

TRADITIONAL LAND DISPUTE SETTLEMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE FOR PEACE IN GHANA

Amoah Emmanuel Badu

Institute of African Studies, University of Ghana, Legon, Ghana
Email: ebamoah@st.ug.edu.gh

How to cite this paper:

Badu Amoah Emmanuel (2024) Traditional land dispute settlement and infrastructure for Peace in Ghana, Journal of Global Resources, Vol. 10 (01)

DOI:

10.46587/JGR.2024.v10i01.002

Received: 28 Sep. 2023

Reviewed: 24 Oct. 2023

Final Accepted: 21 Nov. 2023


Freely available Online
www.isdesr.org

Abstract: *The conflict resolution process and content in every society have been the ingredients of a social contract based on individual effort to make its instructive value the greatest measure to ensure sustainable peace on land matters. The infrastructure for peace concept and traditional land dispute settlement have emerged as evolving ontological and methodological approaches to arriving at a sustainable peace slant. The purpose of this review paper is to conceptualize weak states and infrastructure for peace and constructivist theory on traditional land dispute settlement in a manner that is more trustworthy, equitable, just, and fair, which provides means to reduce land conflict, and finally create a platform for African writers to critique infrastructure for peace with traditional land dispute settlement in African realities. The method for the study is purely qualitative data from interviews and observation. The findings were that the values of infrastructure for peace were the creation of an early warning system that can influence and provide an early response to conflict, collaboration, and cooperation of all states in one system using the local approach to resolve land conflict or dispute. The two approaches collaborate on the structures that can prevent, manage, resolve, and ensure sustainable peace using bottom-up approaches from weak states theory and the constructivist paradigm to bring out the infrastructure for peace on land. The use of technology and African conflict reconciliation and reintegration would help social bonds out of the adjudication process, which is more antagonistic. Lastly, the structure is familiar and easily supplements land disputes that have dominated our legal and rational dispute settlement and traditional authority in a more trusted and collaborative manner.*

Key words: Infrastructure for Peace, Traditional Land Dispute Settlement, Constructivist Theory

Introduction

The study explored the use of instructive values to resolve land-related conflict in Sub-Saharan Africa, where national legislation co-exists de facto with deep-rooted culture. The national legislation's inability to resolve land disputes has called for a hybrid peace-building structure such as the infrastructure for peace. The purpose of this study is to conceptualize weak states, infrastructure for peace, and constructivist theory in traditional land dispute settlement. It also examines the traditional land dispute settlement structures that are more trustworthy, equitable, just, and fair, which provide means to reduce land conflict, and finally create a platform for African writers to critique the infrastructure for peace with traditional land dispute settlement. I further argue that traditional land dispute settlement and infrastructure for peace need to be reclaimed from the Western neoliberal agenda if Africa wants to succeed in providing a culturally sensitive framework through which war-torn societies like Sudan, Somalia, the Niger Delta in Nigeria, the Central African Republic, Angola, and some communal land conflicts could be healed successfully. On articulating and sustaining this standpoint, "historical, anthropological, and sociological approaches that limit liberalism and neoliberalism are unable to deal with culture in the nuances and sophisticated manner" (Harvey, 2005:18). This is precisely why prevailing approaches to traditional land dispute issues were locally effective but unfortunately repackaged as a legitimate solution to meet cultural, political, and socio-economic issues that meet individual, group, and communal needs of the people that have lived with Africans in the precolonial period, but Western scholars claim ownership. It is Africa's own, and academia in African studies should claim the general concept. Roughly, scholars and policymakers' apprehension about land conflict resolutions and infrastructure for peace has turned their attention to recognizing the importance of traditional land dispute settlement approaches. It is clear that community and individual participation to generate sustainable peace on land issues becomes necessary (Richmond 2011). The governance framework and policies on land management, though having some constraints on enforcement to settle land disputes, were strained by indigenous traditional structures. It exists side-by-side with state actors. In some African peri-urban and urban communities. It is the only viable option, though in some cases it is expensive, convoluted, and corrupt (Brigg, 2011). Proper statements of land may be confronted with legitimacy, ownership, and accountability obstacles. In some cases, the traditional land dispute should try to address issues of efficiency and equity, transparency, and accountability challenges it faces in development (Kasanga et al., 2001). Amanor (2006:65) justified the "deficit in customary control of land out of the local democracy and reduction of the role of chiefs to ornamental figures." The plurality of land tenure and management prevailed in many countries (Kasanga et al.). et al. (2001), which are poorly articulated in the crash sequence. It is a root-long commodity trade for conflict among countries, kingdoms, communities, groups, families, and individuals from pre-colonial, colonial, and post-colonial democratic contemporary dispensations. The concepts of infrastructure for peace using a bottom-up approach by scholars in peace and conflict studies where 'insider mediators' of local engagement to resolve land dispute settlement display certain cultural biases. The role of international engagement through legislation with local approaches to resolving land disputes is strongly shaped by constructed ideas that sometimes reduce tensions on land but do not resolve their challenges completely.

