonym of the Kitutu people together with Nyaribari who were brothers. The two clans now claim to be descendants of Mosweta Ngoge and a leader of the family Kitutu. Mosweta was a chief who had no son from his first wife, however he fathered son Oisoe from a second wife, who begot Oibabe and other generations as followed that Oibabe fathered Kiboma who begot Tibichi and Tibichi fathered Nyakundi who was nicknamed ‘Ritutu’ meaning ‘a bush’, translated as Egetutu, however due to the pronunciation called it Kitutu. According to Ochien’g (1974) Nyakundi is the credited the founder of Kitutu division as a chief in the 1870s. However, Gusii traditions narrate that Mosweta’s first wife adopted a son child from Oisoe grandchild (omochokoro) aimed to succeed the properties of Nyakundi where his generations later followed down to form Nyaribari clan to save the name of the first wife on a succession dispute.

The name ‘Ritutu’ was a nickname from her mother the second wife, who jokingly pronounced it to her peers as the only son born for her and a blessing because she believed that he had hidden her shame of not giving her husband a son to inherit his wealth. After six decades of generations, Chief Angwenyi in the chiefdom lineage at his old age at 80s, (1933-1939) as son of Nyakundi, was a fourth generation of the great grandson Mosweata Ngoge and was an hereditary chief who later became particularly a paramount chief.

His people of Kitutu numbering about 25,000 loved him very much but he was not intelligent, although was one of the best chiefs the colonial government had, since he settled local matters or affairs in a just way and in accordance with the Gusii customs.

In another perception, Ochieng (1974) ‘Ritutu’ is a Gusii name for a black cuckoo bird, the ‘cuculus cafer’, which is very common in Gusii countryside with a three-note drawn-out call. This answer, was which Nyakundi’s mother gave to her well-wishers, as a joke and became a nickname of the child as his real name. The Nyakundi’s followers, later adapted it as their group name ‘Kitutu’ developing into a clan. History has it that Kitutu later was the only Gusii clan with particularly a strong and hereditary leadership (Ochieng’, 1974) and Nyakundi in the fourth generation chief, was the accredited founder of the Kitutu division as son of Oisoe who led the Sweta group from Nyangararo in Trans-Mara to Manga area. The story relating to the genesis of Nyakundi’s nickname goes as follows according to Robert Ochieng’ that, “when he was born many people came to see the child. It was especially for the father, a recognized head of the state Sweta group who had begot only girls and the people were anxious for him to get a male child-heir to succeed the ‘good old chief’. When Nyakundi’s mother was asked whom (child) was that had given birth to, she always answered that she had given birth to a young ‘Ritutu’ meaning a bush” where birds of cuckoo hid.

Closely related to Abasweta, are the Abagisero clan who are living at Mosocho on the borders of the Luo. They seem to be divided into two groups as those who believe that they belong to Kitutu and others said that they belong to the Luo of Kabondo and Kapsul descendants. Gusii traditions indicate in their narratives as per Erastus Abuga of Kitutu, that ‘omogesero’ was a synonym of a founder clan warrior Mogusii and was the youngest of the migrants from Kano plains and are closely related to Abanchari and Abatondo. On the other hand, Abatondo would be the offsprings of the Maasai community whom the Gusii borrowed in return for food at the times of hunger in Maasai land at Nyangararo Settlement Scheme, while Abanchari (Wanjare) would be of Luo origin.

In another perspective, the people of Mukusero clan (Abagisero) according to (Hemstead, 1924) are offspring of the Kitutu rebels, whom are said to be one of the famous chief ‘Oisoe’ not a true son of Tibichi a chief of heridity. It was that one of the first wives of chief Tibichi, failed to get a baby boy for Tibichi,
who was adopted by Oisoe’s grandchild as a grandchild and he was from Tibichi’s brother follower to inherit him later as a chief. The adopted child came a head of the Kitutu and begot many children, as one of them ‘Nyabusagi’ and at one time found himself in-love with Nyakundi’s beloved third or so woman, Wanjare. Following that love affair, the man was cast to the woman Wanjare now Bonchari 1820-1850, who formed a clan Bonchari.

Mukusero (Omogesero) in Bonchari is derived from ‘Okobusura’ that means to scatter, since the woman Wanjare used to scatter grain at sowing times more oftenly was nicknamed after it. In the mid of the 20th C, Mukusero group in that pretext were oftenly attacking Kitutu group and retreated to Bonchari during Nyabusagi’s reign. There came Ombati a self-styled chief of Mukusero and engaged the Kitutu war frequently but was defeated by Kitutu warriors. That was the time he felt left with no alternative and rushed to Kisumu for help from the British colonial government in 1902. The clan Mukusero group was later nicknamed Bonchari clan after Monchari in the Mogusii circles changing from Wanjare, because of them the group being associated with the Luo community that they never liked.

