The promotion of pastoralist heritage and alternative 'Visions' for the future of northern Kenya

Zoe Cormack*
Department of History, The Open University, Milton Keynes, UK

Abstract
This article examines increasing prominent claims of 'heritage' and 'culture' along the LAPSSET corridor. In particular it looks at how heritage is being used to promote pastoralism, communal land ownership and the survival of indigenous cultures in northern Kenya. In the context of the ambitious infrastructural development projects contained in the LAPSSET and Vision 2030 plans, 'heritage' is emerging as a way of negotiating change. Various legal instruments, including the formalization of customary laws and 'bio-cultural community protocols' are currently being developed to protect pastoralist heritage and communal land tenure. An important example is the attempts in Isiolo County to reinvent and strengthen a Borana customary institution for grazing management: a council of elders called *dedha.* The article explores the ways in which these attempts to promote pastoralist heritage are part of a larger conversation about the value of pastoralism and pastoralist culture and how the heritage of pastoralism is being positioned as the basis for an alternative 'Vision' for the future of Kenya's arid lands. Heritage isn't simply about preserving the past; it has effects on the present. This article will show how attempts to revive customary institutions are themselves part of the process of transforming space in northern Kenya; shedding light on the intentional and unexpected ways in which large-scale development plans reconfigure the landscape.
Keywords: pastoralism, heritage, advocacy, customary institutions, northern Kenya.

> As communities that have long been disenfranchised, and that are in dire need of development, we commend the Kenyan government for its commitment to upgrading and modernising the country's infrastructure…However, we are deeply concerned by the lack of community consultation and transparency…[1]

> For the pastoralist communities in Isiolo County, land is not just the means for economic survival, but also the basis of their cultural identity and spiritual wellbeing.[2]

The value and survival of 'culture', pastoralist heritage and indigenous identity are emerging as points of contention in both practical and ideological struggles over the future of the northern Kenya. In recent years there has been a shift in focus towards Kenya's arid and long neglected north. Previously regarded as a political and economic periphery, the region has been brought into the centre of Kenya's Vision

* ztcormack@gmail.com

2030 development plans. An ambitious infrastructural project called LAPSSET (Lamu Port-South Sudan-Ethiopia Transport Corridor) aims to turn the north into a regional transport hub. Devolution in 2013 also dramatically transformed the political landscape, decentralising political power and control of resources to County Governments in the north. This article explores how pastoralist heritage is being revalorised in the context and what is at stake in this process.

The statements above are both from civil society coalitions representing communities affected by LAPSSET. They highlight a pressing contradiction: while infrastructural development plans have been welcomed as a means of redressing historical marginalization, there are fears that a political and economic rush on the north may result in the exploitation of the rural pastoralist population, the fragmentation of communal land and the loss of cultural identity. In this process, the region's heritage is becoming a way to negotiate anticipated changes. Heritage, broadly defined as the selective use and valuation of the past in the present, is being used in novel ways by local community organisations as a way of articulating aspirations for the future. The creation of heritage is thus both a response and a potential form of resistance to large-scale development plans and changing uses of space in northern Kenya. It is being drawn, in complex ways, into the politics of development.

Concerns about pastoralist cultural heritage are not only emerging in the wake of LAPSSET; they are part of a larger conversation about the value of pastoralism. Pastoralism is now more valued by environmental scientists and practitioners than it has ever been; and 'a new policy space for pastoralism' has emerged in Kenya.[3] Advocates and pastoralist civil society groups have capitalised on changing narratives and discursive spaces to assert the value of their cultural heritage. Yet, despite gains for pro-pastoralist advocates, wider development policy and public discourse retains many anti-pastoralist elements, including a focus on dryland irrigation schemes and a prevailing assumption that modernity is sedentary. These ambiguities in policy and aspiration are being worked through in debates about pastoralist heritage.

While this article can only scratch the surface of these complex (and evolving) debates, it offers an empirical case study of how concerns about heritage and the future of northern Kenya are interacting. It explores the development of a 'bio-cultural community protocol' (BCP) in the small town of Kinna in Isiolo County. A BCP is a legal empowerment tool that aims to translate the terms of customary natural resource management into the language of national and international law and give communities the power to manage their own interests, particularly when dealing with external actors. It is not a legally binding document, but it does assemble all the relevant domestic and international laws that can be used to support a community's rights.[4] The Kinna BCP has emerged out of concerns to promote community land rights. It builds on ongoing attempts, spearheaded by development practitioners and pastoralist civil society to strengthen and formalise a Borana customary institution for grazing management called *dedha*. This is a council of elders who control grazing within an area called *dedha* (the word *dedha* is used to refer to both the council and

the grazing area). The aim of this BCP is to promote *dedha* as an example of local pastoralist heritage and use it to safeguard communal land rights.

The following discussion focuses on what the *dedha* and BCP projects are trying to achieve and on the opportunities and constraints of heritage-based advocacy. Reinforcing and developing legal support for customary institutions is one way of disputing privatisation and appropriation of communal land. Through these efforts, heritage is used as the basis for articulating an alternative future for northern Kenya. The paradox, in this case, is that in order to challenge the fragmentation of common land, revived *dedha* councils and the BCP have drawn on bounded notions of space. In order to be formally recognised in government structures they have presented customary grazing patterns as a series of bounded territorial units. The reinvention of *dedha* is also being co-opted by other local agendas and concerns about boundaries and access to resources and identity politics. This means that the reinvention of *dedha* is at once an attempt to defend 'tradition', but is also another facet of attempts to claim bounded space for particular ends. Thus heritage is simultaneously a strategy to protect communal land rights and the future of pastoralism in the context of sweeping changes, and is itself part of the political process of transforming the landscape.

Research background and approach

This research was conducted between November 2014 and May 2015 as part of an ESRC-funded project investigating how rights to culture are being articulated and claimed in Kenya since constitutional reform in 2010. Data are drawn from focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews with members of the Kinna *dedha* council and other Kinna residents who were identified through a snowball sample as having a connection to the council's work: including chiefs, charcoal collectors and members of local CBOs. These interviews were conducted in Borana through an interpreter and later transcribed in English. Other interviews were conducted with members of civil society involved with the BCP project and advocates who work on promoting pastoralist, land and environmental rights.

Work on the BCP process and support for the legal basis for the *dedha* councils is ongoing. This is not, in any case, an attempt to evaluate the 'success' of the projects discussed. While initiatives like this are usually looked at through a lens of 'natural resource management' or 'development', this article looks at their work in the context of the mobilization of heritage, considering what the potential constraints and opportunities of heritage-related advocacy are for pastoralist land tenure debates.

Pastoralist heritage

> As pastoralist societies or as indigenous people we can survive, we can argue against the tragedy of the commons. That is clear from our spirituality, our leadership. We have a very strong system.[5]

For an understanding of the ways that pastoralism is celebrated in northern Kenya, you couldn't do better than attend the Kalacha Cultural Festival. Held on the edges of the Chalbi Desert in Marsabit County, this is an annual celebration of northern Kenyan heritage organised by an NGO called The Kivulini Trust. Its tagline for 2014 was '*Heritage for Social Cohesion and Prosperity*'. Over several days of presentations, representatives of CBOs, National Museums of Kenya and other organisations spoke of the complex ingenuity of pastoralist adaptation to the arid landscape, the richness of their traditional spiritual and political systems and the possibility of integrating cultural heritage into sustainable development. As the speaker quoted emphasised, the participants and organisers openly sought to reject notions like 'the tragedy of the commons' which have entrenched an understanding of pastoralist cultures as environmentally degrading and backwards.

