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Abstract
Pastoral mobility is seen as the most effective strategy to make use of constantly shifting resources. In northern Kenya, mobile pastoralism as a highly-valued strategy to manage grazing areas and exploit resource variability is becoming more complex. Policy and project implementation has historically been driven by the imperative to secure land tenure and improve pasture in bounded areas through State-led settlement schemes. Relatively recently, increased (inter)national interests in nature and wildlife conservation on community land in the northern pastoralist regions see conservation and development as crucial and urgent requirements for stimulating economic growth and security. This study presents the case of Samburu pastoral mobility within the context of such shifting social and environmental circumstances. It focuses on changing rules of access and control of livestock resources. These transformations are analysed in the context of the large-scale establishment of community conservancies and what role these conservancies play in the actual use and transformation of space for pastoralists. Empirically, this thesis is based on a total of eighteen months fieldwork including semi-structured interviews and observations in Samburu, Isiolo and Laikipia. It demonstrates how the principal of reciprocal access to pasture between pastoralists is giving way to conditional access based on membership of more formal, territory-based institutions such as community conservancies. It further shows how access to private land may be open for negotiation through the formation of grazing arrangements, which are also used to control pastoralists’ movements beyond enclosed land. In spite of a rhetoric acknowledging the multiple benefits of livestock mobility, current policy entails a continuation of past policy and project implementation where prescriptions still revolve around conservation enclosures and settlement politics. The thesis concludes that such processes of territoriality are likely to produce unexpected and potentially disappointing outcomes, while struggle and conflict persist.
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Siwuo lenkaiyiai oropili tukutaki yio ropili,
Nikutaki nkopang mayian nicho ntawuang nkuta
Nkerai enkaiyia mintisia kimaririta ntawuang
Kimaririta ntawuang olchekut lang orita
Kajipasaiko nomorokorie echa larin meitodei rumata
Yio naichopokita namuka supukolang lenkijepe
Naichopo naa meyelo neitomoku nkijepe

Peiyie kipejoki lengota lashe leToiyiai naibor
Peiyie emoku naa Nkijepe amu keshomo supuko meyieolo
Siemuo engungur lowan muntoki aibok lpusi
Muntoki aibok metasha peiyie emat ntawua nkuta
Lopirr longirigi leKargi ebunge Rantile ldero toLpurkel
Otooka naimarei nama namat nkuta to.Lkerei
Kechem lopir nkosheke nelusoki naa tenesha
Nelusoki naa tenesha payie atum aingwai nkuta

Ngoto lmongiai nikimany kanu Kenya kirikito
Amu kotoriko nkopi nayiolo peiyie aloit ateyielo
Loturoni emimita lekando elbaribara
Payie emat lchekuti epuo talamei eibwara nkop
Ruk enkopang tepio mbaringoyiai payie amat
Peiyie ematie ntawua nkuta tenesha nkatamboyia

'Lchekuti' song-text, Lemarti, 2018
(Translation: Daniel Lenkaina)

Nkai’s fresh air, hit us with your freshness
Bless our land and provide our cows with the first rainwaters
Child of Nkai, do not get tired when our cows are looking upon you
When our cows are looking upon you together with their herders
What can I do to keep the cows at home while the rains do not fall
We have tightened our shoes, heading to cold mountains
Heading to cold unknown mountains, and we are not used to the cold

We lighted a big fire, for the calf of a white cow named Toiyie
So he will get used to the cold, as he went to cold unknown mountains
The rainbow over the mountains, stop blocking the rain
Stop blocking, so the cows can get the first rainwaters
The heavy clouds from Kargi that gave Rendille hopes at Lpurkel
It rained at Naimarei and first rainwaters were found at Lkerei River
I love heavy clouds especially when they give rain
Especially when it rains so that I can smell the scent of the first rainwaters

Mother of many bulls, you have taken me across for long
You took me to many places I did not know, and returned knowing them
Small water sources along the routes, do not get dry
So that herders can find waters on their way while moving
Wind of our land, clean the water sources so that we can drink
So that also our cows can find the first rainwaters
Abstract

Pastoral mobility is seen as the most effective strategy to make use of constantly shifting resources. In northern Kenya, mobile pastoralism as a highly-valued strategy to manage grazing areas and exploit resource variability is becoming more complex. Policy and project implementation has historically been driven by the imperative to secure land tenure and improve pasture in bounded areas through State-led settlement schemes. Relatively recently, increased (inter)national interests in nature and wildlife conservation on community land in the northern pastoralist regions see conservation and development as crucial and urgent requirements for stimulating economic growth and security. This study presents the case of Samburu pastoral mobility within the context of such shifting social and environmental circumstances. It focuses on changing rules of access and control of livestock resources. These transformations are analysed in the context of the large-scale establishment of community conservancies and what role these conservancies play in the actual use and transformation of space for pastoralists. Empirically, this thesis is based on a total of eighteen months fieldwork including semi-structured interviews and observations in Samburu, Isiolo and Laikipia. It demonstrates how the principal of reciprocal access to pasture between pastoralists is giving way to conditional access based on membership of more formal, territory-based institutions such as community conservancies. It further shows how access to private land may be open for negotiation through the formation of grazing arrangements, which are also used to control pastoralists’ movements beyond enclosed land. In spite of a rhetoric acknowledging the multiple benefits of livestock mobility, current policy entails a continuation of past policy and project implementation where prescriptions still revolve around conservation enclosures and settlement politics. The thesis concludes that such processes of territoraility are likely to produce unexpected and potentially disappointing outcomes, while struggle and conflict persist.

Key words: pastoralism; livestock mobility; conservation; community conservancy; Northern Rangelands Trust; political ecology; access; institutions; governmentality; territoriality; Samburu; Laikipia; Isiolo; Kenya
Sammanfattning

Nomadiserande boskapsskötsel (pastoralism) betraktas generellt som den mest effektiva strategin för att utnyttja den ständigt växlande tillgången på resurser, som vatten och växtlighet, i områden med torrt klimat. I Kenya har denna markanvändningsstrategi för torrområden dock blivit alltmer komplicerad. Efter en längre tid av relativt små investeringar i dessa områden har ambitiösa utvecklingsprojekt påbörjats. Drivkraften för statsledda utvecklingspolitik och projekt i Kenyas torrområden har historiskt sett varit att stärka markrättigheter och förbättra betet inom avgränsade områden. På senare år har dock naturvård och utveckling lyfts fram som avgörande och nödvändiga delar för att stimulera ekonomisk tillväxt och säkerhet i regionen.


Avhandlingen består av en övergripande sammanfattning och fyra delstudier, där varje delstudie behandlar olika aspekter av Samburufolkets boskapsmobilitet i Ewaso regionen. Artikel I analyserar hur pastoralister får tillgång till naturresurser och hur de kontrolleras och förvaltas i ett föränderligt landskap. Den visar att principen om ömsesidighet mellan olika grupper av pastoralister kring tillträde och nyttjande av betesresurser håller på att ersättas av regler för tillträde baserade på medlemskap i mer formella och territoriellt avgränsade institutioner som t.ex. lokalt förvaltade naturvårdsområden. Artikel II behandlar två fall där sådana lokaltt förvaltade naturvårdsområden har upprättats i syfte att genom vildmarksturism stimulera både naturvård och utveckling. Studien tar sin teoretiska utgångspunkt i begreppet ‘gränsobjekt’ (‘boundary object’) och analyserar
hur lokalt förvaltade naturvårdsområden har blivit en form av patentlösning
för olika aktörer att nå skilda mål och syften. Den visar också att
motsättningar mellan dessa olika mål får oväntade resultat. Artikel III
undersöker hur tillträde till privatägd mark förhandlas, förhindras och
upprätthålls när pastoralister flyttar till ett område med andra
ägandeförhållanden. Resultaten visar att privatägd mark både kan göras
tillgänglig för pastoralister genom upprättandet av ‘betesöverenskommelser’
(‘grazing arrangements’), men också att sådana överenskommelser används
i syfte att kontrollera pastoralisters mobilitet även utanför privatägd mark.
Detta sker dock inte utan motstånd från pastoralister. Artikel IV fördjupar
diskussionen om motstånd och konflikter med utgångspunkt i en specifik
konfliktteori. Den visar på konflikters varaktighet och hur dynamiken i en
konflikt påverkar dynamiken i en annan, vilket gör konflikter svåra att helt
avgränsa och hantera. Studien bidrar till en teoretisk diskussion om
konflikter genom att visa på hur konflikter blir påverkade av, eller påverkar,
sociala och materiella förhållanden och förändring.

Sammantaget visar avhandlingen att det har skett en förändring från ett
mer öppet till ett mer slutet landskap, vilket har skapat sämre förutsättningar
för pastoralisters mobilitet. Genom att beskriva hur förutsättningarna för
boskapsmobilitet har blivit alltmer komplexa och präglade av besvär och
konflikt, samtliga som mobilitet är en nödvändig förutsättning för
pastoralism, visar avhandlingen att etableringen av nya territoriella gränser
enligt rådande bosättnings- och naturvårdspolitik riskerar att inte bidra till
förväntade utvecklingsmål. En trolig utveckling är istället att motsättningar
mellan aktörers olika intressen ger upphov till oväntade och potentiellt
negativa konsekvenser. Trots att man erkänner de många fördelarna med
boskapsmobilitet innebär den nuvarande politiken en fortsättning på tidigare
utvecklingspolitik och projekt där målet om fast bosättning och upprättande
av territoriella indelningar för boskapsskötsande pastoralister fortfarande står
i fokus.
Samenvatting

In gebieden met een aride klimaat is het voor pastoralisten en hun kuddes doorgaans van groot belang dat zij vrij kunnen rondtrekken, zodat ze optimaal gebruik kunnen maken van de continue veranderende natuurlijke hulpbronnen in de omgeving. Hulpbronnen zoals gras en water zijn immers weids verspreid in een dynamisch en veranderlijk landschap. In de Keniaanse context is het voor pastoralisten steeds lastiger om natuurlijke hulpbronnen te gebruiken en beheren. In het verleden richtten koloniale en postkoloniale regeringen hun beleid grotendeels op het veilig stellen van landrechten voor pastoralisten door middel van het instellen van territoriale zones waaraan mensen werden ‘gebonden’. Door de opgelegde nederzettingen en begrenzingen is de mobiliteit van pastoralisten en hun kuddes langzaam afgenomen. Na jaren van relatief weinig investeringen in deze gebieden worden er op dit moment verscheidene ambitieuze projecten geïmplementeerd in de Keniaanse aride gebieden, waarbij ontwikkeling en natuurbehoud als cruciaal worden beschouwd voor het stimuleren van de economische groei en veiligheid, waardoor de complexiteit in het landschap steeds verder toeneemt. Dit brengt opnieuw belemmeringen voor de mobiliteit met zich mee.

In dit proefschrift staan specifiek de Samburu pastoralisten en hun mobiliteit centraal, in de context van de veranderende sociaalecologische omstandigheden en toenemende begrenzingen in de Ewaso regio in het noorden van Kenia. De mobiliteitspatronen van de Samburu pastoralisten met hun kuddes worden in beeld gebracht, om inzicht te geven in hoe de toegang en controle over natuurlijke hulpbronnen zijn georganiseerd en in de loop der tijd zijn veranderd. Deze veranderingen hebben deels plaatsgevonden in de context van de introductie van zogeheten ‘community conservancies’, oftewel natuurbehoudsgebieden. Dergelijke gebieden worden beheerd door en zijn in eigendom van de lokale gemeenschap. Desalniettemin vormen ze in toenemende mate een verdere beperking voor de mobiliteit van de pastoralisten in de regio. Het onderzoek is gebaseerd op 18 maanden veldwerk, bestaande uit semigestructureerde interviews en observaties in de noordelijke Ewaso regio in Kenia (bestaande uit de counties Samburu, Isiolo en Laikipia). De verzamelde data zijn geanalyseerd door gebruik te maken van theorieën en concepten uit de politieke ecologie.