The pluralistic approaches to the land management system, which are sometimes built on traditional structures, for example, the chieftaincy system, and modernity through institutions like the court and ADR centers, have created resilience factors to some extent. There are egregious disputes that need mitigation through a new concept of infrastructure for peace, factoring in existing institutions to resolve land disputes. Such methods revolve around a top-down approach that seems to recommend and implement a particular kind of

governance. The prescriptions seek to launch a policy between the ruler and the ruled that ensures life, liberty, freedom, and property. The established Western approaches to land dispute settlement that evolved through time were shaped by wealth rather than more collective approaches to welfare and cultural preservation. The contemporary land dispute settlement, or as other 'scholars' call it, "land management," has moved from a legal regime and rarely draws on local practices, using cultural resource skills in mediation, negotiation, arbitration, and dialogue that acknowledge a need for social welfare. Although external engagement in conflict is based on Western values, its legitimacy nevertheless relies on the support of local actors and the population at large. This approach to settling land disputes has influenced human societies since the early days, using diplomacy, resistance, and collaboration.

Methodology

The study has been designed as qualitative research and conducted in Kumasi Metropolitan Assembly. The research relied primarily on a review of the literature on infrastructure for peace, traditional land dispute settlements, the weak state, and constructivist theory in governance. Brief overviews, based on secondary data, were made of the general pattern of state policy on land. Archival data coupled with indigenous research methods were also gathered and analyzed according to the themes of social constructivism and the interpretive approach. The indigenous research method built a situation where rationality and relational accountability made the meaning of the subject clear from the content. The results from previous research, coupled with my lived experience as a conflict resolution and peace-building practitioner and scholar, considered the subject matter well. Contextual and content analysis were used to arrive at the conclusion of the study.

Traditional Land Dispute Settlement Concept

The concepts of traditional land dispute settlement have generated a more challenging issue that intends to acknowledge both theory and concept among academia in the study of Africa. From a Weberian standpoint, it means a society controlled by beliefs in the legitimacy of power that has always existed. Nunkuya (1992) described it as a label in a pre-colonial society characterized by hereditary succession as the basis of the customs. Gyekye (1992:221) conceptualized it as process idioms, not as a mere transmitter from generation to generation but also as something that could require some amendment. Traditional culture in Africa resides with the traditional rulers, priests, elders, and the generality of the people, according to Ayayi (2016). This exposes the construction of the tradition study as a consensus responsibility with the cooperation and coordination of various parties in a community of a given place on mutual roles and acts. It is therefore "written in festivals, rituals, and ceremonies; shrines and sacred objects and places; religious objects; music, song, and dance; liturgy; art and symbols; and every other means of Africa's existence" (Ayayi 2016). The concept of reaction with external influence would lead to conflict, which land tenure and management systems have faced to date in African society. Kehinde (2016) expresses his thoughts as an inherited pattern of thought and action, a specific practice of long-standing. This may be customs or legends handed down from generation to generation, or it may be oral traditions. The study related the tradition in the light of history, beliefs, processes, and powers of action in the administration of political, social, and economic well-being for all his subjects. This is key to the structure of society, and managing all issues like political, economic, religious, educational, marriage, and health unite the community.

The central point was religion, which shaped society and predicted continuity. These four features are 'synchronic' and 'diachronic' and are expressed in both vertical and horizontal

dimensions. Relating traditions to land dispute settlement expresses land matters that have been established in history through relationships, religious procedures, and power generally accepted by the people who are governed by them. Scholars in the legal field distinguish between disputes and conflicts. Dispute is defined as conflict or controversy; a conflict of claim or rights; an assertion of a right, claim, or allegation on the other.” In law, conflict progresses into dispute when contrary privileges are avowed in public, that is when the claims and their discordancy are linked to a third person. Lamwai (1985) points out that dispute arises only when the question of individual rights arises and there is a creation of private property in a class society. This work used traditional land dispute settlement, which means pre-colonial, colonial, and neocolonial approaches to settling differences or disagreements among individuals, groups, and communities on issues related to land. The judicial systems are responsible in theory for the settlement of such disputes, along with the local communities, which is effective and more understanding based on the belief system and power relationship recognized in such a society.