The participants at the Kalacha Festival also discussed the threats to Lake Turkana from the Gibe 3 dam in Ethiopia, the uncertain impacts of the LAPSSET project and the urgency of securing communal land tenure. These discussions underline that as development plans advance, the heritage of northern Kenya is becoming a cause for concern. International attention has been drawn to the future of prominent UNESCO World Heritage Sites, such as Lamu Old Town and Lake Turkana.[6] Civil society actors are also turning attention to the heritage of pastoralism as a way of promoting their rights and to advocate for a space for pastoralism in the future of ASALs.

Heritage is not the past, but the selective use and valuation of the past: a cultural, political and economic resource for the present.[7] Heritage is created; it can be official state-authorised version of the past, but indigenous and minority groups can also take control of heritage to articulate their own understandings of the past and desire for the present.[8] Scholars are increasingly recognising that 'while heritage is produced as part of a conversation about what is valuable from the past, it can only ever be assembled in the present, in a state of looking toward, and an act of taking responsibility for, the future'.[9] Thus the creation of heritage is an act of 'future-making'. Heritage is also fundamentally shaped by notions of endangerment and preservation, which become particularly prominent when the past is perceived to be at risk.[10] As the past is the foundation for individual and collective identity, creating heritage is part of 'the impulse to preserve the self.'[11]

At a time when the old Northern Frontier District is reconceptualised as a 'new frontier for development', fears have been raised of coming exploitation and that the north will be culturally and politically assimilated into the privatised, sedentary and neo-liberal model of the central state.[12] In response, some actors are using a heritage frame to preserve what they see as valuable at an uncertain time. Northern Kenya is not exceptional in this regard. Indigenous and cultural rights advocacy globally have been closely associated with large-scale development, often explicitly emerging in opposition to such schemes.[13]

'Pastoralist heritage' in northern Kenya is emerging against a related but different set of historical and contemporary circumstances from those that have shaped the articulation of pastoralist heritage around the 'fortress conservation'

models in southern Kenya and northern Tanzania. There, predominantly Maasai expressions of 'heritage' are closely linked to promoting tourism and asserting pastoralists' heritage of biodiversity conservation.[14] In northern Kenya, although county governments are seeking to use the visual cultural appeal of their pastoral constituents to encourage tourism,[15] the articulation of 'heritage' is strongly linked to concerns about infrastructural development, resource extraction, privatisation of communal land and cultural assimilation.

Pastoralism, 'culture' and advocacy

The promotion of culture is a distinct branch of pro-pastoralist advocacy. But the use of cultural heritage as a tool for supporting pastoralism is complicated. For a long time, dominant theories and myths about pastoralism have presented 'pastoralist culture' as archaic, resistant to change and anti-modern,[16] the cause of irrational accumulation of livestock, overgrazing and resource degradation in communal tenure systems.[17] Suspicion of 'pastoralist culture' became deeply rooted in policy and development practice in the twentieth century.[18] Advocates have therefore avoided using culture or heritage as a campaigning tool because of its negative associations.[19] They have worried that a focus on the cultural or aesthetic appeal of pastoralists may 'detract from the complexities involved in ensuring true and effective engagement' and that promoting heritage could obscure the significant economic contribution of pastoralism to national governments – a contribution more likely to inspire constructive policy change.[20]

Recently understandings of the value of pastoralist culture have changed, however, and with them, the possibilities for advocacy. Theories of pastoral development and dryland ecology are still in flux, and have unevenly filtered into policy, but there has been a concerted move towards a more favourable evaluation of pastoral cultural institutions and traditional practices of range management. [21] Pastoralist 'resilience' in the unpredictable ASAL environments like those of northern Kenya has been given renewed attention in light of climate change debates.[22]

In parallel, global networks have been vocal in advocating a new image of pastoralism, creating new opportunities for local groups to articulate rights and frame identity as heritage, notably the global indigenous peoples' movement, which has placed cultural identity, heritage and the right to culture at the heart of its project since the 1980s.[23] Indigenous rights have been shaping the politics of pastoralist identity in East Africa for several decades, most visibly through Maasai organisations taking up indigenous identity since the early 1990s.[24] In the early twenty-first century pastoralist groups began to claim a distinct strand of global indigenous identity. They framed pastoralist identity through a shared experience of mobile livelihoods, marginalisation, reliance on livestock and common property tenure governed by traditional institutions.[25]

Uncertain policy directions

Many of Kenya's legal and policy frameworks are, on paper, among the most progressive for pastoralists in the region.[26] This is partly a result of the changing paradigms about pastoralism and partly a result of advocacy work in Kenya. Civil society has mobilised around promoting pastoralist interests since the early 1990s, in which time being a 'pastoralist' has become a significant political identity.[27] A Pastoralist Parliamentary Group has been operational in Kenya since 1996, although there have been constraints on its effectiveness.[28] The promulgation of the 2010 Constitution was regarded as a tentative success for pastoralists, as it laid the ground for legal provisions recognising communal land tenure and specifically identified pastoralists as a 'marginalised group'.[29] The establishment of a Ministry of State for the Development of Northern Kenya and Other Arid Lands (operational 2008-2013) helped to mainstream pastoralist interests in government. The Vision 2030 policy for Northern Kenya and ASALs states strongly that there is a place for pastoralism in development plans and asserts that the path for development in the ASALs would need to take into consideration the particular opportunities and constraints of pastoralism.[30]

Paradigms about pastoralism have shifted but remnants of old thinking are firmly entrenched in some government departments. Despite positive steps, there isn't a monolithic policy direction on pastoralism across Vision 2030 or in government policies more broadly.[31] Agricultural and irrigation schemes, which would compete with livestock production, feature in other Vision 2030 plans for Tana Delta and the Uaso Nyiro in Isiolo,[32] despite recognition that large irrigation schemes have failed in the past. [33] The process of land reform in Kenya is happening in parallel with, and is linked to developments in pastoralist policy. Particularly important is the 'Community Land' legislation, which is set to allow for communal land holdings. However, this land reform is controversial. Customary land tenure globally is receiving more legal support than ever. [34] Yet simultaneously, as LAPSSET and mineral extraction plans demonstrate, threats to land held under communal tenure in northern Kenya are also arguably greater than ever.