Dit proefschrift bestaat uit een uitgebreide samenvatting en vier artikelen waarin de onderzoeksbevindingen zijn gepresenteerd. Ieder artikel behandelt
diverse aspecten van het mobiliteitsproces van de Samburu pastoralisten in de Ewaso regio. Artikel I gaat over de manier waarop Samburu pastoralisten natuurlijke hulpbronnen gebruiken en beheren in een veranderlijk landschap. Het artikel laat zien hoe de gebruikelijke ‘open’ manier van onderling beheer met wederzijdse toegang tot en gebruik van hulpbronnen tussen verschillende groepen pastoralisten langzaam is veranderd naar een meer gesloten territoriaal landschapsbeheer op basis van lidmaatschap op de hedendaagse community conservancies, waarbij toegang alleen nog kan worden verleend als er aan de formele regels en de (van buiten opgelegde) normen voor natuurbehoud is voldaan. Artikel II bediscussieert twee cases waarbij de community conservancies zijn ingezet om natuurbehoud en ontwikkeling te stimuleren door middel van toerisme gericht op de wilde natuur. Door gebruik te maken van het zogenaamde ‘grensobject’ (‘boundary object’) concept, analyseert het artikel hoe het ontwerp van de community conservancies, als wondermiddel voor natuurbehoud en ontwikkeling, zo snel werd geaccepteerd en geïmplementeerd in noord Kenia, ondanks meervoudige belangen en doeleinden van verschillende actoren. Dit artikel laat ook zien dat, als gevolg van contradicties tussen de actoren en hun verschillende belangen, het gehoopte resultaat niet zal worden bereikt. Artikel III onderzoekt hoe pastoralisten met hun kuddes ‘onwettig’ gebruik maken van landschappen en gebieden in privébeheer. Het artikel bespreekt de verschillende strategieën die worden ingezet door privé-eigenaren om deze ‘illegale’ praktijken te voorkomen en laat verder zien hoe onderhandelingen tussen landeigenaren en pastoralisten kunnen leiden tot overeenkomsten voor het gezamenlijk gebruik van privéterreinen. Het artikel toont ook aan hoe deze overeenkomsten soms worden ingezet om juist de territoriale controle van privé-eigenaren verder te vergroten. Dit gebeurt echter niet zonder weerstand van pastoralisten. Tot slot richt Artikel IV zich voornamelijk op deze weerstand en gaat verder door te onderzoeken wat de rol van aanhoudend conflict is in de ontwikkeling van andere, gerelateerde conflicten. Door gebruik te maken van een specifiek theoretisch kader omtrent conflict laat dit artikel zien hoe conflicten zijn verbonden en elkaar kunnen versterken, wat het moeilijk maakt ze te beheersen of te controleren. Dit artikel draagt bij aan de theoretische discussie omtrent conflict in relatie tot sociaal-materiële veranderingsprocessen.

Dit proefschrift concludeert dat deze veranderingsprocessen bijdragen aan een transformatie van het bestaan van een ‘open’ landschap naar een meer gesloten landschap, wat mobiliteit voor pastoralisten steeds ingewikkelder maakt. Het is aannemelijk dat deze transformatie, aangedreven door invloedrijke ideeën omtrent ontwikkeling en natuurbeheer, niet zal leiden tot gehoopte ontwikkelingen. In tegendeel, als gevolg van spanningen en dissonanties tussen verschillende actoren en hun belangen zal dit juist leiden tot tegenvallende resultaten. Verder draagt deze voortzetting van het historische beleid en projecten die zijn gericht op permanente
nederzettingen en het ‘binden’ van mensen aan specifieke gebieden niet bij aan de ondersteuning van de mobiliteit van pastoralisten. En dit ondanks het feit dat de mobiliteit van pastoralisten en hun kuddes juist in toenemende mate wordt erkend door beleidsmakers als de optimale strategie om gebruik te maken van natuurlijke hulpbronnen in de aride gebieden.
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</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

This study is about the livestock mobility patterns of the Samburu of Kenya, a pastoralist community living mainly in Samburu County but also in Isiolo and Laikipia counties. Here they move through and settle within a highly diverse and dynamic landscape, in order to gain and maintain access to the land they reside on and the resources they use. In Samburu, Isiolo and Laikipia – as part of the Ewaso region, also known as the Ewaso (Nyiro River) basin, catchment or ecosystem (Lane 2011; Ericksen et al. 2012; Kimiti et al. 2017) (Figure 1) – two important processes are unfolding. First, many national and international NGOs, private donors and investors, and governments are, in line with current participation and decentralisation policies, investing in community based ecotourism projects for wildlife based tourism (Little 2013; Pellis et al. 2014). Through the formation of community conservancies in northern Kenya, the Northern Rangelands Trust (NRT) in cooperation with local governments and international donors are aiming to bring economic development to the communities while conserving wildlife and biodiversity through tourism and rangeland management initiatives. These developments are also intended to bring security to the area.

Currently, with the support of NRT, over 42,000km² of Kenya’s landmass is ‘secured’ under the NRT through 35 community conservancies, and this amount is growing. These conservancies are demarcated areas in which the local population, consisting mostly of pastoralist communities in the drylands, plays a key-role in conservation management while benefiting from the revenues tourism is supposed to bring, in addition to improving grazing areas for the cattle and livestock of the community. This, then, would also reduce the communities’ dependency on seasonal livestock migration by improving the quality and quantity of pasture on the land (Greiner 2012; Little 2013; Odote 2013).

1‘[P]eople who gain a substantial portion of their livelihood from livestock’ (Catley et al. 2013, 2). Pastoralism is also a way of life with socio-cultural norms and values, and indigenous knowledge revolving around livestock (Ayantunde et al. 2011).
The second important process taking place in the region is the increase in livestock movements both within and across Samburu, Isiolo and Laikipia counties. This is partly a result of the gradual sedentarisation of pastoralist communities over the last fifty years, and partly due to a loss of grazing land. Furthermore, the need for seasonal mobility has increased in a context of demographic growth, changing weather conditions and a growing area set aside for conservation (Fratkin 1994; McPeak and Little 2004; Fratkin and Roth 2005; Lengoiboni et al. 2011; Letai and Lind 2013; Pas 2018). Pastoralists require access to dry-season grazing land and watering points during the dry seasons – even more so when a drought occurs, as was most
recently the case in 2008-9, 2011-15 and 2016-17. Dry-season grazing areas are not easily accessible in Samburu, Isiolo and Laikipia. Most of the good-quality and well-rained lands are allocated to either restricted community based conservancies, private ranches and conservancies, agricultural smallholdings and national parks, or are subjected to violent conflict between different pastoralist groups (McCabe 2004; Greiner 2013; Galaty 2016a). Within this landscape, livestock mobility entails a complex web of variable social, political and biophysical factors within which the cattle and livestock herders have to navigate (Galaty 2013; Reid et al. 2014).

Hence, while certain projects continue to (willingly or unwillingly) curtail mobility through community conservancies and alternative income opportunities, pastoralists continue to practice livestock mobility to sustain their livelihood, which is becoming increasingly complex. These changes have further important impacts on pastoral mobility and significantly challenge pastoralists’ livelihoods (Fratkin 2004; Galaty 2013).

Mobility in drylands

African rangelands, also referred to as drylands or arid and semi-arid lands (ASAL), cover about two-thirds of sub-Saharan Africa (Homewood 2004). They are characterised by unpredictable rainfall and variations in vegetation growth, leading to highly dynamic environments (Ellis and Swift 1988; Behnke et al. 1993; Zimmerer 2000). In these drylands, livestock mobility is seen as the most effective strategy to sustain both pastoralism as a livelihood and rangeland environments (Turner 2011; Galaty 2013; Butt 2016).

Worldwide, drylands are facing similar challenges of changing environments, while being subjected to projects of rangeland management and/or extractive investments. Drylands in Africa, as well as in Asia, Europe, and America have been the source of livelihood for large numbers of mobile pastoralists (Van Veen 1995; Agrawal 1998; Ludi 2003; Homewood et al. 2009; Kerven et al. 2012; Upton 2012a). Although diverse in their complexities because of different political-economic histories, cultures, religions, geographies and development pathways, pastoralists are still facing similar challenges of imposed rangeland fragmentation, geographical and political marginalisation, forced settlement schemes, and ‘modern’ rangeland innovations (Sullivan and Homewood 2003; Upton 2012b; Catley et al. 2013; Galaty 2013; Benjaminsen et al. 2015; Bottazzi et al. 2016). Besides these challenges worldwide, pastoralists in Africa face additional concerns of violent conflict, increased investments in large-scale infrastructure, land grabs, establishments of extractive industries, recurrent droughts, and land tenure insecurities (Goldsmith 2013; Gu et al. 2015; Mosley and Watson 2016; Bottazzi et al. 2016; Freeman 2017; Cavanagh 2018b). Within this context, various approaches to improving pastoralists’ livelihoods and combating rangeland degradation, such as (forced)
sedentarisation, land privatisation as well as development and conservation efforts among others, have led to new or renewed forms of enclosures delimiting and restricting the movement of people (Fernandez-Gimenez 2002; Kerven et al. 2012; Marin and Bjørklund 2015; Ichinkhorloo and Yeh 2016; Enns 2017). These various interventions by (powerful) non-governmental organisation and county governments are ongoing, creating profound transformations of access and control of natural resources. These transformations, in addition to processes of regaining authority and access, have led to a renewed understanding of the commons, in the literature referred to as the ‘new pastoral commons’ (Bollig and Lesorogol 2016). Throughout these processes, land users have often partly lost access to, and autonomy over, the land and natural resources they use (Sikor and Lund 2009; Peluso and Lund 2011; German et al. 2016), contributing in different ways to the generation of immobility.

Still, in a growing number of African states, a recent shift in policy and legislation to formally recognise and support pastoral mobility has taken place, particularly in several countries in West Africa, but also in Kenya (African Union 2013; Elmi and Birch 2013). This ‘mobility paradigm’ importantly breaks with common views about pastoralists as destroyers of the environment who are responsible for widespread rangeland degradation through overstocking, overgrazing, and overpopulation (Herskovits 1926; Hardin 1968; Lamprey 1983; Anderson 1993). However, although pastoral mobility has gained recognition in policy and legislation, it has lacked support in its implementation (Elmi and Birch 2013; Butt 2016). Hardships and struggles in accessing resources are still part of daily practice in the drylands within a context of rapidly changing socio-economical and climatic conditions that shape, and negatively affect, the livelihoods of pastoralists (Fratkin and Roth 2005; Galvin et al. 2008; Catley et al. 2013; Butt 2016). Therefore, it is key to recognise the various ways in which livestock mobility, access and immobility are generated by pastoralists, but also by other actors and their practices (Li 2007), and draw lessons from local struggles and opportunities (Sullivan and Homewood 2003; Adger et al. 2003; Haller et al. 2016; Watson et al. 2016; Krätli 2016).

**Aim and research questions**

The two processes, as introduced earlier, play a significant role in the ways the pastoral commons are reshaped and transformed in northern Kenya. Indeed, both processes bring about a shift in the way pastoral mobility is

---

being conducted and indicate new forms of accessing and controlling natural resources within and beyond pastoral areas. The rise in governmental, non-governmental and private interests, as expressed through community conservancies, alters the ways in which pastoral commons are currently governed. Moreover, the increased number of cases in which pastoralists (permitted or unpermitted) access private land, or come to temporarily settle on land with unclear ownership status, modifies current tenure relations. The way in which these transformations are playing out differs significantly at finer scales.

I am interested in understanding how pastoralists transform ways to access and control grazing resources in a context of governmental and non-governmental interventions aimed at improving resource management. I specifically look at how the governance of resources and current patterns of livestock mobility are changing. Two overall objectives were identified: i) To understand how mobility and access are organised and transformed and ii) To understand the role of the government and non-governmental organisations and their projects in the transformation of pastoral livestock mobility and access to resources. It is important to gain knowledge and deeper insights into these dynamics of mobility because the rapid changes that are occurring affects pastoralists’ livelihoods, policy making, and conservation, in addition to the level of friction and conflict within the region: not only between various pastoral groups, but also between pastoral and non-pastoral communities.

In order to fulfil this aim, the thesis is structured around empirical research investigating contemporary processes concerning the transformation of Samburu pastoralists’ livestock mobility within the Ewaso region, with a special focus on access and control of resources in Samburu, Isiolo and Laikipia. More specifically, the following research questions will guide this thesis:

1) How is access to pasture, water and land gained, maintained and controlled by the Samburu, and how is this similar or different to historical patterns of access and control?

2) In what way do interventions of development and conservation, based on discursive and material practices, shape and reconfigure the practices of pastoral mobility, access to resources and control of space?