The basic action and thought have one major role, that is, to exert and construct an ideology of authority over others. All these powers are in the spiritual beliefs of the people, and myths around the power provide checks and balances and powers similarly drawn from modern court systems, which adjudicate cases beginning with swearing-in with objects of belief in a witness box. Believers in earth gods’ beliefs in their powers, like ancestral power beliefs in the stool or skin of the powers, the evolving African conflict from pre-colonial periods to the contemporary democratic era has been a major trigger on land-related issues, including ownership by clans, families, ethnic groups, individuals, and states, among others. It is clear that without conflict, any human activity or settlement dispute has no significant role in any society. The issues of land-related conflict generated political, economic, and social conflict in society from its acquisition to its distribution, even until the small part that would be allocated to society after departure from life, where even land conflict in society still continues. Unruh (2006) attributed it to land tenure systems, which have proven to be some perplexing issues in the developing world where the formal and customary property rights systems on land security have become difficult issues to overcome. Early independent Ghana's role states assumed land lordship with clauses that applied to the national interest, public interest, and the interest of development, which weakened the customary ownership and control over settling land disputes. The state legislation to control this appealed land with the others sometimes becomes a settling hole of conflict that emanates. The major issue that has tagged the poor world conflict is the impious processing of land resources, as argued by economics in state building. Traditional dispute settlement dates back to the pre-colonial period when Africans had their approaches and misunderstandings on land settlement. Pre-colonial African societies had a major way to acquire land, and ideas of land were rooted in the religious and sacred belief systems of Amankwa (1989). It was a foundational and reverent object in most communities and was viewed as a symbol of religious awe. Among the Talensi and Dagomba tribes of the Northern, Upper East, and Western Regions of Ghana, the land was believed to belong to the earth priest, who was said to be the giver of life and fertility (Awedoba, 2009). The Ga-Adamgbe in the southern part of Ghana claims it is the property of the Lagoon spirit. The Asante in the southern part of Ghana identified land with a supernatural female that had the power of its own to execute and function as a female. They regard the land as a sanctuary for the souls of the departed ancestors and need reverends in the form of “Nsatuo”¹ to accord

¹The land is being made more peaceful as a result of human attempts to annoy it while it is being used. Land is viewed by Akans as God's creation, and as such, it deserves respect and dignity. The procedure is to notify "Asase Yaa," the spirit of the land God, of its usage. In order for third parties to use the land, security, and productivity were also required by the procedure.

it in time of usage. In northern Nigeria, land is seen as a property of Allah and is not subject to compensation or taxation (Awedoba (2009)). God is a deity of justice, wealth should pay on their land for the maintenance of the poor, giving it compensation for the Allennu (1962) maxim that “land belongs to a vast family of whom many are dead, a few are living, and countless are still unborn”. This gives explanations for restraint on the sale of land among many communities in Africa. The responsibility of a living being losing land by any means brings drastic failure on his part, the people he leads, and the ‘unseen spiritual policemen and women who control the affairs of the land.’ The ontology of land in Africa has been guided from the beginning by how issues surrounding land must be handled to resolve egregious land conflicts.

Infrastructure for Peace Concepts

The earliest academia whose critic argued against liberal peace on sociological consideration under the notion of ‘Conflict transformation’ did it to transform the society. These critical theorists, such as Michael W. Doyle, Charles T. Call, Roland Paris, Richmond and Mac Ginty, and John P. Lederach, have reopened an open debate around ontologies and epistemologies that underpin the field of peace and conflict studies. For the past 50 years, state mechanisms in humanitarian intervention have dominated, expressing impartiality to local law and politico-judicial processes that act to provide the illusion of rationality and constancy in the absence of historical interference. The end of the Cold War, democracy, and the new order allow for substantively new considerations for peaceful intervention among nations in the post-conflict era. The unresolved issues that arise are: who processes the legitimacy of enacting peace in the world? Whose responsibility is it to settle issues in land disputes? These questions clearly make infrastructure for peace a reality and require cooperative actions among all parties that matter for peace. The term infrastructure for peace was first coined by Lederach in 1997 when he proposed to “statists to go beyond diplomacy” and create an enduring infrastructure across our society “that empowers the resources for reconciliation from within that society and maximizes the contribution from outside”. Lederach (1997) attributed the incorporation of grassroots and local actors into a peace process to their dependence on elite-level negotiation and acceptance of the other roles of outside actors. This study examines the intentionality and purposefulness of peacebuilding using Lederach's Conflict Transformation and Zones of Peace concepts. Zones of Peace stress dynamics that promote peacebuilding rather than violent conflict, whereas Lederach's idea promotes constructive, dynamic, and community-centered action. The idea of “infrastructures for peace” contends that local communities possess the institutions and know-how to foster peace in their immediate surroundings also be used in the study. These notions all revolve around the ethics of strategic peacebuilding, and they can be used as guidelines for developing a theory. Ulrike Hopp-Nishanka expresses the concept in the following way;

“Peace infrastructure consists of diverse domestic, inter-connected forms of engagement between conflict parties and other stakeholders. The organizational element can be established at all stages of peace and dialogue processes, at all levels of society, and with varying degrees of inclusion. The objective of peace infrastructure is to assist the parties (e.g., through capacity building and or advice), the process (e.g., through mediation between the conflict parties of facilities of public participation), or the implementation of processes (e.g., through monitoring and coordination of agreement implementation (p.3).