On their own relations and wrangles within the Kitutu sub-clans (Bonchari, Nyaribari and Abatondo ), were with those involved as subjects on one-side over competitions like the official chiefs’ successions and on the other hand, those numerous individuals of enterprises who felt excluded from the narrow executive structures. They were seeing official programmes only as generally insufficient, but also as tended to favor the official communication and for those who helped into implementing them, caused feuds. Competitions normally involved relatively small numbers of individuals who tended to present their conflicting claims to the local administration, such as Ombati with little attempt to mobilize popular mass support in their areas during the colonial times.

For intra-clan disputes, two chiefs of Kitutu known as Ogalo and Kimaiga founded resolutions by using the neighboring communities’ disputes between 1880-1900. According to (William, 1974) they summoned their people at Seusi now ‘Manga court’ at Manga and reminded them of the constant trouble and destruction they had faced from the Kipsigis over years. They came up with resolutions to make safe their homes and children and agreed to have another meeting with all other Gusii leader-warriors of Nyaribari, Bassi, Bomachoge, Bonchari, Kitutu and North Mugirango on the next occasion and therefore were asked to cooperate.

They were required to suspend their betty issues for the sake of survival from the Nilotic peoples’ attacks, where in the next meeting Kimaiga chief of the Kitutu, invited Sakawa son of Ngiti. In the meeting, the resolution passed concurred with final remarks that the prophet continues updating the clan elders with information as to when the Maasai, Luo or Kipsigis would strike again. At that, drums would be beaten to call in warriors from all over Gusii corners for their defense and whenever they were attacked to shun off the enemy.

At some time 1889 and 1892 a cattle disease referred to as ‘ogango’ broke out in Gusii, Luo, Maasai and Kipsigis lands killing most of the communities herds, which lead to fewer cattle stocks in the region. In 1891, the Kipsigis tried to raid Gusii community for restocking their cattle but because of the poor strategy, were severely defeated where all their warriors were killed in the war, leading to an end of raids from any of the neighbouring attacking communities later. With that, the Kipsigis becoming weak, as later on the Gusii of North Mugirango expanded towards Ikonge and the Kitutu towards Rigoma to Nyangararo (Kenen) Settlement Scheme to date.

In protecting themselves against these skirmishes from their neighbors, they gathered and settled on highlands in bomas and at small locations for security and defense as a united Gusii group. A call from a horn blow or a drumbeat was always signal for trouble and the reaction was immediate, young men would leave whatever they were doing then dashed off to the places where weapons were kept. For example in the
1890’s the Kipsigis raided the Gusii with such ferocity that the Gusii had to build a walled settlements for protection. The Gusii eventually forged a broad military alliance which inflicted a decisive defeat on the Kipsigis shortly after the turn of the century through Gusii clans’ forged unity, prevailing peace in the area on inter-clan conflicts in that era.

The spread of the Kitutu clan to Keroka area in the pre-colonial times

Sweta is a synonym of the Kitutu people together with Nyaribari who were brothers. The two clans now claim to be descendants of Mosweta Ngoge and a leader of the family Kitutu. Mosweta was a chief who had no son from his first wife, however he fathered son Oisoe from a second wife, who begot Oibabe and other generations as followed that Oibabe fathered Kiboma who begot Tibichi and Tibichi fathered Nyakundi who was nicknamed ‘Ritutu’ meaning ‘a bush’, translated as Egetutu, however due to the pronunciation called it Kitutu. According to Ochien’g (1974) Nyakundi is the credited the founder of Kitutu division as a chief in the 1870s. However, Gusii traditions narrate that Mosweta’s first wife adopted a son child from Oisoe grandchilds (omochokoro) aimed to succeed the properties of Nyakundi where his generations later followed down to form Nyaribari clan to save the name of the first wife on a succession dispute.

The name ‘Ritutu’ was a nickname from her mother the second wife, who jokingly pronounced it to her peers as the only son born for her and a blessing because she believed that he had hidden her shame of not giving her husband a son to inherit his wealth. After six decades of generations, Chief Angwenyi in the chieftom lineage at his old age at 80s, (1933-1939) as son of Nyakundi, was a fourth generation of the great grandson Mosweta Ngoge and was an hereditary chief who later became particularly a paramount chief. His people of Kitutu numbering about 25,000 loved him very much but he was not intelligent, although was one of the best chiefs the colonial government had, since he settled local matters or affairs in a just way and in accordance with the Gusii customs.