I address these research questions through the research papers presented in this thesis. In Article I, I explore current patterns of access and control within Samburu, as well as the shifts and transformations towards new rules of access. In Article II, we discuss community conservancies and analyse, through the concept of boundary object, how these conservancies were accepted so quickly by so many groups despite their different interests. This
article also explores in more detail the spatial effects of community conservancies. In Article III, I explore in detail the grazing arrangements for access to private property in Laikipia. I focus on the arrival of Samburu pastoralists, and how this transforms existing grazing arrangements into becoming even more disciplinary in nature. In Article IV, we zoom in to a case of a public-private conservation alliance and how conflicts, following their own internal logic, interrelate and steer the relations between multiple actors. Although the emphasis in each of the articles is on one of the two research questions, all articles contribute to the overall understanding of current patterns of livestock mobility, and the transformations therein relative to access and control of grazing resources in the Ewaso region. In doing so, I contribute to a better understanding of the current ways in which Samburu pastoralists gain and maintain access to resources, how pastoral mobility more generally unfolds in a changing context and the messy ways in which processes of government, aimed at organising people and space, play out at finer scales.

The thesis is organised as follows: the next section provides the theoretical lens and conceptual background of the study followed by a short geographical and historical context of the Ewaso region. I then introduce the methodologies chosen for this study. I further present the summaries of the four research articles that explore different aspects of pastoral mobility in the Ewaso region, followed by a synthesis and my overall conclusions.
Theoretical Considerations

This section introduces my understanding of pastoral mobility and access to resources in a powerful conservation landscape as entanglements of the new pastoral commons, where processes of government – aimed at organising people and space – are shaped by and reflect specific configurations of power. I start by introducing the general field of study, political ecology, as the lens through which I analyse configurations and transformations of resource access and control. I then turn to the concepts of access and institutions and follow this up with how these concepts fit within the new pastoral commons. I argue that the understanding of the new pastoral commons provides a productive conceptual context and entry point to study shifting rules of access and control. However, in order to understand how the new pastoral commons are functioning as technologies of rule, I draw on the analytic of governmentality as a way to critically engage with different forms of interventions, designed to steer the behaviour of mobile people, and to understand relations of power between various actors. As such, I conceptualise the new pastoral commons as sites where interventions of spatial arrangements, intended to steer the behaviour of people, are articulated through the use, access and control of resources.

Political ecology and the pastoral commons

Common pool resources, or the commons, are natural resources such as water, grazing land and forests that are managed and used by groups of people/communities for collective benefit (Basu et al. 2017). Considerable political and academic attention has been given to the study of the commons, especially on the over-exploitation and degradation of communally managed natural resources, which has resulted in a wide range of studies and discussions on resource relations. Hardin (1968) developed an influential theory in the debate on the management of rangelands. He believed that systems of commonly owned resources will lead to their overexploitation and degradation because each individual is making decisions based on her/his self-interest due to a lack of incentive to do otherwise. The ‘tragedy of the commons’ stems from this way of thinking, in which individuals will extract resources to their benefit while the costs of overexploitation are shared over the community of users (Lesorogol 2008). This thinking led to
the idea that private property would be the best solution to the overexploitation and degradation of natural resources. Hence, private property is seen as the most efficient institution that will result in optimal use and management of the resource (Deininger and Binswanger 1999; Borras 2002). In pastoral areas, where natural resources are generally communally owned and managed, privatisation policies were implemented to target land degradation, population pressure, and institutional failure by curtailing mobility, attempting to destock, and turning communal land into private property (Okoth-Ogendo 1986; Lesorogol 2008).

Within this context of depoliticised narratives on the environment, a political ecology perspective on pastoral land use and socio-environmental change in semi-arid Sub-Saharan African rangelands emerged to critically engage with human-environmental relations (Blaikie 1987; Ostrom 1990; Behnke et al. 1993; Peters 1994; Turner 1993; Niamir-Fuller 1999; Woodhouse et al. 2000). Political ecology studies on common pool resources management has focused on embedding ecological processes in the context of the broader political economy, placing environmental changes and conflicts as the products of unequal social relations and political processes, leading to new understandings of the pastoral commons. Political ecology as an approach implies a focus on human-environment relations, making the role of social, political and economic forces in environmental challenges and their impacts more explicit (Greenberg and Park 1994). It therefore views human-environmental intersections as political processes, where power relations and political struggles in relation to socio-environmental interaction and change are at the centre of investigation (Greenberg and Park 1994; Zimmerer and Bassett 2003; Paulson et al. 2003; Robbins 2011). Political ecologists argue that there is a need for a politicised understanding of local knowledge, history, power and (post)-colonial politics that must be taken into account when studying socio-environmental change (Peet and Watts 1993; Peluso and Watts 2001). Here the environment is not only seen as a stage where multiple claims and conflict over resource access and control are negotiated and played out, it is also considered an active player in these processes (Bollig et al. 2014; Bollig and Lesorogol 2016; Straight et al. 2016).

While doing so, a shift in analysing power within the political ecology approach has taken place opening up new ways of understanding intersections between nature, power and society (Zhang 2015; Svarstad et al. 2018). Previously power was understood as structural and negative – studying relations from realistic and material conflicts over access to resources where power is based on structural economic domination and exploitation. Yet, power gradually came to be conceived of as constructive through processes of knowledge production and discourse (Escobar 1996; Leach and Mearns 1998; Adger et al. 2001). The discursive construction of pastoralists as backwards and destroyers of nature, for example, produced influential environmental and development discourses that shape the
understanding of problems and solutions through policy implementation (Morton 2010). Scholars increasingly engage with the analysis of power as productive, ‘everywhere’ and capable of mobilising the agency of subjects in order to regulate relations between people and nature using a governmentality framework (Rose-Redwood 2006; Rocheleau 2008; Cavanagh 2018a). Such a post-structural approach to political ecology has led to a number of studies on environmentality, green governmentality, eco-governmentality and neoliberal environmentality (Agrawal 2005; Li 2007; Rutherford 2007; Goldman 2009; Green 2010; Fletcher 2010; Valdivia 2015; Bluwstein 2017). As such, current political ecology scholars often engage with the concept of power by using a combination of the various perspectives (Svarstad et al. 2018). That is, they see power as exercised by people who are situated in structural differences while their agency is not totally constrained by structures alone. Furthermore, structural institutions, practices and discourses can be seen as disciplinary, steering people to act in certain ways. In addition, the steering of people’s behaviour through the creation of ‘subjects’ through rational interventions engages with power in a more ‘invisible’ way. Again, this discipline is never total. Following Svarstad et al. (2018), within a political ecology study, I believe it is useful to employ an approach that engages with a combined understanding of power.

Likewise, in this thesis, I employ political ecology as a lens through which I analyse the transformations and reconfigurations of resource access and control in relation to governmental interventions (Li 2007; Kronenburg Garcia 2015). I view these transformations as political processes that have far-reaching implications for the livelihoods of mobile pastoralists, especially in relation to accessing and controlling resources. Therefore, the concepts ‘access’, ‘institutions’ and ‘control’ take a central place in this thesis (Vandergeest and Peluso 1995; Ribot and Peluso 2003; Lesorogol 2010a). In addition, I will deploy a governmentality approach as a framework of analysis to understand interventions and the use of technologies of rule as modes of government regulating interactions between mobile people and the environment (Elden 2007; Fletcher 2010; Fletcher 2017; Regassa et al. 2018). To do this, I first elaborate on my understanding of pastoral mobility in relation to the concepts of access and institutions. I then discuss the ‘new pastoral commons’ as a conceptual context describing the transformations and reconfigurations of resource access taking place in Eastern and Southern Africa (Bollig and Lesorogol 2016). I then propose to understand these new pastoral commons – including shifting rules of access because of local practices, governmental interventions and other (external) involvements – in relation to governmentality. This interpretation of the new pastoral commons can serve as an analytical – rather than descriptive – purpose to analyse the working of power through different technologies of government that are reorganising relations between pastoralists and the land, leading to changing territorial relations.
Pastoral mobility

Research from various disciplines including anthropologists, geographers, economists, environmentalists and archaeologists, have studied pastoralism from a variety of angles (Turner and Hiernaux 2002; Butt et al. 2009; Wario et al. 2016; Lane 2016). A significant amount of knowledge produced through these studies relates to practices or resource utilisation and management and pastoralists’ relation with space. Mobility, spatial use of resources and complex tenure arrangements, as major components of pastoralist resource use and engagement with space, plays an important if not central role in these studies. Studies range from the biophysical vegetation and rangeland aspects of pastoral mobility (Shigaeva et al. 2007; Butt et al. 2011; Wario et al. 2016) to changing decision making practices (Wario et al. 2015), conflicts with other mobile groups or sedentary societies (Turner 2004; Witsenburg and Adano 2009; Adano et al. 2012; Brottem 2016), and issues of rangeland fragmentation and enclosures that compromise mobility (Galvin et al. 2008).

More generally, mobility is understood as the movement of people, networks, ideas, material, and information focusing on processes of exchange that lead to social change (Sheller and Urry 2006; Ilcan 2013). Social life is based on movements, flows and connections that gather at certain ‘nodes’ around which social life takes place (Sheller and Urry, 2006). The formation of local-to-local relations and spatial connectedness as a result of multiple social and material mobilities, is seen to reform and create new localised spaces, while reproducing spatial differences as well (Massey 2005; Greiner 2011; Greiner and Sakdapolrak 2013). Hence, places are relationally produced based on the various forms of movements of people, objects and ideas. Furthermore, mobility as the ability to be mobile goes hand in hand with immobility, in other words, with disconnection, and social exclusion as a result of unequal relations (Massey 2005; Sheller and Urry 2006).

For pastoralists, mobility is a matter of daily practice where social-economic and political life is centred on mobility in ways similar to those described above. Besides the physical movement of people and livestock over the landscape in search of water and pasture, pastoral mobility is also about crossing borders, exchanging knowledge and the formation of places (Moss 2014; Straight et al. 2015). Social life during practices of mobility is produced around points such as water sources, villages and encampment points (Ingold 1986; Turner 2011). These places are temporary based on the nature of constantly shifting resources in the drylands. Access to these places has to be constituted and negotiated and is based on social connections and networks. While pastoral mobility is ongoing, more permanent forms of place making also occur in pastoralist settings (Bollig et al. 2014). Likewise, pastoral mobility is an embodied practice of human and animal bodies on the move. While crossing internal boundaries, these bodies also represent
Here are the differences, creating and/or limiting access to certain places. Continuous judgements are made on these moving bodies and not all people possess the freedom to move anywhere, anytime. Lastly, the mobility of pastoralists has been constructed as abnormal and problematic as compared to the ‘normal’ fixed lifestyles (Merriman 2009). Hence, many different bodies are on the move ‘and it is often through their movements and proximities that bodies are marked as “different” in the first place’ (Sheller and Urry 2006, 207). These mobile bodies, then, ‘need’ to be controlled because their mobility is in some places undesired. In the case of mobile pastoralists, the control of pastoralists and their mobility mostly occurs through the control of (access to) places, particularly land and pastures.

However, as opposed to focusing on processes of place-making and the social (trans)formation of spaces relating to more permanent forms of mobility and exchange, this thesis is concerned with the spatial and social aspects of pastoral mobility that routinely occurs on a seasonal or yearly basis. For the purpose of this thesis, livestock and/or pastoral mobility, movement, and migration are used interchangeably to refer to the movement of (segments of) households with livestock in search of water and pasture (Niamir-Fuller 1999; Turner 2011; Butt 2016; Lane 2016). Such mobility is seen as the most effective strategy to make use of constantly shifting resources (Krätli and Schareika 2010; Butt 2010). In general, pastoral mobility can be ordered in various forms, from recurrent continuous movements with the entire household within one ecozone – nomadic pastoralism – to seasonally structured movements between different ecozones, often with only a segment of the household – referred to as transhumance (Karplus and Meir 2013; Bollig and Österle 2013; Lane 2016). Pastoral mobility thus includes short-distance circular movement around a homestead on a daily basis as well as large-scale movements, and combinations of these (Butt 2016). The distance and frequency of such movements are dependent on the unequally distributed resources over place and time (Turner 2011).

Pastoral mobility enables access to resources, and this access is based on social relations constituted throughout the landscape. Since resources in the drylands are fluctuating and unpredictable, so are the relations that secure access to localised resources. Mobility over long distances means that herders need to have a strong and wide social network of connections to share information and access pastures and water points maintained by other communities (Casimir 1992; Turner 2011; Galaty 2013). Access to resources is thus created through negotiations with other resource users – pastoralists and farmers – and is often agreed upon by following certain customary rules and regulations. Galaty (2013, 477) stated that in pastoral areas there is a territorial system where ‘rights in and norms for negotiating access to resources, duties towards others regarding land held in common, and powers of holding, disposing and using land, and excluding others from it, whether through force or persuasion, are defined and secured’. These rules and
regulations form the institutions that Galaty refers to as social agreements between pastoralists. These institutions provide the function of mediator between people and the environment, which then structure access to resources in informal agreements (Galaty 2013; Moritz 2016). In what follows, I will provide clear definitions of how I use the terms ‘access’ and ‘institutions’ in relation to governance of the commons in a mobile context.