It is clear again that two UN former secretary generals namely; Boutros- Boutros Ghali and Kofi Annan advocated for institutionalized peace and lasting peace through peace works as infrastructure for peace. Kumar (2013) defines it as the “dynamic networking of interdependent structures, mechanisms, resources, values, and skills which, through dialogue

and consultation, contribute to conflict and peace-building in our society”. The device to make this concept a working tool has brought VanTongerren (2011) to connect network ideas with the institutionalization of the legal financial framework of infrastructure. This makes the philosophy of infrastructure for peace a tool that describes the rationale behind a “process transformation which must emerge from society in order to ensure sustainability and resilience “within a governance structure (Paladini Adell, 2014). Its embellishment ideas from the definition were built on theoretical concepts of conflict transformation and process orientation as far as its concept on local agencies is concerned. There are three main issues that clearly show hope for developing this infrastructure that the liberal peace-building approach ignores. These are the matters of inclusion, continuity, and reliable rules of engagement and linkages of various stakeholders (Hopp-Nishanka 2012a, Giessmann 2015, Danielak 2013). This calls for multi-layer approaches to be tested, the challenges of regional and local variation, not under government control, the influence of politics of the day, and the final impediment to connecting other infrastructures. The definition already explained accepted these mechanisms for cooperative problem-solving among all stakeholders in peacebuilding.

The processes of response to conflicts produce outcomes that lead to conflict transformation, social, political, and reconciliation, and transformative dialogues. An investment in conflict early warning, prevention, and robust post-conflict reconstruction and development that delivers on human security and economic growth. A platform to mobilize the internal capacity of a nation to build peace, and strengthen self-reliance at the community level. The various philosophers ignore the structural role of prevention and building blocks to prevent conflict. The constructivist theory on infrastructure for peace ideology the system as already existing it is nothing than ‘tick box’ exercises. The theorist’s explanation did not express case study methodology evidence. The approach to other people is just been suited by the state elite and international community. This countered intuitive the grass-root level using a bottom-up approach. Again, the approach used has become instructive and prescriptive instead of being collected to strengthen the already existing system. Though this concept has some negative tendencies from liberal peace-building and its functional levels of peace processes, it is necessary to meet head-on to resolve conflict including land dispute settlement as confronted every day in various societies. It has the tendency the build a market for political peace centers.

The Weak State theory and Infrastructure for Peace

“On the contrary: the fact that Europeans form in a certain way then imposed their power on the rest of the world, guarantees that non-European experience will be different if we pinpoint the durable characteristics of the system European first.... we will be better placed to specify what is distinctive about contemporary states, under what historically-imposed constraints they are operating and what relationships among characteristics of the state are likely to hold in our time” Tilly (1990)

The challenging socio-economic and political posers and problematic state-citizen relationships in Sub-Saharan Africa confronting with statehood have certified some inherent contradictions of post-colonial “nation-state” in the sub-region Ahorsu (2006). Browlie (1985) explained the character as ‘weak’, ‘juridical’, ‘quasi, soft’, and have failed largely due to their peculiar foundation, immediate history, and internal characteristics being different from the classical state in terms of social cohesion, legitimacy, viability, and efficiency. The conception came as a result of the concept of structuration that identifies social systems that have regularized prevailing existing power systems that inhibited a form of domination and respectable institutions of mediation of power. There were clear strategies that were employed to foster the incorporation of local communities into the fabric of society to reduce the relative

power of the local (Venema and Van den Breemer 1999). Though Giddens (1960) supported the philosophy of weak through the lenses of his concept of structuration and modernity emerging from the nation-state, it is our edifice that serves to fix practices together in time-space through involvement and production of the social system of social interaction. He calls post-colonial states ill-formed states or state-nations as a clarification of how their formation differed from European nation-states. The ontological proponent of the weak states by early European philosophers as some already mentioned was founded by causal powers, self-understanding, the interest of its agents, and another platform to create ideology on the dominant distinction. The use of the role of surveillance, coercion, capital, and industrialism by an early anthropologist had implications for the evolution of tribal societies from nation-states to a global nation-state system. Ahorsu (2006) supports and explains the traditional social system as a similar role where the four basic pillars of Giddens represent various institutions. Surveillance was a process where data gathered on security, analyses and proactive findings resorted to action. Africa had a security apparatus where every traditional community, where every member gathered security and information to the necessary authority for action. Strangers identified were reported and early responses were measured by authority. For example, the 'Asafo' was the original military company that moved to destool Okyenhene in 1918 but was saved by the military intervention through the forces from the then colonial government to defend him (Amanor, Simensen 1975, Rabathbone 1993, Addo-Fenning 1997). The second construction coercion deduced its strength from individuals or groups who according to Tilly sought to wield power from the enlarged population and resources from the state. Tilly (1960) argues that the state borders evolve, and emerge as a by-product of the rulers' enterprise to acquire means of war in the state of anarchy. Ahorsu (2006;44) explained that "industrialization of warfare, reorganization, and professionalism within the army force provides the most powerful emerging motivation for the concentration of resource and the fiscal reorganization that characterize the rise of the modern states". Coercion and a warfare role are all about the formation of nation-state analytical value when measured in economic resources. Africa's coercion power was centered on religion. Gyekye (2013) justified this worldview as a central belief system in which every aspect was linked. The central power and control were in the belief in a power of which living object was vested in the priest and other time in a skin or stool. Traditional land dispute settlement exercises are excessive and more times lead to reconciliation on land disputes. The adjudication of land dispute exercise similar power by the court of competent jurisdiction and give attention to religion by which parties are given the object to swear based on their belief. Capital and other means of communal survival including tax, food creation, and other revenue help to influence the institutional structure of states. It is, however, that capitalism and its binge were critical to the consolidation of absolute states and the world economy from the late 16th century onward. The national state had, however, been principally shaped through industrial capitalism and the universalization of nation-state systems. Early processes of industrialization involved the direct integration of mechanism and human labour" (Giddens,1961).