Situating LAPSSET in Isiolo County

There is considerable speculation and distrust surrounding the LAPSSET plans in Isiolo. This is a project in which the politics of information, or lack of it, are particularly acute. Civil society organisations have decried the absence of detailed information surrounding the project. At the same time, there are suspicions that privileged access to information has facilitated appropriation of land and investment opportunities, while free prior and informed consent has not been sought from affected communities.[35] Environmental or social impact assessments on any aspect of the project are yet to be carried out in Isiolo County.[36] In 2013 civil society groups in the northern LAPSSET corridor in 2013 released a statement of concern over low

level of consultation and the threats to the 'ecological and cultural uniqueness' of the region posed by the project.[37] The UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous People has raised these issues in international forums.[38]

Many tensions rest on land and the question of who will benefit from the project, both at a local and county level. These uncertainties have exacerbated existing political tensions, most dramatically over an unresolved border dispute between Isiolo and Meru Counties. When violence broke out along the Meru-Isiolo border and in Isiolo Town in late October 2015, local MPs were quick to blame LAPSSET.[39] And as Elliott[40] has shown, the anticipation of LAPSSET is experienced in the everyday life of the town. Not only are expectations of development driving up the price of land, they are also reanimating conflicts over belonging and historical claims to the town itself. This is despite the fact that there are very few tangible signs of the project itself.[41]

Anxieties over LAPSSET are also felt outside of Isiolo town. The empirical focus of this article is Kinna, a small town in the south east of Isiolo County, 25 miles south of Garba Tulla and close to the border with Meru County. The main inhabitants are the Uaso Borana, part of the larger Oromo speaking Borana ethnic group who live in Kenya and Ethiopia. According to the initial plans, the busiest section of the LAPSSET corridor will pass through grazing land between Kinna and Garba Tulla.[42] Many residents share fears that LAPSSET will result in the illicit acquisitions of land, dissect livestock migration routes, separate people from water sources and drought reserves and exacerbate local conflicts (including the border conflict with Meru). Some advocates have even warned the project will usher in 'the end of pastoralism.'[43] Although the future of the project is still far from certain, in May 2015, a team of surveyors believed to be working for LAPSSET laid beacons near Garba Tulla. In an indication of local suspicions of the project, residents protested and dug up the beacons prompting a delegation from Isiolo County government to visit the site.[44] We should expect local reactions to be complicated. Kochore (2016) has shown how the new Isiolo-Moyale road (part of the suite of LAPSSET projects) has had a complicated reception in Marsabit. In part, the new road has been heralded as progress and a beneficial connection with central Kenya. However, it has also caused some people to reassert links with Ethiopia – regarded as the Borana homeland. This is because of the region's ambivalent historical relationship with the Kenyan nation.[45]

Some aspects of this region's history are important for understanding how the LAPSSET project is situated within local memory in Kinna. The Northern Frontier District (NFD) is a contested zone of nation building. Kinna's residents share an experience of political and economic marginalization by colonial and post-colonial states. They have experienced decades of oscillating state power, which when it has been felt, has more often been coercive and violent than benign. The colonial policy of promoting distinct tribal grazing areas directly contributed to the territorialisation of previously relatively fluid ethnic identities, creating tensions, which continue to play out in local conflicts. In 1962, on the eve of Independence, residents of the NFD voted in a referendum to join Somalia rather than become part of Kenya. The result was rejected by the incoming president, Jomo Kenyatta, and led to an insurgency

known as the '*Shifta* War'. Borana in Isiolo bore the brunt of this conflict and it is remembered as a period of crisis. Counter-insurgency and villigization policies forced many people into assigned settlements and decimated livestock populations.[46] Supposedly a simple security measure, these policies had the effect of criminalising mobile pastoralism.[47] The population of small towns like Kinna grew significantly during the '*Shifta* War' and subsequent relief projects focused on food aid and irrigation schemes, with very little support to the livestock sector. This undermined the pastoral economy further and trapped people into aid dependent sedentary lifestyles.[48] It is not hard to see how this history could be viewed as a sustained assault on traditional livelihoods.

Heritage-based advocacy: aims, opportunities and contradictions

Against this historical backdrop and within a new context of uncertainty, heritage is becoming a focus for attention. This article now traces attempts to protect heritage through the development of a BCP. Beginning with its roots in recent attempts to reinvent a Borana customary institution for grazing management, called *dedha,* to its development as a way to safeguard community rights in response to infrastructural development projects. The *dedha* is being explicitly promoted as bio-cultural heritage of Kinna. Seeing the BCP as 'heritage' work helps to understand the particular package of aims, strategies and their consequences. What objectives are being articulated at different levels of the BCP and *dedha* projects? What preliminary observations can be drawn about the use of heritage in pro-pastoralist advocacy and as a means to contest privatisation and infrastructural development? How is this part of a larger process of transforming the landscape of northern Kenya?

Reinventing a customary institution: dedha revival in Isiolo County

A *dedha* is defined as 'the largest recognisable geographical unit used by the Borana for the purpose of resource management'.[49] *Dedha* had almost ceased to exist in Isiolo in the early 2000s. The loss of livestock and disruption during the *Shifta* conflict, land tenure policies favouring private and individual ownership and local government administration had undermined its ability to manage grazing.[50] In 2008 development organisations began to revitalise this institution. *Dedha* reinvention started under the internationally funded project 'Improving Natural Resource Governance for Rural Poverty Reduction'.[51] A local organisation called Resource Advocacy Project (RAP) were involved in the conceptualisation of the *dedha* revival and building local support. Since 2011, support to *dedha* has been linked to the Isiolo County Adaptation Fund, a pilot for devolved climate change projects, implemented by the National Drought Management Authority and IIED.[52]

Fourteen *dedha* have been identified in Isiolo County.[53] The principle is that each is divided into three different areas: an area for wet season grazing, an area for dry season grazing and an area of drought reserve grazing. A council of elders (*jarsa*

dedha) are elected after a community meeting and made up of experienced and respected stock owners. The *dedha* council regulate access to pasture and water and determine movements between the grazing areas in a year. This ensures that drought reserves are not depleted and dry season grazing is allowed to regrow. The council meet regularly to make decisions about movement. The Kinna *dedha* council define their objectives as 'to plan and manage grazing patterns of the community members through better management of pasture, boreholes and dams as per the regulation of Borana customs'.[54] There are indications that *dedha* system helped Isiolo pastoralists cope better with drought in mid 2014 than neighbouring counties.[55]

The architects of *dedha* reinvention imagine the councils as 'hybrid institutions', rooted in tradition but amenable to integration into local government structures.[56] Support to *dedha* councils has been explicitly linked to devolved institutions. There has been engagement at a local level, including meetings and extensive participatory mapping.[57] A bill on customary institutions was drafted that proposed to enshrine the *dedha* council's authority to manage land and natural resources in Isiolo County.[58] This Bill was submitted to the County Government but it was rejected amidst some controversy: it appears that this was partly because the focus on Borana customary institutions was interpreted as an attempt to exclude non-Borana communities.[59]

Bio-cultural heritage

While aspects of the *dedha* revival are innovatory, there is nothing, in itself, new about using indigenous institutions in pastoral development projects.[60] There is a precedent of using Borana customary institutions in development projects and natural resource management since the 1990s in southern Ethiopia. [61] A new element, in Kinna, is the explicit attempt to draw on the category of heritage.

A Bio-cultural Community Protocol (BCP) aims to collate all the national and international laws and protocols that support their rights to their culture, identity and land. The aim is to empower indigenous and local communities to negotiate 'external threats' to their land and territories.[62] Bio-cultural heritage, which BCPs seek to protect, is taken as the holistic nature of indigenous people's relationships with ecosystems, biodiversity, culture and spirituality, customary laws, community based natural resource management and the formation of landscape.[63]

The BCP is a document that identifies all the national and international legal instruments that protect a community's heritage. It is put together through a process of community consultation, including participatory resource mapping and analysis of resource use strategies. A major reason for creating the BCP is to empower people in Kinna, and the *dedha* elders especially, to articulate and negotiate their community rights to the LAPSSET developers and other investors.

The BCP in Kinna supports the *dedha* councils and their management of natural resources within the *dedha* area. The area of the BCP is Kinna ward. It has three *dedha* councils, Kinna, Duse and Kulamawe. It is being developed by a Kenyan NGO called Kivulini Trust. Kivulini's objective is to promote heritage in northern

Kenya: 'to reconnect pastoralist and other minority groups of northern Kenya' by drawing 'on the wisdom inherent in our communities' traditional cultural systems and practices, and…their power to shape their own destiny.'[64] The BCP project is supported by Natural Justice, who have developed BCPs elsewhere and who are working to support community rights in areas affected by the LAPSSET project.[65] The BCP project itself is funded by UNDP.