**Access**

As stated earlier, pastoral mobility is governed through the governance of access. Throughout this thesis, the concept of access takes a central place for analysis in order to understand in what way access to resources is gained, maintained and controlled by pastoralists. Based on the theory of access developed by Ribot and Peluso (2003, 153), access is defined as ‘the ability to derive benefit from things’. Here, the ability is based on social relationships that are embedded within the socio-political environment. Hence, this theory allows one to focus on the differences in abilities to benefit, and as such ‘[P]lacing this analysis within a political-economic framework helps us identify the circumstances by which some people are able to benefit from particular resources while others are not’ (ibid., 158).

Access mechanisms can be described as the various methods used to gain, maintain, and control access to natural resources (Leach et al. 1999; Ribot and Peluso 2003; Ribot 2014). The theory of access assumes that individuals do not start from equal positions and that power relations influence one’s ability to benefit from things. Other mechanisms enable to ‘benefit from things’ are technology, capital, markets, labour, knowledge, authority, identities, and social relations (Ribot and Peluso 2003, 161-162). Such mechanisms can ‘shape or influence access’ (ibid., 165), which means that if one is endowed with capital, knowledge and strong networks there is greater chance to turn the endowment into an entitlement and actually make use of it.

Access can be supported and stimulated, or restricted and limited, by the socio-political environment. By means of policies and laws, some people are provided with access to certain resources while others are excluded from such use. It is important to note that property is only one of the ways to regulate access and control of a resource. Using access as an analytic concept enables one to focus on the actual use of the natural resources by actors where gaining, maintaining and controlling access are seen as processes. The interpretation of gaining access, then, goes beyond legal access and provides alternative ways to investigate access and tenure relations from a new perspective (Ribot and Peluso 2003; von Benda-Beckmann et al. 2006; Lesorogol 2014; Cavanagh and Benjaminsen 2015). Maintenance of access involves investments in social relationships while the control of access is the organisation and regulation of others’ access (Ribot and Peluso 2003). I
interpret the process of controlling access as a form of government (Kronenburg García 2015). As such, access control occurs through rules and regulations – or, institutions – that govern other people’s ability to use resources.

In this thesis, the concept of access is central and provides the starting point for the analysis of how access is gained, maintained and controlled. In Article I, I discuss how access is gained, maintained and controlled through institutions in a mobile context. I further analyse the transformations of the rules of access. In Article II, we implicitly discuss access maintenance and control in relation to the establishment of community conservancies and processes of territorialisation. In Article III, I describe the process of gaining access through illicit (night)grazing, and how this, through technologies of government, is attempted to be controlled. In Article IV, we discuss illicit access to private properties as example of an enduring conflict. Inspired by the theory of access, and as a means to gain further insights in the rules and regulations in the process of maintaining and controlling access, I turn to the concept of institutions and how they can be best understood in a mobile context.

Institutions in a mobile context

Customary institution building for sustainable and equitable management and use of natural resources in the Global South has been an object of study and development work over the past 50 years. Research on the commons often takes the perspective, directly or indirectly, of Common Property Resources theory and New Institutional Economics (North 1990; Mehta et al. 2001; Haller et al. 2013). Instead of considering that solely private property will lead to the efficient use of natural resources (Hardin 1968), institutional theory considers that the commons can be managed sustainably under certain conditions. It was argued, based on research of traditional management systems of the commons, that degradation and exploitation were avoided by local actors following the rules where benefits and costs are equally distributed. Here, institutions are key in restricting and regulating action (Berkes 1989; Bromley and Cernea 1989; McCabe 1990; Ostrom 1990; Ostrom 2002; Agrawal 2003).

The role of institutions in natural resource management and distribution is critical (Leach et al. 1999; Scoones 1999; Cleaver 2001; Adano and Witsenburg 2008; Galaty 2013). Institutions are ‘regularized patterns of behaviour between individuals and groups in society’ (Marns 1993, 103), as the ‘outcome of many individual actions and choices that occur over a long period of time that ultimately result in the consensus about an institution’ (Lesorogol 2008, 5). Institutional arrangements on natural resource management define the property relations between the resource users and the resource. The legitimising authority to warrant rights, rules and regulations as accepted does not necessarily have to be derived from the state or a
centralised government: when an institution authorizes, sanctions or validates certain rights, the observance of these rights by people constitutes recognition of the authority of that particular institution (Lund 2006; Sikor and Lund 2009). Instead, institutions are often based on the functioning of informal sets of shared beliefs and norms (Lesorogol 2008). Institutions are to be agreed upon by the wider community, and compliance to these rules is necessary. Institutions to govern the commons and regulating access are monitored and sanctioned within and by the community. Although institutions are considered to be rather stable, they are in fact highly dynamic and subject to change as they are the result of differing beliefs and diverging interests and power, mediating between a changing environment and changing society (Leach et al. 1999).

Institution building processes are triggered by struggle over meaning, power, control and access. Struggles over access to natural resources are part of the daily social encounters of cooperation, negotiation and conflict (Turner 2004). Interactions between various interest groups often consist of multiple complex relationships of social and economic exchange, reciprocity and joint advantage. Struggles, as a way of interacting, have led to conflictive and cooperative practices and understanding (Turner 2004; Lund 2006). Such encounters sometimes result in cooperation based on mutually agreed upon rights, rules and regulations. These rights, rules, and regulations of access are conceptualised as institutional arrangements or institutions. Institutions, more generally, are ‘the rules of the game in a society or […] the humanly devised constraints that shape human interaction’ (North 1990, 3). In relation to natural resource use and management, institutions become mediators between people and resources and play a major role in defining how the distribution of resources is organised (Leach et al. 1999). Institutions, therefore, are in use to stabilise processes of gaining, maintaining and controlling access to resources.

Institutions are considered to ‘work’ when certain conditions, or principles, are met. The principles outlined by Ostrom (1990) define a bounded approach to natural resource management, where commitment and understanding are limited to a specific place for both the community and the natural resource (Turner 2011). In addition, she states that a sustainable and successful set of institutional arrangements is dependent on the long term use of such arrangements that are widely agreed upon and accepted. Such an institutional approach assumes that there are clearly defined sets of rules that are appreciated within the homogenous community and in existence for a longer time period, and this will lead to the most efficient way of allocating resources without depletion or degradation (Giordano 2003). However, this approach deploys a rather rigid understanding of social organisation when dealing with human-nature interactions, both in time and space.

This understanding of the management of the commons based on institutions has had a great impact on development policy and intervention (Mehta et al. 2001; Bollig and Lesorogol 2016). Community based resource
management projects that include participatory institution building has been high on the agenda (Dressler et al. 2010). However, these processes were criticised as top-down, open for elite capture and therefore not reaching the goal of actual participation in decision-making (Agrawal and Gibson 1999; Haller and Galvin 2011). Furthermore, a critique of the institutional approach in relation to common pool resources is that there is no attention given to power differences related to the design of the institutions. This implies that there exists a general agreement on the design and content of institutions without resistance, where agreement is easily reached (Haller et al. 2015; Cleaver and De Koning 2015; Bennett et al. 2018). However, there exist a wide range of levels of power, interests and needs within each community, and these interests are change over time. In addition, regarding the mobility and change of both resource availability and resource users, a rigid institutional perspective concerning the production, management and use of natural resources is not suitable.

In order to overcome the more rigid principles of the institutional approach for studying spatial and temporal variety in relation to access institutions, it is useful to apply an understanding of institutions that encompasses these elements of variation. This is especially necessary for the drylands in central-northern Kenya where resources are spatially distributed and unpredictable, and where land tenure systems are a patchwork. As previously mentioned, pastoral mobility enables access to resources. Access to resources is created through negotiations and is often agreed upon by following certain customary rules and regulations, i.e. institutions. Rules and regulations existing among people from different communities combine to form social territories. ‘Access and control of resources, then, is managed through the formation of social boundaries, to which members of a specific (sub-)group or entire community belong’ (Pas 2018, 3 see also Casimir, 1992). Being part of that community does not imply that one has the right to exclude others; however, it gives one the right to make decisions on resource conservation, regulation, and allocation – in other words, the authority to manage the institutions and govern natural resources (Niamir-Fuller and Turner 1999; Marin and Bjørklund 2015). Such a flexible system with open boundaries is often confused with ‘open access’, referring to a system without rules (Hardin 1968). However, following Moritz (2016), ‘open access’ in relation to pastoralist use of space and resources, is better understood by viewing it as an ‘open property regime’: ‘[O]pen access is not the absence of rules; open access is the rule’ (ibid., 704). Here, pastoralists are able to move around, and access is facilitated by the understanding of open access ‘with complex rules and codes of conduct based on a deeply seated sense of obligatory sharing of natural resources’ (ibid., 670; see also Behnke 2018). These ‘open’ institutions, then, are best adapted to the complexity of shifting resources over time and space. I see this way of controlling access through ‘open’ institutions as a technology of government. This institution of ‘open access’ is, however, often limited to
the people of the same social group e.g. the Samburu among each other. The Samburu are less likely to provide open access and reciprocity to people from the pastoral Turkana and Borana communities. In addition, the open access understanding is also not shared with non-pastoralists communities who have a more spatially fixed property system with clear and fenced boundaries.

In similar ways, I understand institutions regulating access to resources as ‘open’, where resource relations are not based on clear and demarcated spatial exclusions. In Article I, I engage with this understanding of institutions in order to analyse how access is gained, maintained and controlled among Samburu pastoralists and how this has shifted over time. In doing so, I identify transformations and reconfigurations between people, and the resources. In Article II we further analyse these shifts in relation to the establishment of community conservancies. In Article III, I understand institutions as a technology of government to control access to private properties. Article IV discusses a case where an institution of control became enrolled in a long-standing conflict. In the next section, I elaborate how this interpretation of institutions and access control, as technologies of government, supports a more critical understanding of interventions aimed at ordering and controlling people and space in pastoral areas.

Ordering and controlling pastoral spaces

The role of space in the production of governable subjects can be observed in colonial contexts through categorisations of people (Cavanagh 2016) and binding them to particular ‘productive’ or ‘unproductive’ spaces. The government of people, their bodies and their movements is not a new phenomenon for pastoralists. Territorial control of pastoral areas in colonial contexts transformed not only territories to subjects, but people and animals as well, as a means to control their mobility within this territory. Linking beliefs on modernity, animal disease, overpopulation and overstocking, pastoralists and their livestock were subjected to a range of governmental projects (Morton 2010).

Pastoralist areas, rendered empty or unproductive, have been subjected to a number of frontier processes, subjecting people and resources (Peluso and Lund 2011; Korf et al. 2015; Mosley and Watson 2016; Regassa et al. 2018; Rasmussen and Lund 2018). Pastoralists are still deemed backward, poor, destructive to the environment and in need of development and modernisation. Producing such ‘truths’ is used to justify interventions and ‘to create subjectivities of conservation and sustainable livelihoods’ (Bluwstein 2017, 102). Following this line of thought, it is argued that pastoral lands can be made more productive and improved by restructuring pastoralists’ behaviour in relation to the use of resources and space (Kolås 2014; Marin and Bjørklund 2015; Zhang 2015; Johnsen and Benjaminsen
Community conservancies are the ‘recent’ trends profoundly changing pastoralist spaces in Eastern and Southern Africa (Greiner 2012; Little 2013; Gargallo 2015; Nthiga et al. 2015; Koot and Van Beek 2017; Bersaglio and Cleaver 2018; Fox 2018), together with an increase in ‘reasserting the commons’ where former common land is being restored for common access (BurnSilver and Mwangi 2007; Lesorogol 2014; Butt 2014; Archambault 2016; Bollig 2016; Galaty 2016b), Bollig and Lesorogol (2016) termed these developments – which strongly alter the use of, access to and control over resources – the ‘new pastoral commons’, describing the transformations and reconfigurations of resource access taking place in Eastern and Southern Africa.

The new pastoral commons provides a productive conceptual context and entry point to study shifting rules of access and control to common resources, as I describe in the following. I then propose to understand these new pastoral commons – including shifting rules of access because of local practices, governmental interventions and other (external) involvements – in relation to governmentality.