The dogmatic authority in traditional society regulates economic power because of easy access to land and the power to settle matters arising from the land. Amanor (2008) put it that "chiefs were empowered to own and sell land and negotiate concessions, and to use political claims on land to establish coercive control over their subject". The local powers of the traditional authorities to legislate matters of land have been influenced by contemporary pluralistic religious belief systems, positions of Western education demonized the traditional systems, lands owned by individuals and corporate institutions, state management of land coupled with legal issues on land and lastly economic challenges measure by greed and grievance, dispute settlement for few literate's traditionalists who used the system to

impoverish many members of the community among others. The infrastructural system has been inherently controlled by laws and orders coupled with political and social milieu. It is effectively collaborated and coordinated with civil society, independent non-partisan state facilitators, religious leaders, women, and youth representatives can enrich the traditional land settlement. An institutional self-determine approach to resolving land disputes could fail but collaborating and coordinating this same with a willing facilitator would emerge better to deal with issues.

Constructivist Theory in the Traditional Land Dispute Settlement

The constructivist gives an explanatory scheme of the origin of conflict and also the norms that influence the state and international systems. The norms are largely influenced by the conduct, interests, and basic character (identity) of the state. Subjective, normative, and identity are their trademarks that distinguish its worldview from the realist paradigm which employs history, rationality, and objectivity to analysis conflict in a given situation. The clear point of the constructivist theory on land dispute settlements are stance on the identity and identity determinants within the self-determine discourse in international relations (Hurd, 2008). The foundation was explained using the theory of materialism, realism, and rationalism in the context of political power, cooperation, and conflict on substantive issues at large. The line that separates them is not too much because realism is essential to materialism which means material needs, incentives, and powers to settle land disputes.

Rationalism is about instrumentalism (Hurd 2008) that explains the state pursuing individual advantages by observing costs and benefits. It is, therefore, erroneous to subordinate a substantive interest in power wholly with realism, because all the “paradigms” of international relations are interested in power, as either drive, cause, or effect. Power in the constructivist approach is central to all social systems and purposive agent both in the course of their conflictual and cooperative activities and relationships to achieve the desired outcome (Ahorsu, 2006;93). Jabri (1995, p.61) also explained that the power is symmetrically distributed, giving rise to structures of domination that are drawn upon by the contextually located actors like international bodies in the conduct of their daily encounters and during the most utter confusion. The traditional land dispute settlement in the light of infrastructure for peace should not use this same power-dominant approach to resolve the land dispute but must share equal power since the local approaches to resolving land disputes have not settled all land disputes.

In communities where they have “survived,’ they are deemed to be particularly well placed to prevent eschatology of resource-related communal strife (Kibreab, 2002; Tubiana, Tanner, and Abdul Jalil, 2012). I differentiate realism too as a precise theory about material power in international relations, in contrast with constructivism’s emphasis on the social meaning involved in objects or practices. The material resources and skill resources sometimes conflict with each other. Traditional mediation, negotiation, reintegration, and conciliation largely depend on the communal customs that hang on the beliefs that differ from the dominant administer life in various structured institutions. Opportunity should be given to innovate the local principles conflict resolution principles coupled with the international knowledge skills. The dynamics of traditional land dispute settlement are not the same and a room from each land conflict analysis can lead the way on this hybrid nature of conflict. Constructivists should not take the traditional authority role because they are in a position to enforce decisions on land disputes effectively. Infrastructure for peace in the area of land could be another form of reconstructed concepts from the already tested traditional land dispute institutions as in cases of ‘Xeer” in Ethiopia, ‘Wajir’ in Kenya, Tanganyika’ and “Ujamaa” in

Tanzania, 'Bashingantahe' of Burundian, among others to help the society use its proactive approach to handle its land challenges with little influences externally. Realists in infrastructure for peace are keenly trusted in domination that seems to achieve local elite and international needs which in a long time have been in our society but do not bring the final curtain on the dispute on land. Pre-colonial model of conflict resolution is viewed by many as particularly effective in settling land disputes because it drew their strength from high levels of traditional legitimacy and due to their specific, consensus and basic character (Boege,2006; Yamano and Deininger,2005; Zautman, 2000). This is the realist standpoint of traditional land disputes already infrastructure is respected and accepted to resolve differences on protecting and inheriting. When land is owned by an individual alien from the community these traditional approaches are disregarded even though after the death of the individual owner's dead is still owned the property is family owned.