In another perception, Ochieng (1974) ‘Ritutu’ is a Gusii name for a black cuckoo bird, the ‘cuculus cafer’, which is very common in Gusii countryside with a three-note drawn-out call. This answer, was which Nyakundi’s mother gave to her well-wishers, as a joke and became a nickname of the child as his real name. The Nyakundi’s followers, later adapted it as their group name ‘Kitutu’ developing into a clan. History has it that Kitutu later was the only Gusii clan with particularly a strong and hereditary leadership (Ochieng’, 1974) and Nyakundi in the fourth generation chief, was the accredited founder of the Kitutu division as son of Oisoe who led the Sweta group from Nyangararo in Trans-Mara to Manga area. The story relating to the genesis of Nyakundi’s nickname goes as follows according to Robert Ochieng’ that, “when he was born many people came to see the child. It was especially for the father, a recognized head of the state Sweta group who had begot only girls and the people were anxious for him to get a male child-heir to succeed the ‘good old chief’. When Nyakundi’s mother was asked whom (child) was that had given birth to, she always answered that she had given birth to a young ‘Ritutu’ meaning a bush” where birds of cuckoo hid.

Closely related to Abasweta, are the Abagisero clan who are living at Mosocho on the borders of the Luo. They seem to be divided into two groups as those who believe that they belong to Kitutu and others said that they belong to the Luo of Kabondo and Kapsul descendants. Gusii traditions indicate in their narratives as per Erastus Abuga of Kitutu, that ‘omogesero’ was a synonym of a founder clan warrior Mogusii and was the youngest of the migrants from Kano plains and are closely related to Abanchari and Abatondo. On the other hand, Abatondo would be the offsprings of the Maasai community whom the Gusii borrowed in return for food at the times of hunger in Maasai land at Nyangararo Settlement Scheme, while Abanchari (Wanjare) would be of Luo origin.

In another perspective, the people of Mukusero clan (Abagisero) according to (Hemstead, 1924) are offspring of the Kitutu rebels, whom are said to be one of the famous chief ‘Oisoe’ not a true son of Tibichi
a chief of heridity. It was that one of the first wives of chief Tibichi, failed to get a baby boy for Tibichi, who was adopted by Oisoe’s grandchild as a grandchild and he was from Tibichi’s brother follower to inherit him later as a chief. The adopted child came a head of the Kitutu and begot many children, as one of them ‘Nyabusagi’ and at one time found himself in-love with Nyakundi’s beloved third or so woman, Wanjare. Following that love affair, the man was cast to the woman Wanjare now Bonchari 1820-1850, who formed a clan Bonchari.

Mukusero (Omogesero) in Bonchari is derived from ‘Okobusura’ that means to scatter, since the woman Wanjare used to scatter grain at sowing times more oftenly was nicknamed after it. In the mid of the 20th C, Mukusero group in that pretext were oftenly attacking Kitutu group and retreated to Bonchari during Nyabusagi’s reign. There came Ombati a self-styled chief of Mukusero and engaged the Kitutu war frequently but was defeated by Kitutu warriors. That was the time he felt left with no alternative and rushed to Kisumu for help from the British colonial government in 1902. The clan Mukusero group was later nicknamed Bonchari clan after Monchari in the Mogusii circles changing from Wanjare, because of them the group being associated with the Luo community that they never liked.

On their own relations and wrangles within the Kitutu sub-clans (Bonchari, Nyaribari and Abatondo), were with those involved as subjects on one-side over competitions like the official chiefs’ successions and on the other hand, those numerous individuals of enterprises who felt excluded from the narrow executive structures. They were seeing official programmes only as generally insufficient, but also as tended to favor the official communication and for those who helped into implementing them, caused feuds. Competitions normally involved relatively small numbers of individuals who tended to present their conflicting claims to the local administration, such as Ombati with little attempt to mobilize popular mass support in their areas during the colonial times.

For intra-clan disputes, two chiefs of Kitutu known as Ogalo and Kimaiga founded resolutions by using the neighboring communities’ disputes between 1880-1900. According to (William, 1974) they summoned their people at Seusi now ‘Manga court’ at Manga and reminded them of the constant trouble and destruction they had faced from the Kipsigis over years. They came up with resolutions to make safe their homes and children and agreed to have another meeting with all other Gusii leader-warriors of Nyaribari, Bassi, Bomachoge, Bonchari, Kitutu and North Mugirango on the next occasion and therefore were asked to cooperate.

They were required to suspend their betty issues for the sake of survival from the Nilotic peoples’ attacks, where in the next meeting Kimaiga chief of the Kitutu, invited Sakawa son of Ngiti. In the meeting, the resolution passed concurred with final remarks that the prophet continues updating the clan elders with information as to when the Maasai, Luo or Kipsigis would strike again. At that, drums would be beaten to call in warriors from all over Gusii corners for their defense and whenever they were attacked to shun off the enemy.

At some time 1889 and 1892 a cattle disease referred to as ‘ogango’ broke out in Gusii, Luo, Maasai and Kipsigis lands killing most of the communities herds, which lead to fewer cattle stocks in the region. In 1891, the Kipsigis tried to raid Gusii community for restocking their cattle but because of the poor strategy, were severely defeated where all their warriors were killed in the war, leading to an end of raids from any of the neighbouring attacking communities later. With that, the Kipsigis becoming weak, as later on the Gusii of North Mugirango expanded towards Ikonge and the Kitutu towards Rigoma to Nyangararo (Kenen) Settlement Scheme to date.