The new pastoral commons

As mentioned above, Bollig and Lesorogol (2016) provide a useful way of looking at issues concerning governance of the commons. Framed as ‘the new pastoral commons’, this approach enables the contextual understanding of a wide range of changing institutional arrangements between a wide variety of actors. The new commons, then, is to be understood as both the transformation of already existing commons into new forms of commonage (e.g. through community conservancies) as well as the introduction of communal sharing of resources that were previously not subjected to common sharing or that have been part of the commons before but were not anymore (Galaty 2016b).

As the authors state, two major processes in particular have led to this renewed understanding of the commons – similar to the two processes which form the main focus of this thesis. First, this includes the increased number of cases in which pastoralists have come to temporarily access or settle on land with unclear ownership status or access (permitted or unpermitted) private land (Galaty 2016b). Second, this concerns the rise in governmental, non-governmental and private interests to interfere in the governance pastoral commons, especially water, forests and rangelands (Lamers et al. 2014; German et al. 2016). These interventions play a strong role in the reshaping of the pastoral commons. Community conservancies are, for example, formed around concerns of rangelands, wildlife and biodiversity degradation. Natural resources management regulations within community conservancies are reorganised based on a design of participation, environmentalisation and private investments, and often follow the design principles of Ostrom’s (1990; 2002) commons (Adams et al. 2004; Green
Furthermore, in general, community conservation increasingly follows the logic that nature needs to be valorised. Conservancies are thus also based on the commodification of natural resources aimed at improving nature and livelihoods through new and more efficient ways of governance (Igoe and Brockington 2007; Fletcher 2010; Dressler and Roth 2011; Büscher et al. 2012). More specifically, the new pastoral commons are characterised by the emergent character of institutions shaped by ‘continuous negotiations between state agents and local actors and among local actors fostering new ideas of sharing’ (Bollig and Lesorogol 2016, 667). These new institutions can accordingly come from bottom-up ideas on how to share and/or govern access to resources but also from the State, NGOs or private organisations and trusts.

In the case of Samburu pastoralists, both such centrally planned as well as bottom-up processes of the formation and enactment of the new pastoral commons is occurring in different though related ways. Bottom-up processes of re-asserting the commons might involve processes of claim making, which can result in struggle and conflict (Galaty 2016b). As Galaty (2016b) describes, negotiation between private landowners and conservationists, small-scale farmers and pastoralists is needed to re-negotiate access claims and control of land. These negotiations have led to a transition in which private land is controlled. The continuous process of access, control and claims conveys a notion of the formation of new pastoral commons, including its tensions and dynamics. Moreover, the Samburu pastoralists’ landscape is undergoing large-scale transformations as community conservancies are widely implemented based on top down planned establishments. Just as in other areas of eastern and southern Africa, the commons are heavily reorganised based on a design strongly founded on global ideas: ‘global developmental concerns about participation, ownership and accountability, blueprint formulas were packaged at a global level and then translated into national legislation and finally communicated to and adjusted by local actors’ (Bollig and Lesorogol 2016, 676). These blueprints, then, formulate the ways in which local resource users are supposed to go about the governance of these resources. This creates transformations and brings in new rules of access, often based on both communal sharing and communal obligations (Bollig and Lesorogol 2016; Pas 2018). States, NGOs and private trusts, in this case, are engineering transitions of resource governance in pastoral spaces based on global ideas of management, complying to the demands of conservation, participation and development, which include attempts to replace open property regimes with common property regimes that limit mobility and flexibility (Moritz 2016).

Such engineering transitions, besides the possibility it will never go as planned, have multiple – desired and undesired – effects on the people actually living in these spaces (Greiner 2012; Gargallo 2015; Bluwstein and Lund 2018). People’s shifting engagement with the land and resources due to local practices, governmental interventions or other (external)
involvements are part of processes reorganising people and space, which leads to changing territorial relations (Peluso and Lund 2011; Li 2014; Korf et al. 2015; Regassa et al. 2018). I interpret the new pastoral commons as a conceptual context in which transformations and reconfigurations of access and institutions take place. Clearly, institutions in their role of controlling access are a technology of government where power is at work. Hence, processes of engineering people’s behaviour in relation to their mobility and access to and control over resources shaping the ways in which pastoralists use and manage resources can also be interpreted as processes in which governmentality is contained. This interpretation of the new pastoral commons can serve as an analytical – rather than descriptive – purpose to analyse the working of power through different technologies of government that are reorganising relations between pastoralists, the land and resources, leading to changing territorial relations. Therefore, in the next section, I will turn to the analytical terrain of governmentality.

Governmental interventions and governmentality

Controlling ‘unruly subjects’ by controlling people’s movement and access to places and claiming and controlling those spaces through the discursive construction of distinctions and categorisations is, following Foucault, a form of ‘government’ (Lemke 2001; Morton 2010; Regassa et al. 2018). The governmentality approach as used in this thesis follows Dean’s (2010, 18) take on government:

Government is any more or less calculated or rational activity, undertaken by a multiplicity of authorities and agencies, employing a variety of techniques and forms of knowledge, that seeks to shape conduct by working through the desires, aspirations, interests and beliefs of various actors, for definite but shifting ends and with a diverse set of relatively unpredictable consequences, effects and outcomes.

Government, as referring to ‘the government of self and others’, or, the management, control, direction and guidance of groups of people and oneself, is seen as a way of using power to create productive and regulated individuals through the working of power (Lemke 2002; Foucault 2007; Dean 2010). Processes of government as ‘the conduct of conduct’ are not found in state institutions alone, as government cuts across scales of state, civil society, family and personal life (Ferguson and Gupta 2002; Rose et al. 2006; Dean 2010). Here, power takes a very subtle form that works from a distance by a myriad of actors, as power is everywhere and ‘the sites of governing are multiple’ (Zhang 2015, 70).

Seeing governmentality as a form of power, it constantly shapes our desires and practices without our being aware of it, as we follow our self-interest (Li 2007). Governmentality is thus the mobilisation of agency
through a specific regime of practice, or assemblage, of domains of power, rationalities, technologies and subjects. A process of governmentality includes a mix of internal and external incentives or goals to improve the lives of self and others. These incentives become internalised in social groups and individuals, i.e. the subjects, towards a form of self-governance: a form of responsibilisation of subjects in relation to their own well-being. (Rabinow and Rose 2006; Fletcher 2010; Fletcher 2017). While through its working it aims to regulate ‘people and things’, processes of governmentality do not remove agency from its subjects: ‘To govern means to act on the actions of subjects who retain the capacity to act otherwise’ (Li 2007, 17). The workings of such subtle power, however, can only be studied from its effects by making explicit how certain ideas, policies, or truths ‘are influencing our thinking, our bodies and actions by defining what we think is possible and impossible’ (Dean 2010, 56). It provides a frame to analyse the various domains of power, how they came into being, the diagnoses and prescriptions that are formulated for governing adjustment, the role of other actors, subject formation, and the boundaries and exclusions that are created throughout this process (Elden 2007; Li 2007; Dean 2010; Fletcher 2017).

A governmentality approach enables the disclosure of the current struggle for access to resources, as well as related conflicts and transformations. I interpret the interventions in Samburu in the form of conservation programmes and regulations to access private land, or, the processes involving the formation of the new commons, as governmental projects. These projects rely on a certain knowledge about how to efficiently organise the use of common pool resources through reorganising the conduct of the pastoralist subject. Such governmental interventions, as Li (2007, 5) argues:

are benevolent, even utopian. They desire to make the world better than it is. Their methods are subtle. If they resort to violence, it is in the name of a higher good (…) They structure a field of possible actions. They modify processes. They entice and induce. They make certain courses of action easier or more difficult. (…) They blend seamlessly into common sense. (…) Whatever the response, the claim to expertise in optimizing the lives of others is a claim to power, one that merits careful scrutiny.

This demonstrates the numerous angles a governmental intervention entails: the processes of power, authority, actors, actions, motivations, and effects where expertise forms the political rationality to justify intervention (Goldman 2001; Baka 2013). Intervention, then, occurs through technologies of government; these are the programs, or projects, made to guide subjects to conduct their behaviour in a certain way. They contain measures and ways of rendering solutions probable by normalising and standardising both the problem and the solution (Li 2016).

The ordering of subjects takes a central role in the relation between governmentality and the governance of resources (Cavanagh 2018a).
Furthermore, in the formation of governable people and environments in the name of conservation, space plays a powerful role (Agrawal 2005; Fletcher 2010). As Huxley (2008) stated: ‘governmentality incorporates spatial elements that are integral to both rationalities and practices aspiring to form, control or guide the actions of others and the self’ as ‘the focus of disciplinary institutions is on categorising, canalising and normalising bodies in space and time’ (Huxley 2008, 1644). As such, space and the organisation of subjects in relation to space work to produce ‘Same’ and ‘Other’, through inclusions and exclusions, categorisations and hierarchies (Said 1978; Huxley 2008). Hence, spatial techniques are used as part of projects aspiring certain conduct of its subjects, where space, or land, or territory, is employed as technology for the government of a population (Elden 2007; Elden 2010). As Elden (2010, 810) states, ‘Territory can be understood as a political technology: it comprises techniques for measuring land and controlling terrain’. It is the normalised process of making land and territory calculable through mapping, ordering, measuring and demarcation, in order to make its people administrable, governable and controllable (Elden 2010).

Hence, processes of territoriality, appropriation and resource control can be seen as processes of ‘government’ where people’s behaviour, their movements, their access to land and resources are regulated (Bluwstein and Lund 2018). However, as mentioned earlier, the mobilisation of people through rationalities of government does not remove the capacity to act from its subjects: governmental interventions can be contested, resisted, rejected and adapted (Scott 1985; Li 2007; Huxley 2008; Upton 2009; Benjaminsen et al. 2013; Cavanagh and Benjaminsen 2015). Furthermore, as Li (2007, 18) also points out, ‘beneficial outcomes cannot be guaranteed (…) [G]overnmental interventions can never achieve all they seek’. Instead, Li (2007) argues, governmental interventions often produce effects that are contrary to what was initially aimed for. In addition to contestation and resistance, the transformation of the behaviour of subjects might entail that people choose to co-opt as a means to achieve their own goals (Marin and Bjørklund 2015; Korf et al. 2015; Johnsen and Benjaminsen 2017). Furthermore, since governmental projects, as technologies of rule, often have differentiated effects on different people, this might lead to local struggle and contestation. In other words, the limits of control in relation to multiple dynamics and complexities, which leads to contestation and resistance as well as the agency of people to act strategically according to their own interest, are intrinsically part of processes of governmentality (Rutherford 2007).

Concluding remarks

In this thesis, I will apply the analytic of governmentality to frame my view on the interventions that are designed to steer the behaviour of mobile people
in northern Kenya. As such, I approach the new pastoral commons as sites where interventions of spatial arrangements are articulated through the use and control of resources to create governable spaces (Huxley 2008; Fischer-Tahir and Wagenhofer 2017; Cavanagh 2018a). Both the massive reorganisation of space that is ongoing all over Samburu and beyond through community conservancies, as well as the subtle ways in which private land in Laikipia is controlled, display the workings of power to produce spatially specific behaviour ‘even as they provoke counterconducts and counterspaces’ (Huxley 2008, 1647). Therefore, the governmentality approach supports the disclosure of the technologies of government used to steer the behaviour of people in relation to the use, access and control of resources, but also the spatial exclusion dynamics that are created throughout these processes as well as the processes of resistance to these subject positions.

This thesis will, by analysing shifting rules and institutions of access to resources, contribute with insights into how interventions to govern and control people and spaces are (re)shaping and (re)configuring these rules and institutions. I argue that the new pastoral commons are entangled with processes of rule and control. By analysing shifting rules of access to resources (Article I and II), this thesis further discusses the use of technologies of rule to spatially control people. However, by ‘correcting’ existing rules and regulations in relation to the management of resources, mobility is significantly altered – partly also because of the strategic actions of the subjects (Article II). Focusing on the processes of access and control of resources not only displays multiple technologies of government through institutions, it also illustrates how these processes can be resisted (Article III and IV).
Geographical and Historical Context

In this section, I start introducing the research area, also known as the Ewaso region, as connected by the Ewaso Nyiro River and its tributaries. I then introduce the research area as divided in the three counties of Samburu, Isiolo and Laikipia, followed by an in-depth socio-economic and cultural background to Samburu pastoralists. I then review major historical processes, or interventions, concerning attempts to order and control Samburu people and space. This section provides an important background to the articles, which themselves present more thorough analyses of historical and current patterns of territoriality.