The rational and relational approach from the constructivist paradigm supports the social philosophy of every society to ensure sustainable peace in every community in the center of diversity and a self-determined worldview. The flexible framework for overcoming land disputes could be regulated in a hybrid of all stakeholders such as traditional leaders, religious leaders, civil society organizations, and community-based organizations, among others that collaborate on some common basis channels independent regularities from state manipulation. The symmetric approach of all these stakeholders to this could ensure effective infrastructure for peace on land dispute settlement. Efforts must be made to strengthen the broken traditional authority to position them to face their task.

The Concepts of Land in Akan's Reality

Ghana's ethnic group called Akan ontology on land is that of religious relationships not only with them but some others in the African continent. The land is the center of all human transactions and is classified as sacred. It is treated as a person with dignity equating to that of human beings. As Busia put as the center of livelihood for the living, dead, and the unborn in society. The various transaction on land is known as "Asatuo²" and pacifying since the land could not be sold even in the recent democratic era. The land is in the control of the traditional authority which is called the "boundary owner." The Akans people's land relationships are a religious obligation more than economic.

Religious responsibilities are the common grounds³ that influence their political, economic, education, health, and family among other things. Settling issues on land matters also subscribes to a more religious method and the various forms of ritual attached to it in a more respected, trusted, and truthful manner that rationality and empiricism could not explain. Western and other concepts cannot explain the context of land disputes in Akan society since their ontological nobility is different altogether. Using the constitution and other legislation to resolve spiritual matters on land either suspended or compromised the conflict which

²*It currently stands for kin premium, consideration value, and land price and is referred to as "drink money". Its current price is exactly equal to its current economic value. The caretaker chief is to keep two-thirds of this money for himself, the stool, the stool elders, the queen mother, the usufruct holder, and town development. Finally, the paramount chiefs receive one-third of the funds. Keep in mind that the family who once farmed the land is the usufruct holders.*

³Diana L. Eck, "What is Pluralism",

https://rootandbranches.org/wpcontent/uploads/2012/03/eck_what_is_pluralism_2.pdf, (accessed on 24th August, 2023); Diana L. Eck, "Forward", in Barbara A. McGraw and Jo Renee Formicola (eds.), *Taking Religious Pluralism Seriously: Spiritual Politics on America's Sacred Ground*, (Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press,2005), ix-xv; Jan-Jonathan Bock and John Fahy, "Emergent Religious Pluralisms: Ideals and Realities in a Changing World", in Jan-Jonathan Bock, John Fahy, and Samuel Everett (eds.), *Emergent Religious Pluralisms*, (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave MacMillan, 2019),1-19

oftentimes waits for a trigger. This has been the nature of settling land disputes with the court system without giving references to the indigenous peace-building ascribed to religion.

The Legitimacy of Infrastructure for Peace and Traditional Land Dispute Challenges

The tag on African societies in the minds of the Europeans was not about the structural issues but with their economic and power crises they could only benefit. The natural decision and choice process deal with the manufacturing of internally controlled element in nature and the management of the command-and-control process to bring about the categorical convention of ontological potential politics Dompere (2017). This asymmetrical power has led scholars in peace and conflict studies to conceptualize after the failure of liberal peacebuilding on land-recommended infrastructure for peace. This paper has observed that all these theories are of traditional origin and with the theorist centered not tradition such role theory into concept and into policy on land dispute settlement and infrastructure for peace would woefully fail.

The Asante, Ghana study demonstrates how traditional peace-building systems regulate land. While 80% of the land in Ghana is controlled by traditional leaders and just 20% is owned by the government, in the Asante kingdom, all of the land is owned by the chiefs. Although there is a lack of land for specific uses, Ghana's land administration role is also accompanied by avarice on the part of some individuals, multiple property transactions, litigation, boundary disputes, and frequently accompanying unfavorable circumstances.⁴ All customary land secretariats have been instrumental in addressing issues related to land in my area of study. The Supreme Court encouraged academics and policymakers to draw conclusions from the fact that land transactions are secure and reliable in *Boateng v. Mckeown Investment Limited* (2020) GHASC3. This is not to argue that the problems with land that were previously described were the only ones that indigenous settlements had to face. Due to rivalry and theological diversity, where reverence for nature had been a factor in religious interpretation, the study also discovered a breach in reverends on property. The land value in contemporary multicultural Ghana, migration, and inability of effective social values regulations on land, and lastly the role of respect for money contends with human dignity in contemporary Ghana.