Natural Justice see this BCP as part of a bigger programme of work on supporting community rights across the area of the LAPSSET corridor. The Kivulini Trust have similar hopes that the process of developing the BCP will help to empower pastoralists in Kinna in the light of the uncertain future and changing land laws. The local volunteers on the BCP project see their work as strengthening the elders and reviving the customary system of natural resource management in relation to external threats. As one of them said 'the BCP is using the past ways to protect our livelihood…it is a way to protect pastoralism.' It is important to 'open their eyes', he said referring to the elders, to 'make them courageous' and 'show them their constitutional right' because 'the Vision [Vision 2030] is coming across the livelihood of the people'.[66]

Alternative visions: prosperous pasts for prosperous futures

One of the most striking features of the BCP is how it harnesses heritage to assert an alternative future vision for rural Isiolo. In many ways the BCP exemplifies what scholarship is now emphasising: that concerns to protect heritage are acts of future-making.[67] At the most basic level, heritage involves packaging and evaluating what is good about the past, in the present, for the benefit of an imagined future. Heritage, despite its conservative characteristics, can become a focus for finding alternative meanings and expressing dissenting views. In northern Kenya, the movement to preserve traditional grazing management institutions is part of a much older debate between different regimes of value. One of the most significant messages of the *dedha* revival and the BCP is that pastoralism has a future, it is valuable – both for itself as a cultural practice and because it is a way to be prosperous.

Articulating a different kind of future is entirely congruent with concerns about LAPSSET more broadly. Criticism of LAPSSET has not been about rejecting development, but about negotiating and claiming a stake in the process of development. [68] Given the history of assimilationist policies in northern Kenya, it would not be surprising if an ambitious state-led development project were treated with suspicion. Yet it is not the case that northern Kenyans simply do not want any form of 'development' to happen in the region. The residents of Kinna are well aware about their marginal relationship to state power, the flickering electricity supply and the poor condition of the roads linking them to Isiolo, Meru and 'to Kenya'. In interviews several *dedha* elders pointed out that there could be benefits to the LAPSSET plans, but they want to be involved in the process and assurance that their priorities for the future would be taken seriously.

For decades, northern Kenya was designated as unproductive. This idea is now being challenged at various levels. [69] RAP and IIED are also working to demonstrate that the *dedha* system is producing quantifiable improvements to the local economy and protection from drought.[70] This was particularly emphasised by the members of the council themselves. Underscoring that, despite media representations and the persistence of relief aid, many pastoralists do not consider themselves to be poor.[71] The cultural roots of pastoral prosperity where frequently emphasised in interviews with the *dedha* elders. A reoccurring point in my interviews was the impossibility of separating pastoralism from 'culture' and prosperity. Much of what the elders were saying, when they spoke of the virtues of *dedha*, is that this is a way to be richer. As one council member put it, 'we revived the *dedha* system to manage our grazing land and return to our lost glory'.[72] The chairman of the *dedha* council explained this in the context of current economic realities in Kenya,

> In the past our cultural laws have not been documented, they passed from generation to generation through practice and story telling. For us we would like to leave our young people with documented cultural laws for them to follow. They have nothing other than the livestock and the land; they must be able to protect their land and livestock, which is our source of livelihood. In Kenya today the highly educated do not get jobs, the rate of unemployment is high, so for our children they have a resource which is livestock, they must keep this gold mine and protect it if they are to prosper.[73]

Statements like this make it clear how the *dedha* members also see 'culture' as an alternative route to social and economic security. There are complications to this narrative in a simple form. To a certain extent, the interests of heritage promotion and elite elder men are aligning in this case. One critique of advocacy that seeks to protect the rights of indigenous and local communities by tying their rights to heritage and land is that the promotion of an ideal of traditional life can trap people in this 'tradition' – which doesn't necessarily bear a resemblance to how people actually live (or want to live in the future).[74] For example, many residents of Isiolo County see their future best served by securing a plot in town.[75] It also implies an ideal that everyone has herds. In fact, one of the most contentious issues for the Kinna *dedha* was charcoal burning. The *dedha* council want to prevent the commercial charcoal burners coming (allegedly from Meru) to Kinna and making charcoal in the drought reserve.[76] But this was also resented by the poor and stockless of Kinna, some of whom made money from selling charcoal. One subsistence charcoal collector told me he viewed the *dedha* as little more than an instrument of elite exploitation of the poor.[77] These highlight the local-level politics that are present, but which are often occluded by notions of heritage, community and tradition.

Naturalization of change and boundary making

Another critique that has been made of heritage is that it naturalises the process of conserving the past and that it is 'bad' or malleable history.[78] Despite the frequent references to the past in discussions about *dedha* and the general acknowledgment

that it had recently been resurrected from virtual insignificance, the extent and nature to which the *dedha* of today and *dedha* of yesterday are different tended to be glossed, especially in interviews with members of the Kinna *dedha* council. Yet *dedha* has been hugely transformed. Probably the most significant change is that it has come to be identified as a bounded territorial community linked to a formal institution of resource governance.

We can get some sense of what *dedha* was like in the past by looking at older analyses and descriptions. *Dedha* is defined in recent literature and discussions as geographical unit used for resource management and as a 'governance mechanism'.[79] But anthropologists working in Isiolo in the 1970 and 80s described *dedha* differently. A picture of *dedha* emerges from these historical accounts as something less formal, defined more by a series of relationships between herders and to their grazing land. Overseen quite lightly, with elders meeting on a needs only basis, sometimes never at all.

Gudran Dahl called *dedha* 'the vague notion of a grazing community'.[80] At this time she and other researchers were noting the existence of *dedha* as a territorial phenomenon. Dahl cites an Agrotech report identifying among the 'northern Borana' territorial units called 'deda' defined as 'units denoting a more or less permanent grazing area.' However, she is explicit that *dedha* in Isiolo were not formalised units and they did not have strict boundaries:

> Deda meetings are not common. They may take place once in every two or three years or not at all, depending on the particular situation in the deda concerned. The deda is not a formalised unit with strict boundaries but represents a concentration of a population and a 'statistical' regularity of use.[81]

Richard Hogg conducted research in Isiolo between 1979 and 1983. He defined *dedha* as 'the relationship between a group of families and the neighbourhood in which they normally graze their animals…more one of general association than of resource ownership.'[82] He commented that he rarely heard the term used and did not think it was very important.[83]

Both these anthropologists were working within two decades of the *Shifta* conflict. It could be that they were simply describing an institution already weakened. But the context in which *dedha* now operates is different. A constellation of factors have made boundaries important. We know that pre-colonial pastoralist societies in northern Kenya had relatively fluid boundaries, people moved in and out as they were continuously reshaped.[84] The concept of a boundary as an enclosed space didn't exist here before colonialism.[85] Colonial policy of 'Tribal Grazing Areas' and administrative areas all made boundaries important. Post-colonial patterns of sedentarization have also raised the stakes of locality.[86] So too have recent electoral politics and devolution.[87] The historical memory of a clearly organised and territorially discrete *dedha* grazing management system is itself the product of these historical factors, which have been pushing people ever more into investing in bounded models of space.