Regional diversity

The research took place at the intersection of three counties: Laikipia (highlands), Isiolo and Samburu (both semi-highlands to lowlands), as part of the area which came to be known as the greater Ewaso Nyiro River Basin. The area is connected by the Ewaso Nyiro (north) River flowing from south to north (Figure 2). The river fluctuates seasonally and depends mostly on the rainfall on the Laikipia Plateau that constitutes the upper catchment. In Laikipia, the two main tributaries of the river, the Ngare Narok and the Ngare Nyiro who primarily receive water from the Aberdares and Mt Kenya, join to form the Ewaso Nyiro. This permanent river – although lately showing signs of seasonality in lower parts of the catchment – is of major importance, providing drinking water for people as well as water and minerals for crops and livestock throughout the year (Ericksen et al. 2012; Kimiti et al. 2017).

The larger part of the area is classified as arid to semiarid and has a trimodal rainfall pattern (Fumagalli 1977). This means that rainfall in the Ewaso region is concentrated in three peaks of rain per year followed by several months of dry weather. The two strongest peaks in rainfall on the highlands – the Laikipia and Leroghi Plateau – are the long rains named *lng’erng’erwa* in Samburu, between April and May, and the short rains in July and August named *lorikine*. The lowlands also receive *lng’erng’erwa*, between April and May, but instead of *lorikine*, they expect the short rains to

---

4 As opposed to the southern Ewaso Nyiro River which is located in the southern Rift Valley Province (Kenya) flowing from north to south into Tanzania (Schuette et al. 2013).
fall between October and December, called *ltumurin*. There are major
differences regarding the amount of rainfall, mainly differing between the
lowlands (600 mm and 200 mm) and the highlands (1200 mm) due to
specific micro-climates that characterise the highlands and the lowlands.
Although perceived as a pattern, the rains were erratic and are unpredictable
especially over the last thirty years, including consecutive prolonged
perceived reduction of both rainfall, denoting the shortened or even absence of some of the aforementioned rains and declining precipitation levels, and declining vegetation cover (Boruru et al. 2011; Kimiti et al. 2017).

Samburu

The Ewaso Nyiro comprises the main southern boundary of Samburu
County, with Laikipia County finalising the boundary to the south-east.
Marsabit is to the north-east, Turkana to the north-west, Baringo to the west,
and Isiolo to the east. Samburu County can be roughly divided into *Ldonyo*,
(the highlands) with a general altitude of 1500 m, including the Lorroki
Plateau, and *Lpurkel* (the lowland plains) with an altitude ranging between
1140 m and 1500 m. Maralal is the administrative capital of Samburu and is
located at the Lorroki Plateau.

Samburu County, covering approximately 21,000 km\(^2\), is largely covered
by the semi-arid to arid *Lpurkel*, characterised by vast tracts of savannah and
acacia scrubs. The Seiya and the Milgis are two important seasonal rivers.
The climate is hot and dry, and rainfall is highly variable ranging between
250 mm and 700 mm. Population density is low and people practice
pastoralism based on mobility. A large number of wildlife is supported by
the landscape as well, roaming freely or in the demarcated areas for
conservation. Most land in the Samburu lowlands is communally held in the
form of group ranches.\(^6\) There are, however, cases of elite uptake where
certain informed individuals managed to register private land for private
benefit;\(^7\) a number of these cases have been taken to court.\(^8\)

In *Ldonyo*, the Samburu highlands is cooler and wetter, with rainfall
ranging between 750 mm and 1250 mm (Fumagalli 1977; Karanja Ng’ang’a
et al. 2016). *Ldonyo* is characterised by open grasslands and forest areas.
Population density is higher and people are mostly sedentary, while

\(^5\) FGD Sesia, 12-13 October 2017.

\(^6\) 17 of the total 48 group ranches in Samburu have neither been approved nor received
final adjudication by either the County Government or the District Government (pers.comm.
Land Office Maralal, 2015).

\(^7\) pers.comm. location chief, 2015 (see also Letai and Lind 2013; Odote 2013).

\(^8\) Standard Digital, ‘Samburu herders seek orders on disputed land’, Weru 10 May 2016
https://www.standardmedia.co.ke/article/2000201220/samburu-herders-seek-orders-on-
disputed-land
movement with livestock continues. There are registered private lands used for the cultivation of agricultural products (Lesorogol 2008).

Over the last twenty-five years, at least five community conservancies have been formed in Samburu, with the support of the Northern Rangelands Trust (NRT). Besides the NRT conservancies as the map in Figure 2 indicates, the Samburu county government also initiated community conservancies. Currently, approximately 95% of Samburu County is ‘covered’ by community conservancies.9

---

9 pers.comm. county officer, 2015
Isiolo

The Isiolo District is located to the south-east of Samburu. Isiolo County covers 25,698 km$^2$ at an altitude of 200 m to 1200 m. Isiolo borders Marsabit to the north-west, Wajir and Garissa to the east, and Laikipia, Meru and Tana River to the south. Isiolo County is trust land, awaiting transformation to become community land (Cavanagh 2018b). Administratively, Isiolo is divided in six divisions and two constituencies. Of importance here is the Oldonyiro division, the corridor of land which constitutes the borderland between Samburu and Laikipia. Oldonyiro is characterised by bush and grassland, where mainly Samburu pastoralists, but also Somali, Borana and Turkana reside, and making a living mainly out of semi-nomadic pastoralism (Boye and Kaarhus 2011). The Oldonyiro division (as part of wider Isiolo County) knows a complex history (Boye and Kaarhus 2011; Whittaker 2012). Currently, ‘peoples vested interests in the land are not clearly regulated by legitimate institutions’ (Boye and Kaarhus 2011, 102), where people claim land as part of an ethnic identity sometimes leading to conflict.

Oldonyiro division includes Kipsing location to the east, and Oldonyiro location as the westernmost part of Oldonyiro division. Within Kipsing, 124,000 ha of land is government land which was – since independence – managed by the Ministry of Agriculture as a Livestock Marketing Division (LMD). The area was a holding ground designated to serve as a quarantine area during colonial administration. The Somali, Borana, Turkana and Samburu moved back onto this LMD land when it was abandoned by the Ministry (see Boye and Kaarhus 2011 and Whittaker 2012 for further in-depth information regarding the complex history behind the different claims and claimants existing on LMD land). Initially, I selected Kipsing as one of the study sites to conduct interviews during fieldwork. However, due to

---

10 Trust land: the County Council is the manager of the land on behalf of communities actually using the land. Most commonly, trust lands are used by pastoral, transhumant farmers or hunting-foraging communities who manage it as communal land (Ogolla and Mugabe 1996; Musembi and Kameri-Mbote 2013). At the time of writing, the Community Land Act 2016 – which is supposed to elevate collective forms of land ownership such as group ranches and trust land to the legal status of community land – is not yet effective in Samburu, Isiolo and Laikipia (see also Odote 2013; Alden Wily 2018; Cavanagh 2018b for further discussions on the process behind the enactment of the Community Land Act 2016).

11 While the Community Land Act 2016 is supposed to legally entitle trust land as community land, the various development prospects brought about in Isiolo Town and surroundings have spurred individuals to claim land for private purposes (pers.comm. Isiolo, 2015).

12 Belonging to the Department of Livestock Development, and currently under the jurisdiction of the National Government (all holding grounds in the country are thus); 124,000 ha were first gazetted in 1943, with the single most important reason to control livestock diseases coming from the north of Kenya towards Laikipia and further south. The area was supposed to ‘hold’ livestock on transit from the ‘production’ north to the ‘consumption’ south. Currently the area is used and managed by pastoralists (Boye and Kaarhus 2011).
violent conflict between Turkana and Samburu in 2015 in Kipsing and Ngare Mara, I shifted my focus to the Oldonyiro location (the westernmost part of Oldonyiro division). Oldonyiro location, separated to the west and north by the Ewaso Nyiro, borders group ranches and community conservancies both in Laikipia and Samburu, as well as private land Laikipia (Figure 2). Here reside mainly Samburu pastoralists.

Laikipia

Laikipia County, encompassing a highland plateau of low hills, is situated between the slopes of Mount Kenya to the east and the slopes of the Aberdares to the southwest, the Rift Valley escarpment bordering Baringo County to the west, and the arid plains of lowland Samburu and Isiolo County to the north. The county encompasses a highland plateau of low hills, with an altitude ranging from 1,500 m to over 2,600 m. Average annual rainfall differs greatly due to specific microclimates that characterize highland and lowland environments: 500-700 mm in the higher southern and western parts and 300-500 mm in the lower central and northern parts (Lane 2005). Laikipia County, as a highland plateau, generally receives higher rainfall than Samburu and Isiolo and experiences cooler temperatures (Georgiadis et al. 2007). Vegetation production in Laikipia is therefore higher too (Kimiti et al. 2017). Laikipia generally experiences two annual rainy seasons. However, over the last four decades rainfall variability in increasing and vegetation cover decreasing (Kimiti et al. 2017; Yurco 2017).

Laikipia is marked by a mosaic of complex tenure systems, created by the high variety of privately owned commercial ranches, private conservancies and smallholders, community managed group ranches, so-called ‘abandoned lands’ as well as government forests and national parks (Williams 2013; Evans and Adams 2016). An influx of pastoralists to Laikipia from other parts within the Ewaso region is increasingly considered a challenge by Laikipian residents, conservationists and the (local) government (Lengoiboni et al. 2011; Letai and Lind 2013; Galaty 2016b). In the section ‘A history of ordering and controlling space’, I will explain in further detail the histories and complexities regarding land use and land tenure in Laikipia in relation to Samburu and Isiolo (see also Article II, III and IV).

Samburu pastoralism

Social organisation, subsistence and change

Samburu pastoralists, a section of the Maa-speaking people, are considered one of the exemplary nomadic pastoralists of the African savannah. Particularly the images of the young men in red and black traditional robes
became widely known internationally, presuming a historical continuity of a stereotypical fixed identity (Meiu 2017). However, social alliances, economic exchanges as well as flexible ecological strategies have come to characterise Samburu history as economically and ethnically fluid (Spencer 1973; Fratkin 2004). During the course of time, the Samburu, or Samburu pastoralists, have been identified as an ethnic group in various ways. During early British occupation, the Samburu were referred to as ‘Loiborkineji, or ‘people of the white goats’, which was found in texts of European travellers as ‘Burkeneji’. Later, the term ‘Samburr’ was used, probably from the Maa word ‘sampurr’, which is the leather bag Samburu women would wear. Samburu use ‘Loikop’, or ‘people of the land’, to refer to themselves. While highly fluid and mobile in many ways, the Samburu (among other populations) in northern Kenya also feel they are living in a seemingly bounded community since many refer to the area as not being part of (the rest of) Kenya (Holtzman et al. 2004; Mosley and Watson 2016).

Based on the latest count, the Samburu population was approximately 223,947 in 2009, 12% up from 2006 (Kenya National Bureau of Statistics 2010). The Samburu communities are heterogeneous and diverse. Social distinctions among the Samburu are formed around gender, age, kinship, (sub) clan, location of residence (highlands or lowlands), level of education, and economic position, among other factors (Spencer 1965; Straight 1997; Holtzman 2009; Meiu 2017). Samburu society is organised in a gerontocratic way where elders (older men) make family and community decisions about grazing and politics. Moreover, society is strongly characterised by age-sets and age-grades – the life stages men move through following initiation ceremonies – resulting in power being ascribed according to gender and age (Spencer 1965). The most characteristic age-set is that of the lmurran (young unmarried men). In this stage, the lmurran are often distanced from domestic life and take care of the cattle during migrations and at distant cattle camps. At the end of the period, the lmurran will marry and are considered elders while a new lmurran age-set is initiated. Samburu men will marry women out of their patrilocal clan after which the women will join their husbands’ family. Polygamy is a common practice. Women do not formally follow age-sets, and circumcision occurs just before the wedding. In this current patriarchal society, women play a central role in domestic life (Hodgson 1999; Hodgson 2000; Holtzman 2009). This includes fetching firewood and water often from rather distant places, the preparation and distribution of food to everyone (except the lmurran) and the raising of children. Furthermore, the women take care of the calves and small stock and do the milking of all livestock twice a day.