According to the interview the already mentioned challenges served as the study's main source of land dispute. Akan in Kumasi the study area upheld moral standards that depended heavily on spirituality. In settling a land dispute, Akan spiritual ontology places an emphasis on godliness and awe of the Lord. In the post-independent democratic world, land disputes were unavoidable due to human existence and were managed by traditional authority. Traditional authority utilizes religious, cultural, and land judicial obligations to settle land disputes between chiefs and the trusted ancestors and gods through “*duabo*.”⁵ It also integrates both science and spirituality. African spirituality could overcome land issues because attachment could only be grasped from its sources, unlike one acting alone which could fail. Science is simply a gong-making- noise, without the capacity to produce peace for mankind.

Conclusion

The study concluded that traditional land dispute settlement on the power of belief systems and approaches to resolve its differences and disagreements as compared to the hybrid

⁴Prempeh, N.A, Akubla, D, and Obeng-Mireku, K.(2021)Asante Lands: A Practical Guide to Stool Land Acquisition and Documentation, Sedesel Publications, Madina

⁵ *It is the ontology of justice that is governed and directed by the gods and the ancestors. The only reliable land settlement technique that is acknowledged and regarded, nevertheless, is dead. It is only on a few occasions after one goes through the rituals that they are spared. It is a clear deterrent for victims. It deters capitalists from exploitation in an unjust manner.*

method of land management systems issues with legislations in a modernity theory. Therefore, peacebuilding on issues of land has not been grounded well in theory and principles by scholars in peace and conflict studies. It needs a comprehensive approach to understanding the locals. The inter-disciplinary approach through the concepts of infrastructure for peace as a new phenomenon is recommended to resolve land disputes in our society since this approach evolving is just the continuity of the current state of affairs in conflict ontology. The constructivist and weak state theory was the theoretical basis for the phenomenon that explains the ideological power to influence humanity in a biased manner. The new values from infrastructure for peace were the creation of an early warning system that can influence and provide an early response to conflict, collaboration, and cooperation of all state land conflict in one system using the local approach to resolve land conflict or dispute. The methods to collaborate the structures that can prevent, manage, resolve, and ensure sustainable peace using bottom-up approaches from weak states theory and constructivist paradigm bring out the infrastructure for peace on land matters more carefully and reconciliatory.

The paper on conceptualized weak states from an ontological standpoint expresses an anachronistic perception of land dispute settlement that has been practiced since independence in a pluralist approach. The role of belief which was the center of power was the major gear and this is important for some adjudication processes in judicial land dispute normally begins with swearing an oath of religious symbols or objects. This is more traditional and empower traditional priest a leverage and equal power to resolve differences between two persons. The power method is divine and unquestionable as supported by the skin, stool, and natural objects directly watching over land affairs. Things are more real to the disputant than a court of competent jurisdictions who after judgment because difficult to executive the settlement terms far from disputant.

Finally, the primary precolonial framework for traditional disputant settlement on land systems could be rekindled and persist resulting in the end of its structure. The method of settlement on negotiation creates rapid original solutions developed by parties collaborating and is flexible because the parties are owners of the system which is forward-looking. Mediation and reconciliation links between the parties who are no longer getting it. This system helps them determine their own fate. This system preserves relationships in a win-win situation that is confidential and deals with all emotional needs that finally feed into the governance structure. The arbitration and adjudication process being formal, costly, ready-made fixing for the past combined and regulated in one would help resolution of land dispute unserious threat in conflict studies.

References

1. Addo-Fening, R. (1997) *Akyem-Abuakwa 1700-1943: From Ofori Panin to Sir Ofori Atta.*(Trondheim Studies in History 19) Trondheim: Department of History, Norwegian University of Science and Technology
2. Ahorsu, E.K. (2006) *The Political Economy of Post-Cold War Conflict in the Sub-Sahara: The*
3. *Natural Resource Factor: The Case of the 1991 Sierra Leone Civil War*”, Unpublished Ph.D. in International Conflict Analysis Thesis from University of Kent.
4. Amannor, S.B. & Moyo, S. (2008) *Land and Sustainable Development in Africa*, ZED Books, New York.
5. Amankwa, H.A. (1989) *The Legal Regime of Land Use in West Africa: Ghana and Nigeria*, Pacific Law Press, Austral.
6. Awedoba, A.K. (2009) *An Ethnographic Study of Northern Ghanaian Conflict: Toward Sustainable Peace*, Sub-Sahara Publishers, Accra, Ghana.
7. Ayayi, S.A. (2017) *African Culture and Civilization*, Atlantis Book, Ibadan, Nigeria
8. Bendix, R. (1960) *Max Weber; An Intellectual Portrait*, London, Heinemann.