Concretisation of previously fluid boundaries is partly a result of the attempt to make a 'hybrid' customary institution that can be recognised by local government structures. Indeed, it is explicitly stated that *dedha* is based on administrative boundaries in the draft bill, 'Councils as formed shall take into consideration the existing administrative and geographical boundaries.'[88] The area of the BCP is taken to be Kinna Ward, the authority of the *dehda* councils is hence being aligned with the area of the administrative boundary. Participatory mapping potentially used in the project also enforces this conflation between the ward and *dedha* boundaries. As these maps are drawn up they reinforce a model conflating *dedha* and exclusive administrative boundaries. This was visualised in a map from one of the early mapping sessions on the wall of the BCP office. It depicts the BCP area as Kinna ward. On the eastern side of the map was drawn a big red line, marked as 'area of encroachment'.[89] In this respect, mapping for heritage, as well as being empowering, carries the same complexities of similar participatory mapping project: that drawing a map is always part of a political process of negotiating claims over land and belonging.[90]

Strategic alliances: local struggles and rights advocacy

Another issue, related to this increasingly formalised model of *dedha*, is the different interests and alliances playing out in the *dedha* revival and BCP process. There has been a strategic alliance between the advocates who are interested in protecting community rights in light of the LAPSSET project and the *dedha* elders, who have embraced the BCP project to promote local interests around control of access to water and maintaining boundaries.

The volunteers and NGO workers involved in the BCP voiced explicit concerns about LAPSSET. Yet for many of the people I spoke with in Kinna, LAPSSET was at most a gesture, a wave of the arm in a northerly direction indicating where the road will pass. The *dedha* elders articulated a critique of the LAPSSET process that emphasised *lack* of engagement and *lack* of understanding about the plans. To quote one elder 'only God knows the changes and effect it will have on us, we have not been involved'.[91] The *dedha* secretary further emphasised this negative engagement with a proverb, 'something that you don't know, doesn't know you'.[92] In a region with a long experience of marginalisation and separation from state power, highlighting lack of engagement is itself a critique. [93] It emphasises that this is an area in which the government simply does things *to* people, without informing them and without their consent.

While attitudes towards LAPSSET may have been fatalistic (even if containing an underlying grievance), concern about local boundaries was pronounced in many interviews. This often manifested in complaints about movement into the *dedha* area by people who did not abide by the rules and decisions of the *dedha* council – who were therefore perceived to overuse resources and degrade the environment. I was frequently told that the '*dedha* system shall prevent influx of the

neighbouring community and ensure we manage our grazing land.'[94] One council member explained his view of the reasons behind the revival of *dedha*

> The influx of the neighbouring pastoralists from Mandera, Wajir and Garissa triggered the revival of *dedha*. There is a lot of influx in Isiolo County in general from different pastoralist communities... The need to revive *dedha* came to control and manage our grazing land. In old days village elders were responsible for anything that takes place in their villages, they were in charge of *dedha* and any stranger coming should report to them. So this meant that village elders controlled and governed that specific village in accordance with residential norms. *Dedha* was revived to control those coming into our land; those who shall defy *dedha* laws shall be moved away. We have laws governing us on where to graze in dry and wet season, the stranger didn't know the *dedha* system, so *dedha* was revived to create awareness and organize the grazing pattern hence conserving pasture and water.[95]

Statements such as this must be read alongside an awareness of this region's history. Colonial and post-colonial states imposed rigid boundaries, territorialising ethnic identities and creating a generalised 'hardening of lines' both on the ground and between groups of people.[96] The presence of Somali owned herds in this area has long been a political issue, going back to 1934 when the Galla-Somali line was enforced and Somali herds were prevented from accessing the Uaso Nyiro. These debates are now playing out in the context of devolution, where new County governments and boundaries are shaping ideas about belonging alongside a new model of nation building.[97] One member of the *dedha* council said that 'the [2010] Constitution [including provisions for devolution] was designed to help the *dedha*, because it is everybody for his county to develop, not Kenya for all.'[98] Local concerns about boundaries indicate how local relationships have been strained through years of neglect, inappropriate development policies and the territorialization of identity. They illustrate how pastoralists have come to invest in externally imposed boundaries as a way of negotiating access to resources and locality.

The advocates of the various projects to support *dedha* hope its revival and the BCP will provide a way of securing rights and access to communal land that is more in line with the traditional values of Borana society. But Borana customs and relationships to space have been evolving in conversation with the oscillating presence of state power and practices of boundary making in the region for at least one hundred years. This means that some local instrumentalization of 'tradition' and heritage may actually reinforce boundaries and enclosed models of space. A related point is raised by Greiner (this volume) in relation to East Pokot, where he observes how territorialization is now a partly endogenous 'future making' process, as pastoralists seek to secure access to land in the context of anticipated infrastructure developments and political change. [99]

One consequence of these historical processes in Kinna is that by seeking to protect communal ownership and management of land as an integral part of the cultural heritage of pastoralism, the BCP and the *dedha* revival more widely both rely on, and promote bounded understandings of space – discrete *dedha* units which

correspond with local administrative boundaries. To some extent this is because their advocates are in a double bind. They want *dedha* and communal land tenure to be recognized and protected in local and international law, because they hope it will pave the way for pastoralism and culture to be protected, especially as LAPSSET and an anticipated commercial scramble for ASALs loom large on the horizon. But as long as advocates and others present versions of 'culture' and customary natural resource management to fit into the requirements of the law, the law will continue to require such narratives and the hegemony of bounded models of space will not be questioned. While this strategy is a way to challenge the privatization and appropriation of communal land, it may ultimately promote the enclosure of space and reinforce problematic conflations between territory and identity.

Conclusion

Increasingly, marginalised groups are appropriating the language and symbolism of heritage, imbuing it with new and different meanings and redeploying it to serve their own agendas. In Kinna, heritage is being strategically promoted by members of a pastoralist community, who are seeking to protect their rights as owners and users of natural resources. In one respect, the revival and reinvention of *dedha* as a customary institution, part of pastoralist heritage, is a way of reclaiming control of the production of knowledge about the past and about pastoralism. The use of the concept of bio-cultural heritage in Kinna offers an alternative narrative to 'top down' infrastructural development projects and articulates a route to future prosperity through pastoralist production and the values of the local community. Although it would be wrong to overemphasise its political influence, heritage is nevertheless being positioned as the basis for an alternative vision for development and land tenure.

This strategy is simultaneously both emancipatory and restricting. The projects described have, inevitably, transformed *dedha*. This is not surprising, as customs and traditions are all, to some extent, invented. The BCP shows there are opportunities for using heritage arguments in communal land rights claims in the region; and this is a central strategy of the global indigenous rights movements. But there are also complications. In this instance 'heritage' seems to offer an alternative, but only on the basis of accepting and possibly reinforcing the existing ordering of space into defined territorial units. Cultural heritage is promoted as a return to and a revalorisation of pastoralist tradition, but at the same time it is drawing boundaries that conflict with that very notion.

As development plans advance in northern Kenya, it seems likely that appeals to heritage and preservation will continue to find resonance. Where heritage does provide a focus for negotiating the impact of infrastructural development plans, local histories and politics shape the trajectory of these alternative imaginaries. As the prospect of transformation faces northern Kenya, these attempts to preserve 'tradition' are also part of a process of change.