Samburu society is organised in two moieties: Ngishu Narok (Black Cattle) and Ngishu Naibor (White Cattle), which are further subdivided in eight clans: Lmasula, Nyaparai, Lngwesi, Lpisikishu from the Ngishu Narok
moiety and Lorokushu, Lokumia, Longeli and Loimisi13 from the Ngishu Naibor moiety (Spencer 1965; Spencer 1973). Although these clans are currently dispersed over Samburu County, there is still a strong clan affiliation, and in times of ceremonies, members of the same clan get together in a lorrora (a large kraal constructed for ceremonial occasions such as Imugeri14 and circumcisions) to pursue the rituals related to the life stages of men. During moranhood, strong ties are formed between members of different clans through various ceremonies. In addition, as Samburu practice exogamous patterns of marriage, relations are re-established between different clans making it a tight society where information moves ‘like fire’,15 as I was told once during an interview.

As Figure 1 illustrates, Samburu covers both highlands (ldonyo) and lowlands (lpurkel). These geographical features bring about real economic and social differentiation in Samburu society. I was repeatedly told by Samburu pastoralists in Laikipia – who had been living in Laikipia for more than ten years and who had come from the Samburu highlands – that the Samburu from Lpurkel are backwards, do not go to school, and all they care about is cattle. As one informant told me when I asked what Lpurkel meant to him: “Lpurkel means something primitive”. I asked whether Samburu from Laikipia are Lpurkel, and he continued: “No, they're not, but maybe previously some of them were. Because when they came here, let's just say that their lifestyle it was, it has changed. You can find people wearing socks and boots like this. But if you go down there, you can find people with only one cloth”.16 As Holtzman (2004, 2009) has pointed out, even among Samburu the lowlands are considered less developed while the highlands are proudly more ‘progressed’. He continues to describe that this is partly due to the historical legacy of how development was structured. Catholic missions and the presence of the district headquarters located on the highlands have brought such disparity. In short, the highlands were considered to have a more favourable climate and a greater economic potential for agricultural production both during colonial and postcolonial days. Furthermore, Holtzman describes how there exist a strong perception of difference in the lowlands between the schooled and educated and uneducated Samburu – something which is less polarised on the highlands as their children were more frequently sent to school (Holtzman et al. 2004; see also Straight 1997). Another major difference between the highlands and the lowlands appeared in the 1970s when herding was increasingly diversified, as people became mostly sedentary to cultivate rain-fed maize and beans on increasingly privatised land (Lesorogol 2008). What I take from this is that

13 During the period of fieldwork in Samburu, I mostly interacted with the Loimisi clan and hence my positionality is partly related to these interactions.
14 One of several important ceremonies involving the promotion of warriors through grades of warriorhood (lexicon Samburu – English, Stephen Wagner, Maralal 1997).
16 Ibid.
Lpurkel is more than just a term for the lowland area; it also refers to people and their way of living, which is generally seen as backward. Besides pastoralism as the main economic activity, petty trade, livestock marketing, and tourism are of major importance to Samburu livelihoods. In the highlands, livestock rearing is complemented with agricultural food production of corn, beans, potatoes and vegetables. This has, however, also meant the privatisation of common land (Lesorogol 2008). Nevertheless, the adoption of cultivation has not changed the Samburu referring to themselves as pastoralists (Spear 1993; McCabe et al. 2010). Furthermore, the livelihood shift toward increased agriculture might have brought about significant changes to gender roles and performances (Fratkin and Smith 1995; Nduma et al. 2001; Wangu 2008; Wangu 2014; Caretta and Börjeson 2015; Archambault 2016). Further study is needed to better understand its implications on gender roles in Samburu society.

In the vast and dry lowlands, due to low precipitation, small-scale farming is almost impossible. Instead, a shift towards drought-resistant livestock such as camels and a larger number of goats has occurred (Sperling 1987a; see also Watson et al. 2016). While being in the field, I observed people rearing chicken for the production of eggs. I was told that even though most Samburu would not consume eggs nor chicken meat, the eggs were to be sold at local markets for those who do consume. Moreover, as accessing pastures is becoming more difficult within and beyond Samburu County, Samburu are increasingly seeking employment outside pastoralism and outside Samburu County. Samburu living outside of these counties are often engaged in livelihood activities other than pastoralism, while sending remittances back home (Little et al. 2001; Meiu 2015; Karanja Ng’ang’a et al. 2016). Additionally, the diet, previously solely based on animal products of milk, meat and blood, changed over the last seventy years towards a greater reliance on agricultural foods such as corn flour and beans either home-produced, bought in shops or provided in the form of food aid (Sperling 1987b; Holtzman 2007; Holtzman 2009; Iannotti and Lesorogol 2014). However, although economic strategies are flexible and diverse, livestock still plays a central role in Samburu economic and social life.

Mobility, conflict and development

In spite of many governmental interventions and policies intended to sedentarise Samburu pastoralists within Samburu County, Samburu still

---

18 During fieldwork, I encountered one small plot where the local chief was cultivating corn for the first time. After two weeks, however, the growing plants had been eaten by goats and the owner of the plants did not harvest any corn.
move throughout the diverse landscape herding largely cattle, goats, sheep, camels, and donkeys for their subsistence needs. Each of these animals have different water and forage requirements. Cattle, for example, only graze on herbaceous vegetation and preferably drink water every day; camels browse woody or leafy vegetation and can be without water for three weeks in the dry season; goats both graze and browse and need water every other day; sheep, like cattle, graze on herbaceous vegetation but need water, like goats, every other day (Spencer 1973; Fumagalli 1977; Holtzman 2009). Movements, therefore, depend on the season and the species as well as the animal’s age and whether it is lactating.

The Samburu landscape is not divided into wet-season grazing areas and dry-season grazing areas. The grazing patterns are constantly changing and there is rarely enough rainfall and vegetation at one place in the lowlands. Hence, assuring pasture and water for livestock requires complex and precise planning. There is daily short-range movement, seasonal mid-range movement, and long-range movement in times of droughts (Pas 2018). Previously entire households would move along with the livestock to access pastures when regular movements were made on a weekly or monthly basis in near proximity (Spencer 1965; Spencer 1973). In times of prolonged droughts, longer distances were made through established reciprocal relations and cooperation with other Samburu pastoralists both within the lowlands as well as between Samburu from the lowlands and the highlands. People I spoke with told me of their memories of sharing milk with Samburu from the highlands who all came to the lowlands when there was abundance. Nowadays, it is most common that only the livestock move regularly, not the entire household. It is mostly the lmurran who take the cattle herds long distances to laleta (remote cattle camps), while goats, sheep, camels and donkeys stay home with women, elders and children who attend school. Due to several consecutive droughts, I observed households who had to move

---

19 Cattle are mainly kept for milk and ceremonial slaughtering for meat and tapping blood while on the move; camels for milk, goats for milk and meat, and sheep for meat and fat. Donkeys are used as pack animals either for household migrations or to fetch water.

20 During the dry season or a drought, alterations between accessing water and accessing pastures are made on a daily basis. The term used to refer to grazing where no water can be found is aroni; when heading for water from aroni, the word matishe is used. Hence, matishe and aroni are the alternating processes of going either for water without grazing, or for grazing without water. When the distance between the water point and the grazing point is large, the Samburu refer to legetim or lee (desert; the latter only when the distance is very large).

21 Nkai, the Samburu divinity, is central in Samburu religion and daily life revolves around Nkai. I was told by research participants that Nkai was the cause of droughts, disappearing vegetation, and conflict among people. When Nkai is not happy, s/he will not send rain and therefore prayers to Nkai are made in times of drought. The word nkai also means rain. Generally, Nkai is present in all the Samburu natural world (Grillo 2012, see for further discussion and background on Samburu religion also Straight 2007 and Spencer 2011). Additionally, according to the Samburu three-stage cycle (Lniankik, Siria, Lmaina), we are
small-stock to remote goat camps in order to access forage as well. Although this was basically practiced by women and elders, I was told by several *lmurran* that they preferred to bring the small-stock to remote places instead of cattle as they wanted to be good small-stock herders and in addition, these would bring less problems for them than cattle (Pas 2018).

Samburu living in the lowlands still move with cattle herds over a wide area – within and beyond Samburu County – to profit from the topographically complex, but valuable, variation in climatic conditions and vegetation growth.22 Samburu move cattle herds to hills, mountain ranges and the highlands with higher rainfall, offering forage for livestock if necessitated during the dry season or times of drought. However, consecutive droughts, landscape fragmentation and conflict with other pastoralist groups, ranchers and farmers, has made access to pastures increasingly difficult (Greiner 2012; Lesorogol 2014; Pas 2018). Especially at the sweet spots such as Kom and Baragoi – areas not often accessed because of disease or violent conflict that often contain high quality forage – violent encounters with neighbouring pastoralist groups occur (McCabe 2004; Bollig et al. 2014; Straight et al. 2016; Pas 2018). As of today, Samburu have hostile relations with almost all of their neighbours. For this reason, as I was told, people go armed to most regions when bringing cattle to remote places. Normally they would not go armed to Laikipia, which is considered safe.23

For Samburu, neighbouring pastoralist groups include Rendille to the north, Borana to the south and east, Turkana to the north-west, Pokot to the south-west and Laikipia Maasai24 to the south. Traditionally, Samburu have a close relationship of reciprocal support and social and economic exchange now in *Lniankik*, which means that people are facing numerous challenges of drought, disease, conflict and lack of respect to one another (pers.comm. Lodungokwe, 2015).

---

22 In some cases, trucks are used to bring cattle to pastures. Also, hay stacks are sold, bought or distributed by the government in times of drought and lack of pasture.

23 During fieldwork I was repeatedly told that Laikipia is considered a good place for the *lmurran* to go: there is food and safety, hence the *lmurran* will come home healthy. For the cattle, however, Laikipia is not considered a good place – even though pastures are abundant – as the climate in Laikipia is generally colder and wetter. Kom and Baragoi, on the other hand, are considered good places for cattle due to favourable climate conditions, however unsafe and unhealthy for *lmurran* due to conflict and lack of food and drinking water.

24 Maa-speakers who live in the Mukogodo division of Laikipia county are hereafter referred to as ‘Laikipia Maasai’. Maa-speakers of the Mukogodo division have all at some point in history been connected to hunting and gathering. People connected to hunting and gathering came to be identified by external observers as ‘dorobo’ corrupted from Maa *il-torobo*, and defined as an ethnic group of hunter-gatherers by colonial writings (Cavanagh 2016). The term *dorobo* became an umbrella term generally understood to have negative connotations. (For more details about the history and definitions of the term *dorobo* see Spencer, 1965; for more details about the earlier history and colonial construction of the Mukogodo division and its people, see Herren 1987; Cronk 2004; Cavanagh 2016).
with Rendille and Ariaal\textsuperscript{25} and form a solid alliance against other pastoralist groups (Spencer 1973; Fratkin 2004; Galaty 2016a). Samburu have a particularly long-standing tense and hostile relationship with the Turkana (Mkutu 2001; McCabe 2004; Galaty 2016a), while cattle-raids and violent encounters with Pokot over the past thirty years has increased and formed a serious problem (Straight 2009; Greiner 2013; Holtzman 2016). Furthermore, Boye and Kaarhus (2011) describe the complex history and relationship between different groups of Waso Borana, Somali, Samburu, Turkana and Meru in the Oldonyiro division of Isiolo County.

Conflict can occur through cattle raiding in which cattle are stolen and people are hurt or killed; also, violence directed at people occurs through murder, ‘ethnic cleansing’, illegal markets, road banditry or petty theft – although mostly all forms of violence in northern Kenya are considered to be a form of cattle rustling or cattle raiding (Greiner 2013). The aspect of categorising violent conflict as cattle raiding relates to the belief that violence among pastoralist groups in northern Kenya is part of ‘tradition’ inherent to pastoralists societies, stimulated by young girls who want the \textit{lmurran} to be brave and strong (Straight 2009; Greiner 2013; Galaty 2016a). This cultural relation to conflict and violence, as Straight puts it, is not untrue but is only one part of the multiple and entangled layers of causes (Straight 2009). These include the amelioration of weapons in the area, and the failure to provide security by the government (Mkutu 2008), in addition to the role of politics and devolution processes (Straight 2009; Greiner 2013; Galaty 2016a) and increasing difficulty in accessing pastures due to privatisation, conservation and recurrent droughts. Hence, conflicts relate to other changes within pastoralists communities as well as political development in Kenya at large. Within this context, struggle for land is increasingly ethnicised, creating ‘windows of opportunity for violent (re)negotiation of territorial claims in the pastoralist areas in Kenya’s arid north’ (Greiner 2013, 218).