9. Boege, V. (2006) *Traditional Approach to Confront Transformation-Potentials and Limits*. Berlin, Germany: Bergof Research Center for Conservative Conflict Management.
10. Brownlie, I. (1979) *Principles of Public International Law*. Third Edition, Oxford Clarendon Press.
11. Danielak, Silvia (2013) *External Aid Incorporated? Infrastructures of Peace and the Challenges of coordination in Kyrgyzstan*. Readers' comments on Berghof Handbook Dialogue Series No.10 <http://www.berghoffoundation.org/fileadmin/redaktion/handbookdialoguechapters/dialogue10.comment.danielak.pdf>
12. Dompere, K.K. (2017) *The Theory of Philosophy Consciencism: Practice of Nkrumah in Social Systemicity*, Library Data, Adonis& Abbey Publish, UK.
13. Giddens, A. (1971) *Capitalism and Modern Social Theory: An Analysis of the Writings of Marx, Durkheim and Max Weber* Cambridge: Polity Press
14. Giddens, A. (1985) *The Nation-State and Violence: Volume Two of A Contemporary Critique Historical Materialism*, Cambridge: Polity Press
15. Gyekye, K. (2003) *Africa Culture Value: An Introduction*, Sankofa Press, Legon, Ghana
16. Harvey, D. (2005) *A Brief of Neoliberalism*; eds Clifford Geertz. *Interpretation of Culture: Selected Essays* New York Basic Book, 1973 Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of Practices*, translated by Richard Nice (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), p.214
17. Jabri, V. (1995) 'Structure and the Question of Power;' *Paradigms*, Vol. 9 No.2 (Winter. pp 54-55)
19. Hopp-Nishanta, U. (2012 a) *Infrastructure in Peace at the Height of violence Conflict*. *Journal Peacebuilding and Development* 7(3) 70 – 74)
20. Kasanga, K. & Kokey N. (2001) *Land Management in Ghana: Building on Tradition and Modernity; Land tenure and Resource Access in West Africa*, Russell Press , Nottingham UK.
21. Kasanga, K. (2000) *Land Policy and National Development in Ghana; Critical Perspective No.5* Center for Democracy and Development, CDD- Ghana.
22. Kehinde, A. (2016) *The Indigenous Africa and Modern African Writers*. (Eds) Ayayi, S. *African Culture and Civilization*. Atlantis book, Ibadan, Nigeria.
23. Kibreab, G. (2002) *State intervention and the environment in Sudan, 1889-1989: the demise of Communal resources management*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.
24. Kuba, R. & Lentz, C.(2006) *Land and the Politics of Belonging in West Africa*, Brill Leiden, Loston Netherland.
25. Kumar, C. (2011) *Building National "Infrastructures for Peace: UN Assistance for Internally Negotiated solutions to Violent Conflict*. In: Susan Allen Nan, Zachariah C. Mampilly & Andrea Bartoli (eds) *Peacemaking: From Practice to Theory*. New York 7(3) 8-18
26. Lederach, J. P. (1997) *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington, DC.
27. Mac-Ginity, R. (2015) *Where is local? Critical localism and Peacebuilding*. Weisbaden: vs Verlag, 68 - 89.
28. Mann, M. (1988) *States war and Capitalism*. New York, Blackwell.
29. Nukunya , G.K. (1992) *Tradition and Change in Ghana; An Introduction to Sociology*. University Press, Legon, Accra.
30. Ntsebeza, L. (2005) *Democracy comprised: Chief and the politics of the land in South Africa-leiden*, The Netherlands: Brill.
31. Paladini Adell, B (2014) *Peace Infrastructure Towards a support system for Peace-building in Carolina*. *Peace in Progress* No. 20. Retrieved 18/2/2018 <http://www.acip-parlapau-catmero20/articlescentrals/articlecentral3/>
32. Rathbone, R. (1993) *Murder and politics in Colonial Ghana*, New Haven/ London, Yale University Press.
34. Simensen, J. (1975) 'Nationalism from below: the Akyem Abuakwa example,' *Basel Africa Bibliography* 12: 31- 60.
35. Tilly, C. (1960) *The Formation of National States in Europe* (Princeton: University Press.
36. Tilly, C. (1990) *Capital, Coercion and European State, A.D. 990-1990*, Basil Blackwell, New York.
37. Tubiana, J. Tanner, V. Abdul-Jabil, M. A. (2012). *Traditional authorities' peacemaking in Darfur*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press. Retrieved from <http://www.usip.org/publication-traditional-authorities-piece-making-role-in-darfur>
38. Van Tongeren, P, Ojielo, O, Brand- Jacobsen, K, McCandless, E. & Tchirgi, N. (2012) *The Evolving Landscape of Infrastructure for Peace*. *Journal of Peacebuilding and Development*.
39. Yammano, T & Deininger, K. (2005) *Land Conflict in Kenya: Cause, impacts, and resolution*. Washington DC: Foundation for Advanced Studies on International Development, The World Bank.
40. Zartman, W. (2000) *Introduction: African Traditional Conflict "Medicine."* In W. Zartman (Ed) *Traditional Cure in Modern Conflict*. *African Conflict "medicine"* (pp 1-11). Boulder Co: Lynne Rienner