Acknowledgments

This article is based on research carried out for the ESRC-funded research project Cultural Rights and Kenya's New Constitution at The Open University, grant number ES/LO11603/1. I am extremely grateful to the Kivulini Trust and to Natural Justice, whose practical support and intellectual enthusiasm for studying the BCP made this research possible. I am also grateful to members of the Kinna *dedha* council for discussing their work with me. In Kinna, Garba Tulla and Isiolo I was assisted by Mohamed Halakhe, Hassan Ibrahim Ali, Bushra Abdinoor Jillo and Boru Hussein Boru, each of whom made an invaluable contribution to my research. I am indebted to Elizabeth Watson and Jason Mosley for their incisive comments on an earlier draft.

Notes

[1] LAPSSET Community Network, "Aspirations".
[2] PDNK, "Isiolo".
[3] Elmi and Birch, "Creating Policy Space".
[4] Shrumm and Jonas, eds., *Bio-cultural*, 13-14.
[5] Fieldnotes_05.12.2014 Kalacha, Marsabit County.
[6] Bakker et al, "Heritage Impact Assessment'.; UNESCO, "State of Conservation". There is a campaign to have Lake Turkana placed on the UNESCO list of Heritage Sites in danger http://www.internationalrivers.org/resources/8332 (Accessed 05.11.2015)
[7] Ashworth et al eds., *Pluralising Pasts*, 3.
[8] Smith, *The Uses*, 276.
[9] Harrison, "Beyond 'Natural'", 35.
[10] Basu and Modest, "Museums, Heritage", 6.
[11] Hewison, *The Heritage Industry*, 47.
[12] Elmi and Birch, "Creating Policy Space," 4.
[13] Blaser et al., *In the Way"*, 6.
[14] Lane, "Sustainability".
[15] Marsabit County is particularly active in this regard, see Samar Al-Kindy and Kepher Otieno, eds., *Marsabit County* p, 21–22. Since devolution many counties have put culture, tourism and investment within the same ministry.
[16] Galaty and Bonte, *Herders, Warriors and Traders*, 4.
[17] Swift, "Desertification Narratives", 77.
[18] Odhiambo, "The Unrelenting".
[19] Galaty, "Cultural Perspectives," 15.
[20] Heather de Jode, "The Green Quarter", 10.
[21] Vetter, "Rangelands".
[22] Kratli and Schareika, "Living Off Uncertainty".
[23] Engle, *The Elusive Promise*, 102.
[24] Hodgson, *Becoming Indigenous*; Igoe, "Becoming Indigenous".
[25] Upton, "The New Politics": 211.
[26] Kharono, "Pastoralist Lobby", 5.
[27] Little, *Economic and Political*, 99. The (now disbanded) Kenya Pastoralist Forum, formed in 1994, was an early umbrella group bringing together pastoralist and ASAL civil society, particularly in the north. See Livingstone, "A Comparative Study", 27–28. In Isiolo, the Waso Trustland project was formed in 1995 to advocate for pastoralist land rights.

[28] Morton, Livingstone, and Mussa, “Legislators and Livestock"
[29] Odote, “The Dawn".
[30] Odhiambo, “The ASAL Policy".
[31] Odhiambo, “The Unrelenting", 19.
[32] GoK, “Kenya Vision 2030", 18.
[33] GoK, *Vision 2030 for Northern Kenya*, 52.
[34] Fitzpatrick, “Best Practice".
[35] Browne, “LAPSSET", 51.
[36] Sena, “Lamu Port" 17.
[37] LAPSSET Community Network, “Aspirations”.
[38] Anaya, “Letter".
[39] Anon, “Lapsset Fuelling". Abdi and Kwama, “Disquiet”.
[40] This volume.
[41] Elliott, “Planning".
[42] JPC & BAC/GKA JV, “LAPSSET Corridor”, 6.
[43] Letai and Tiampati, “Capturing Benefits", 31; Browne, “LAPSSET", 53–57. Goldsmith "Future of Pastoralist Conflict”, 11.
[44] Anon, “Local and Surveyors". A similar disruption of beacons occurred in Ngaramara in November 2015, Jebet, “Isiolo Residents".
[45] Kochore, “The Road".
[46] Khalif and Oba, “*Gaafa Dhaabaa*", 5.
[47] Whittaker, “Forced Villigization”.
[48] Hogg, “Development",53–56.
[49] Interview with a founder of RAP ISI_002_23.03.2015. Isiolo, Isiolo County.
[50] A similar pattern of local administration undermining grazing management occurred in southern Ethiopia, Elizabeth Watson, “Inter Institutional" 13.
[51] IUCN and DFID, “Strengthening Community", 2.
[52] Wells and Hesse, “Isiolo County”.
[53] IUCN, “Improving Governance" 18.
[54] A copy of this document is with the author.
[55] Toulmin et al., “Investing".
[56] Tari and Pattison, “Evolving Customary".
[57] The maps are online http://webgis5.geodata.soton.ac.uk accessed 13.09.2015.
[58] For a copy of this bill see ILEG, RAP, and IUCN, “Customary Laws”.
[59] Comments to this effect were made in Governor Doyo’s Madaraka Day speech in 2014. A new bill Customary Institutions Bill was being drafted in April 2015. For a summary of different land claims in Isiolo County, see Boye and Kaarhus, “Competing Claims ", 116.
[60] Watson, “Culture and Conservation".
[61] Bassi, “The Politics”; Tache and Irwin, “Traditional Institutions"; Watson, “Culture and Conservation”; Watson, “Examining the Potential".
[62] Shrumm and Jonas, eds., *Bio-cultural*, 15.
[63] Ibid., 13. Also see http://biocultural.iied.org accessed 13.09.2015
[64] Kivulini Trust, www.kivulinitrust.org, accessed 26.08.2015.
[65] A list of BCPs being developed globally is in Shrumm and Jonas, *Bio-cultural*, 10.
[66] Fieldnotes_04.04.2015, Kinna, Isiolo County.
[67] Harrison, “Beyond ‘Natural’”; Zetterstrom-Sharp, “Heritage as".
[68] Similarly in Lamu in Bremner, “Towards” p, 408.
[69] Odhiambo, “Moving Beyond".
[70] Tari et al, “Strengthening Local”.
[71] Scott-Villiers, “We Are Not Poor!".
[72] Interview_ISI_006_29.03.2015, Kinna, Isiolo County.
[73] Interview_ISI_018_02.04.2015, Kinna, Isiolo County.
[74] Engle, *The Elusive Promise"*, 182.

[75] Elliott, “Planning".
[76] Stated in several interviews and in their constitution.
[77] Interview_ISI_009_31.03.2015, Kinna, Isiolo County.
[78] Smith, *The Uses*, 6.; Lowenthal, *The Heritage*.
[79] See Tari et al, “Strengthening Local”; IUCN, “Improving Governance”; Wells and Hesse, “Isiolo County”.
[80] Dahl, *Suffering Grass*, 41.
[81] Ibid., 161–162.
[82] Hogg, “Changing Property,” 25.
[83] Ibid., 30.
[84] Sobania, “Social Relationships", 2.
[85] Schlee, “Territorialising Ethnicity", 6.
[86] Hogg, “Changing Property” 24–25.
[87] Carrier and Kochore, “Navigating".
[88] ILEG, RAP, and IUCN, “Customary Laws", 7.
[89] Fieldnotes_29.11.2014, Kinna, Isiolo County.
[90] Hodgson and Schroeder, “Dilemmas".
[91] Interview_ISI_017_02.04.2015, Kinna, Isiolo County.
[92] Interview_ISI_012_01.04.2015, Kinna, Isiolo County.
[93] Arero, “Coming".
[94] Interview_ISI_015_02.04.2015. Kinna, Isiolo County.
[95] Interview_ISI_017_02.04.2015. Kinna, Isiolo County.
[96] Watson, “A Hardening" .
[97] Akoth, “Challenges".
[98] Interview_ISI_012_01.04.2015, Kinna, Isiolo County.