In protecting themselves against these skirmishes from their neighbors, they gathered and settled on highlands in bomas and at small locations for security and defense as a united Gusii group. A call from a horn blow or a drumbeat was always signal for trouble and the reaction was immediate, young men would
leave whatever they were doing then dashed off to the places where weapons were kept. For example in the 1890’s the Kipsigis raided the Gusii with such ferocity that the Gusii had to build a walled settlements for protection. The Gusii eventually forged a broad military alliance which inflicted a decisive defeat on the Kipsigis shortly after the turn of the century through Gusii clans’ forged unity, prevailing peace in the area on inter-clan conflicts in that era.

The spread of the Nyaribari clan into Keroka area of Kitutu

The Nyaribari clan is the youngest Gusii division on the other hand, coming up between 1820 and 1850 as those who broke out from their elder brother’s rule Nyakundi of the Sweta group at his 80’s to 90’s to Nyanchwa hills from Nyakoe (nyagoe) forest. Nyaribari meant ‘ekebari’ referring to a basket, which was a nickname by her mother who gave birth while away in the gardens from home. However, on her way back home returned with another basket ‘ekebari’ carrying a baby on the other hand, which then jokingly peers named the baby ‘bari’ (Nyaribari).

In a way, the Nyaribari people were the same people as the Kitutu and were the products of a succession dispute within the Kitutu clan. They settled on the slopes of Nyanchwa hills, however, chief Nyakundi followed them and chased them out-of Nyanchwa further southeast and dispersed them eastwards to the boarders of Bobasi, Bomachoge, Bonchari and the borders of the Maasai pastoralist. They on the other hand came into more conflicts with the Maasai at the borders, than the clan was, into disasters. Nyaribari was the founder clan as a warrior against his brother at Nyanchwa hills, where his nickname ‘Bari’ best suited him through the way he behaved when carrying his spears in a basket (ekebari) similar to the mothers’, to wage war against his Kitutu enemy Nyakundi and that resembled his actions. Gusii traditions state that Nyaribari area was the most secure place from none Gusii attackers of the Maasai, Luo and Kalenjin. They started feeling the weight of war after expanding beyond Keroka and Gucha River, then conflicts from the Maasai and Kitutu clans were enhanced on them until the coming of the British (Ochieng’ 1974).

While Nyakundi lived, he kept a firm hand on the Nyaribari’s sympathizers, but as soon as Barare became the next chief, rebels in Kitutu gathered force under Kiboma son of chief Onyangore of Nyaribari, who had been detained by Kitutu chief Nyakundi. He fled to Nyaura in Nyaribari where the Kitutu warriors followed him for war, but were defeated and repulsed. To date, the war in Nyaribari is referred as a war at ‘kiamokondo’ where Onyangore is believed to have died at Kiogoro then succeeded by Nyamwamu son of Giteba, ‘they oftenly remind the Kitutu people when joking’ of the war.

Nyamwamu ruled Nyaribari until the coming up of the British 1914 when he was deposed off because he participated in the loot of Kisii town’s riots. Nyaribari clan formed many sub-clans up to twenty-nine which include: Bonyamayio, Mwamoriongo, Mwamonda, Bombea, Bonyamasicho, Bonyakoni, Bogeka, Mwaboto, Boguche, Boburia, Botondo, Bosigisia, Mwanyako’mbura, Mwanyaboke, Bogisero, Abaichuni, Abandandaracha, Mogati, Okona, Otaranda, Teba, Bogisesa, Basoroko, Boronyi, Momeroga, Bonyagatanyi, Mwanyakerario and Mwamosomi. Of the above sub-clans, botondo is believed to have come from the Maasailand while Abakimweto, Abandaracha and Abagisero are related to Kitutu clan as a Abasweta who are referred as Abagere (Luo) with the Nyaribari’s sub-clans people.

At Nyaura, Nyaribari started searching for more land southwards where they met the Bassi warriors who repulsed them to the hills of Nyamagwa past Keumbu as to date. At some time after several confrontations, Bassi clan went into agreement with Nyaribari to relinquish land extending to Keroka to the Maasai territory in exchange for their Bassi detainees at Keroka. They were to join their brethrens at Sameta and that was in the 1890s, actually shortly before the coming of the British in Gusii land 1907. A sub-clan of Basi as remnants in Kitutu took over Keroka at the time and place now Kitutu people and erected their boma
bordering Nyaribari, separated by river Gucha with Abaichuni in Nyaribari of who were planned to be conquered later, however slightly pushed towards Keroka.
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