References

Akoth, Steve Ouma. “Challenges of Nationhood: Identities, Citizenship and Belonging under Kenya’s New Constitution.” Nairobi: Society for International Development, 2011.

Al-Kindy, Samar, and Kepher Otieno, eds. *Marsabit County Investment Guide*. Nairobi: County Government of Marsabit, 2015.

Anaya, James. “Letter to the Office of the United Nations High Commission for Human Rights. Reference AL Indigenous (2001-8) KEN 2/2013,” April 2, 2013. https://spdb.ohchr.org/hrdb/24th/public_-_AL_Kenya_02.04.13_(2.2013).pdf.

Anon. “Lapsset Fuelling Border Wars in Meru and Isiolo, Say MPs.” *The Daily Nation*, November 1, 2015. http://www.nation.co.ke/news/Lapsset-fuelling-border-wars-in-Meru-and-Isiolo/-/1056/2937732/-/ikeus/-/index.html.

———. “Local and Surveyors Differ over Lapsser Corridor Mapping in Garbatulla, Isiolo County.” *The Daily Nation*, May 5, 2015. http://mobile.nation.co.ke/counties/Lapsset-corridor-mapping-Garbatulla-Isiolo/-/1950480/2706514/-/format/xhtml/-/iqaqis/-/index.html.

Arero, Hassan Wario. “Coming to Kenya: Imagining and Perceiving a Nation among the Borana of Kenya.” *Journal of Eastern African Studies* 1, no. 2 (2007): 292–304.

Ashworth, G.W, Brian Graham, and J.E Tunbridge, eds. *Pluralising Pasts: Heritage, Identity and Place in Multicultural Societies*. London: Pluto Press, 2007.

Bakker, Karel A, Ishanlosen Odiaua, and George Abungu. “Heritage Impact Assessment for the Proposed Lamu Port-South Sudan-Ethiopia (LAPSSET) Corridor and the New Lamu Port and Metropolis Development Project, as Well as Related Development in the Lamu Archipelago, Kenya.” UNESCO, 2014.

Bassi, Marco. “The Politics of Space in Borana Oromo, Ethiopia: Demographics, Election, Identity and Customary Institutions.” *Journal of Eastern African Studies* 4, no. 2 (2010): 221–46.

Basu, Paul, and Wayne Modest. “Museums, Heritage and International Development: A Critical Conversation.” In *Museums, Heritage and International Development*, edited by Paul Basu and Wayne Modest. London: Routledge, 2015.

Blaser, Mario, Harvey A Feit, and Glenn McRae. *In the Way of Development: Indigenous People, Life Projects and Globalization*. London: Zed Books, 2004.

Boye, Saafo Roba, and Randi Kaarhus. “Competing Claims and Contested Boundaries: Legitimating Land Rights in Isiolo District, Northern Kenya.” *Africa Spectrum* 46, no. 2 (2011): 99–124.

Bremner, Lindsay. “Towards a Minor Global Architecture at Lamu, Kenya.” *Social Dynamics: A Journal of African Studies* 39, no. 3 (2013): 397–413.

Browne, Adrian. “LAPSSET: The History and Politics of an Eastern African Megaproject.” London: The Rift Valley Institute, 2015.

Carrier, Neil, and Hassan Kochore. “Navigating Ethnicity and Electoral Politics in Northern Kenya: The Case of the 2013 Election.” *Journal of Eastern African Studies* 8, no. 1 (2014): 135–52.

Dahl, Gudrun. *Suffering Grass: Subsistence and Society of Waso Borana*. Stockholm: University of Stockholm, 1979.

Elliott, Hannah. “Planning, Property and Plots at the Gateway to Kenya’s ‘New Frontier.’” *Journal of Eastern African Studies* 10, no. 3 (2016).

Elmi, Mohamed, and Izzy Birch. “Creating Policy Space for Pastoralism in Kenya.” *Future Agricultures Consortium* Working Paper 068 (2013).

Engle, Karen. *The Elusive Promise of Indigenous Development: Rights, Culture, Strategy*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2010.

Fitzpatrick, Daniel. “‘Best Practice’ Options for the Legal Recognition of Customary Tenure.” *Development and Change* 36, no. 3 (2005): 449–75.

Galaty, John. “Cultural Perspectives on Nomadic Pastoral Societies.” *Nomadic Peoples* 16 (1984): 15–29.

Galaty, John, and Pierre Bonte. *Herders, Warriors and Traders: Pastoralism in Africa*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1991.

GoK. “Kenya Vision 2030: The Popular Version.” Nairobi, 2007.

———. *Vision 2030 Development Strategy for Northern Kenya and Other Arid Lands*. Nairobi: Government of Kenya, 2012.

Goldsmith, Paul. “An Essay of the Future of Pastoralist Conflict.” Addis Ababa, 2011.

Greiner, Clemens. “Land-Use Change, Territorial Restructuring, and the Economies of Anticipation in Dryland Kenya.” *Journal of Eastern African Studies* 10, no. 3 (2016).

Harrison, Rodney. “Beyond ‘Natural’ and ‘Cultural’ Heritage: Toward an Ontological Politics of Heritage in the Age of the Anthropocene.” *Heritage and Society* 8, no. 1 (2015): 24–42.

Hewison, Robert. *The Heritage Industry: Britain in a Climate of Decline*. London: Methuen, 1987.

Hodgson, Dorothy. *Being Maasai, Becoming Indigenous: Postcolonial Politics in a Neoliberal World*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2011.

Hodgson, Dorothy, and Richard Schroeder. “Dilemmas of Counter-Mapping Community Resources in Tanzania.” *Development and Change* 33 (2002): 79–100.

Hogg, Richard. “Development in Kenya: Drought, Desertification and Food Scarcity.” *African Affairs* 86, no. 342 (1987): 47–58.

———. “The Politics of Changing Property Rights Among Isiolo Boran Pastoralists in Northern Kenya.” In *Property, Poverty and People: Changing Rights in Property and Problems of Pastoral Development*, edited by P.T.W Baxter and Richard Hogg. Manchester: University of Manchester, 1990.

Igoe, J. “Becoming Indigenous Peoples: Difference, Inequality and the Globalization of East African Identity Politics.” *African Affairs* 105 (2006): 399–420.

ILEG, RAP, and IUCN. “Customary Laws and Regulations for Governing Natural Resource Management in the Waso Rangeland. Proposed Bill.,” October 2012.

IUCN. “Improving Governance to Support Better Livelihood Security and Ecosystem Management in the Drylands of Africa (IUCN Project No: 76987-070). Garba Tula Drylands Governance Project, Kenya. Final Evaluation.” IUCN, 2013.

IUCN, and DFID. “Strengthening Community Based Natural Resource Governance through Local Institutions and Building Capacity of Pastoralist Communities in Garba Tula, Kenya,” 2011.

Jode, Heather de. “The Green Quarter: A Decade of Progress across the World in Sustainable Pastoralism.” Nairobi: IUCN/WISP, 2014.

JPC & BAC/GKA JV. “LAPSSET Corridor and New Lamu Port Feasibility Study and Master Plan Report. Volume Three: LAPSSER Corridor Master Plan and Development Plan. Executive Summary,” 2011.

Khalif, Zeinabu Kabale, and Gufu Oba. “‘Gaafa Dhaabaa - the Period of Stop’: Narrating Impacts of Shifta Insurgency on Pastoral Economy in Northern Kenya, c.1963-2007.” *Pastoralism: Research, Policy and Practice* 3, no. 14 (2013): 1–20.

Kharono, Elizabeth. “Pastoralist Lobby and Advocacy in Eastern Africa: A Review of the Pastoralist Lobby and Advocacy Context.” RECONCILE, 2011.

Kochore, Hassan H. “The Road to Kenya? Vision, Expectations and Anxieties around New Infrastructure Development in Northern Kenya.” *Journal of Eastern African Studies* 10, no. 3 (2016).

Kratli, Saverio, and Nikolaus Schareika. “Living Off Uncertainty: The Intelligent Animal Production of Dryland Pastoralists.” *European Journal of Development Research* 22 (2010): 605–22.

Lane, Paul. “Sustainability: Primordial Conservationists, Environmental Sustainability, and the Rhetoric of Pastoral Cultural Heritage in East Africa.” In *Heritage*

Keywords: Rhetoric and Redescription in Cultural Heritage, edited by Kathryn Lafrenz Samuels and Trinidad Rico. Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2015.

LAPSSET community network. "Aspirations and Concerns of Communities along the Proposed Lamu Port, South Sudan, Ethiopia (LAPSSET) Transport Corridor," February 2013. http://slamu-137c.kxcdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/LAPSSET-Press-Statement-final.pdf.

Letai, John, and Michael Tiampati. "Capturing Benefits Whist Safeguarding Livelihoods: The Debate over LAPSSET." In *Resilience in the Drylands of the Horn of Africa - Edition 5: Experiences and Lessons Learnt for Improved Policy and Practice*, edited by Heather de Jode and Vanessa Tilstone, 30–32. Nairobi: DLCI, 2014.

Little, Peter D. *Economic and Political Reform in Africa: Anthroopological Perspectives*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2014.

Livingstone, John K. "A Comparative Study of Pastoralist Parliamentary Groups: Kenya Case Study." PENHA, 2005.

Lowenthal, David. *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Morton, John, John K. Livingstone, and Mohammed Mussa. "Legislators and Livestock: Pastoralist Parliamentary Groups in Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda." London: IIED, 2007.

Odhiambo, Michael Ochieng. "Moving Beyond the Rhetoric: The Challenge of Reform in Kenya's Drylands." London: IIED, 2013.

———. "The ASAL Policy of Kenya: Releasing the Full Potential of Arid and Semi-Arid Lands - an Analytical Review." *Nomadic Peoples* 17, no. 1 (2013): 158–65.

———. "The Unrelenting Persistence of Certain Narratives: An Analysis of Changing Policy Narratives about the ASALs in Kenya." London: IIED, 2014.

Odote, Collins. "The Dawn of Uhuru? Implications of Constitutional Recognition of Communal Land Rights in Pastoral Areas of Kenya." *Nomadic Peoples* 17, no. 1 (2013): 87–105.

PDNK. "Isiolo Community Petition on the Lamu Port, South Sudan and Ethiopia Transport (LAPSSET) Corridor." Nairobi: Pastoralist Development Network of Kenya, October 2013.

Schlee, Gunther. "Territorialising Ethnicity: The Political Ecology of Pastoralism in Northern Kenya and Southern Ethiopia." Halle: Max-Planck Institute, 2010.

Scott-Villiers, Patta. "We Are Not Poor! Dominant and Subaltern Discourses of Pastoralist Development in the Horn of Africa." *Journal of International Development* 23 (2011): 771–81.

Sena, Kanyinke. "Lamu Port South Sudan Ethiopia Transport Corridor (LAPSSET) and Indigenous Peoples in Kenya." Copenhagen: International Workgroup for Indigenous Affairs, 2012.

Shrumm, Holly, and Jonas, eds. *Bio-Cultural Community Protocols: A Toolkit for Community Facilitators. Integrated Participatory and Legal Empowerment Tools to Support Communities to Secure Their Rights, Responsibilities, Territories, and Areas*. Cape Town: Natural Justice, 2012.

Smith, Laurajane. *The Uses of Heritage*. Oxford: Routledge, 2006.

Sobania, N.W. “Social Relastionships as an Aspect of Property Rights: Northern Kenya in the Pre-Colonial and Colonial Period.” In *Property, Poverty and People: Changing Rights in Property and Problems of Pastoral Development*, edited by P.T.W Baxter and Richard Hogg. Manchester: University of Manchester, 1990.

Swift, Jeremy. “Desertification Narratives, Winners and Losers.” In *The Lie of the Land: Challenging Recieved Wisdom on the African Landscape*, edited by Melissa Leach and James Fairhead, 77. Oxford: James Currey, 1996.

Tache, Boku, and Ben Irwin. “Traditional Institutions, Multiple Stakeholders and Modern Perspectives in Common Property: Accompanying Change Withing Borana Pastoral Systems.” Securing the Commons. London, 2003.

Tari, Daoud, King-Okumu Caroline, and Ibrahim Jarso. “Strengthening Local Customary Institutions: A Case Study in Isiolo County, Northern Kenya.” Nairobi: Adaptation Consortium, 2015.

Tari, Daoud, and James Pattison. “Evolving Customary Institutions in the Drylands: An Opportunity for Devolved Natural Resource Governance in Kenya?” London: IIED, 2014.

Toulmin, Camilla, Ced Hesse, Daoud Tari, and Caroline King-Okumu. “Investing in Institutional ‘Software’ to Build Climate Resilience.” *A Global Village* 13 (2015).

UNESCO. “State of Conservation - Lake Turkana National Parks,” 2015. http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc/3230.

Upton, Caroline. “The New Politics of Pastoralism: Identity, Justice and Global Activism.” *Geoforum* 54 (2014): 207–16.

Vetter, S. “Rangelands at Equilibrium and Non-Equilibrium: Recent Developments in the Debate.” *Journal of Arid Environments* 62, no. 2 (2005): 321–41.

Watson, Elizabeth. “‘A Hardening of Lines’: Landscape, Religion and Identity in Northern Kenya.” *Journal of Eastern African Studies* 4, no. 2 (2010): 201–20.

———. “Culture and Conservation in Post-Conflict Africa: Changing Attitudes and Approaches.” In *Culture and Development in a Globalizing World: Geographies, Actors and Paradigms*, edited by Sarah A Radcliffe. Abingdon: Routledge, 2006.

———. “Examining the Potential of Indigenous Institutions for Development: A Perspective from Borana, Ethiopia.” *Development and Change* 34 (2003): 287–309.

———. “Inter Institutional Alliances and Conflicts in Natural Resource Management. Preliminary Research Findings from Borana, Oromia Region, Ethiopia. Marena Research Project Working Paper No. 4.,” 2001.

Wells, Geoff, and Ced Hesse. “Isiolo County Adaptation Fund: Activites, Costs and Impacts after the 1st Investment Round.” IIED, 2014.

Whittaker, Hannah. “Forced Villigization during the Shifta Conflict in Kenya.” *International Journal of African Historical Studies* 45, no. 3 (2012): 343–64.

Zetterstrom-Sharp, Johanna. “Heritage as Future-Making: Aspiration and Common Destiny in Sierra Leone.” *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 21, no. 6 (2015): 609–27.

[99] Greiner, “Land-Use Change".