Northern Kenya, being viewed as conflict prone and inhabited by mobile pastoral people, is being constructed as a region in need of development (ideas that were already prevalent during colonial occupation as I will discuss in the following section). However, 2010 marked an opening to change the ways in which northern Kenya was envisioned. The new Constitution of Kenya in 2010 restructured the country into devolved Counties.\textsuperscript{26} ‘Vision 2030’, an ambitious new national development blueprint, has also been implemented emphasising investments in industry, and infrastructure for economic growth (Mosley and Watson 2016). For

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{25} Ariaal are a pastoralist group of northern Kenya considered to be forming a ‘bridge culture’ between Samburu and Rendille pastoralists (Spencer, 1973; Fratkin, 2004). During fieldwork I mostly heard the term \textit{Lmasagara} to refer to Rendille who speak Samburu and/or who have mixed Samburu and Rendille parents.

\textsuperscript{26} ‘[T]o some degree devolved administration and resources to the County level’ (Article II, 11).
\end{footnotesize}
example, the wind-power project in Lake Turkana (LTWP); the Lamu Port Southern Sudan-Ethiopia Transport (LAPSSET); and the KETRACO power-line are major infrastructural projects of investment.

Although these frontier processes of investment for development have, in theory, the potential to ‘redress the historic inequality between the centre, and the dryland northern regions’ (Article II, 11), they create challenges for rural and urban societies as well. The initiation and speculation of development projects led to conflict between different groups for control over sites of investment, trade and other privileges (Elliott 2016; Kochore 2016; Cormack and Kurewa 2018). Rising competition between people over land, which is viewed as an asset that will benefit from the expected developments, resulted in linking particular groups to territories (Greiner 2016). These investment projects are increasingly bringing insecurities to people who fear of losing access and authority over their land.27 In addition, there is the rapid and large-scale establishment of community conservancies by the Northern Rangelands Trust and county governments, in which land has been delineated for wildlife management, security purposes, improved rangeland management and tourism. These conservancies are also producing processes of (ethnic) territorialisation (Article II). These investments and interventions for ‘development’ influence patterns of livestock movements and access to land and resources.

A history of ordering and controlling space

Before colonial occupation, northern Kenya was rather ‘open’ where movement of people and livestock was relatively free (Watson 2010). There were no clearly demarcated boundaries. Instead, movement occurred based on rains and access to resources in certain areas following institutions formed by different groups of people who were associated with that area. The control of water points followed strict rules and regulations (Schlee and Shongolo 2012). Still, access to water and pastures was negotiable depending on social relations and the notion of reciprocity. During colonial times and throughout the postcolonial period, mobile pastoralists were generally seen as inconvenient by government officials and policymakers. Also then, pastoralist livelihoods were linked to poverty, backwardness, unproductivity and insecurity. Pastoralists evaded taxes and crossed borders and, therefore, needed to be controlled (Waweru 2012; Galaty 2016a). These views led to different policies linking people closer to bounded territories and as such, to better management of people and the environment.28

27 The Community Land Act 2016 can also be a promising change for the land and livelihoods of the people in Lekiji, and Samburu.

These policies shaped by colonial and post-colonial government officials have created a mosaic landscape of territorialities with a large variety of actors and interests. The history of this landscape in relation to movements, access to resources, and space for mobility are complex. I will shortly explore some of the major policies and interventions, during colonial and post-independence times, in order to create an understanding of the context in which the current grazing interactions take place.

Early colonial occupation

Upon the start of colonial occupation, Laikipia was constructed by British explorers as ‘empty’, even though historically, Laikipia was in use by the Maasai communities who by the 1900s had suffered from wars and diseases (Hughes 2006; Musembi and Kameri-Mbote 2013). In order to remove the remaining people from Laikipia, the British colonial authorities engineered a treaty, The Anglo-Maasai treaties of 1904 and 1911. This included the forced movement of Maasai people by the British authorities from the Central Rift Valley into Laikipia, followed by their eviction to demarcated areas referred to as native reserves in the south (Cronk 1989; Hughes 2006; McIntosh 2017). These two large ‘Maasai Moves’ consisted of the forced movements of twenty thousand people and 2.5 million livestock. The colonial government intended to create an economically important area out of Laikipia and therefore cleared the Laikipian Plateau for European settlement (Hughes 2006; Kanyinga 2009). The Laikipian highlands were thereafter divided and distributed amongst British beneficiaries, many of them ex-servicemen of the First World War, into private commercial ranches owned by Europeans – a land tenure and land use system which persists today by either Kenyans of European descent and new investors with Kenyan or European backgrounds (Letai and Lind 2013; McIntosh 2017). Large scale ranches of over 10,000 acres were created mainly for cattle production. The Laikipian highlands, also known as the ‘White Highlands’ hosted settlers who became ‘a small, powerful, European elite that was responsible for the management of almost all land in Laikipia’ (Evans and Adams 2016, 217).

Livestock movement within Laikipia was restricted and enforced through fences, laws and police posts; wildfires were suppressed; and grazing patterns were restricted. Over the years, control became stricter and an increase in police presence was set up. The western corridor of land of Isiolo became designated as a government-controlled livestock quarantine block, and was closely patrolled by police so that, in the name of disease control, no cattle or pastoralists from further north would enter into Laikipia (Waweru 2012; Letai and Lind 2013). Oral accounts mentioned that trespassing in Laikipia was made impossible. Unless you were working on the ranches of the settlers or were employed by any other British formality which would give you a special pass that allowed to cross the borders to
Laikipia, you were fined heavily for trespassing for – with or without livestock – setting foot inside private ranches. These rigid colonial boundaries did not allow for livestock mobility (Lane 2005).

While the Maasai of Laikipia were increasingly enclosed within group ranches by fences and police controls, the pastoralists living beyond the Laikipian borders were confined within their areas (Waweru 2012). Unlike the Maasai, the Samburu were not moved to the south, and the Samburu area was not directly settler-occupied (Fratkin 2015). Still, the relations between the Samburu and the settlers were heated, most probably as a result of access and control to grazing land and pasture (Duder and Simpson 1997; Waweru 2012; Fratkin 2015). As mentioned before, the main fear during the early 1920s was that the Samburu would infect settler’s cattle with diseases and therefore the colonial government restricted the Samburu to the northern boundary of the ‘Kittermaster Line’ which they were not allowed to cross. (Duder and Simpson 1997; KLC 1934). Yet, the line was crossed by the Samburu and their cattle in search of grazing land in Laikipia in 1922, 1924, and 1928. The ‘incursions’ into Laikipia were heavily punished by the colonial government, which placed the entire Northern Frontier District\(^\text{29}\) (NFD) in quarantine (Duder and Simpson 1997; Waweru 2012).

The Samburu land question

In 1931, the white settler rancher Powys was killed, for which five Samburu \textit{lmurran} were charged. In 1933, however, before the \textit{lmurran} were charged, the Samburu \textit{laibon}\(^\text{30}\) was arrested and deported under the Witchcraft Ordinance of 1925 and Deportation Order of 1923 for the instigation of the murder on Powys and others. According to several scholars, it is argued that these tensions were mainly a result of access to and control over grazing resources (Duder and Simpson 1997; Waweru 2012; Fratkin 2015). Waller described the killings of settlers in Laikipia by Samburu as a form of ‘boundary maintenance’, as they felt threatened that the whites would take away their grazing lands (Fratkin 2015). The settlers wanted to expand their territory to the Leroghi Plateau, which was at the time inhabited by Samburu pastoralists. Although the Leroghi Plateau was part of the NFD designated to various Kenyan pastoralist groups, the settlers argued that the Samburu were not the original inhabitants of the Leroghi Plateau. Furthermore, they argued that the Maasai were vacated from the plateau to make space for the settlers as part of the 1904 Treaty; that the Samburu area is big enough to host all their cattle; that the Samburu were not originally herders of cattle but goats; and that the Samburu were overgrazing Leroghi drastically with these amounts of cattle that they kept, whereas the settlers would make increased

\(^{29}\) The region to the north of Laikipia that was closed. Travel to the region required a permit until after Independence.

\(^{30}\) Diviner and ritual healer (Fratkin 2015).
economic use of the area. Therefore, the settlers requested the removal of the Samburu from Leroghi as early as possible (KLC 1934; Spencer 1973; Waweru 2012; Fratkin 2015). Likewise, ‘They [the settlers] also argued that Samburu warriors often violated the border restrictions by grazing their cattle on Laikipia District lands’ (Fratkin 2015, 37). With pressure through the Laikipia Farmers Association (LFA), the settlers tried to gain control over the Leroghi Plateau by pushing the colonial government in their favour. The case went to court, and became part of the Kenya (Carter) Land Commission (KLC) that was set to bring a solution to the ‘Samburu question’, to whom to give Leroghi Plateau. Various District Commissioners had proposed to resettle the Samburu in other areas such as the western outspan of Isiolo District and the un-alienated Crown Lands in Laikipia, where the Laikipia Maasai were residing, and as such vacate the Leroghi for settlers. However, the colonial government could not indicate an alternative area that could easily accommodate the Samburu (KLC 1934).

In 1934, the KLC, based on a variety of testimonies from witnesses, decided in favour of the Samburu not to move the pastoralists to the more arid areas of Isiolo. The main argument given by the KLC contained that the 6,000 Samburu pastoralists residing at the time on Leroghi could not be displaced to other areas only to give space for approximately twenty European ranches for sheep ranching alone (KLC 1934; Fratkin 2015). Moreover, not all alienated land in Laikipia was yet occupied by European settlers (KLC 1934), meaning that there was still space within Laikipia and no need to alienate more land. To appease the settlers, the colonial government decided in 1936 to bring Samburu District within the Rift Valley Province instead so that they could have stronger control over Samburu pastoralists and stop the regular ‘trespassing’ (Spencer 1973; Duder and Simpson 1997; Fratkin 2015).

Grazing schemes in Samburu

When the rights for the Samburu to stay and live on the Leroghi Plateau were confirmed, the need for the colonial government to control grazing and stock numbers increased. The colonial administration implemented various policies and strategies in order to manage and control stocking rates, enforced by the assumption that the pastoral rangeland management strategies had negative effects on the quality of land. Apart from narratives on overgrazing and land degradation, overpopulation, conflict and modernisation were other arguments used for enhancing pastoral sedentarisation and curtailing pastoral mobility (Rutten 1992; Galaty 2013). The way of doing so changed over time, but it started with the implementation of grazing schemes. This system of grazing schemes in Samburu was initiated in the 1930s and mainly involved controlled grazing on the highlands, where specific areas (with high quality pasture and rainfall) were fenced and guarded by armed forces from the British army.
Only a limited amount of cattle were allowed within these grazing zones, and goats were not allowed at all (Spencer 1973; Fumagalli 1977; Fumagalli 1978; Lesorogol 2008).

As a result of the quota and access restrictions on the high potential pasture in highland areas, more and more livestock accumulated on the lower quality pasture lands in the lowlands where there were no restrictions on grazing. Due to the problem of localised rainfall, not all the grazing areas received rain, a situation which became aggravated during the 1959-1961 droughts when the grazing schemes had to be opened up to allow for movement (Spencer 1973; Fumagalli 1978). The combination of increased levels of bribery, trespassing, resistance and nearing independence, brought an end to the end the grazing schemes in 1961: ‘the elders cursed the schemes and refused to comply with them’ (Lesorogol 2008). Grazing schemes were not implemented in Isiolo and Laikipia.

Post-independence

When Kenya gained independence in 1963, some of the settlers in Laikipia who had been running ranches left the country, whereas others decided to stay and continue. Most, however, had decided to leave and sell their properties, either to the government or to private Land Buying Companies, which acquired about 30% of the ranch lands of Laikipia (Letai and Lind 2013). The government used the land for resettlement schemes, aiming to solve the issue of landless people, and redistributed 1.2-5 acre plots to mostly Kikuyu smallholder farmers. Land Buying Companies (LBC), a group of farmers mostly from Central Kenya, also invested collectively in the ranching companies that the settlers, who moved out of the country, had left behind. The idea of the LBCs was initially to keep the ranch going and as such, earn their share of the revenues the ranch would make. Many of the companies parted, however, with individuals claiming their share of the company and the land, as both land exchange and private property provided better financial benefits than staying in the ranching business. This, then, lead to the subdivision of some of the large scale ranches, with each individual obtaining its private title deed, although an individual plot in this semi-arid climate of that size could not be cultivated beneficially. Hence land was abandoned and the ranches, supposedly managed by the LBC’s, became obsolescent, resulting in the closing down of the companies. These areas, used neither for agriculture nor for ranching, are referred to as ‘abandoned lands’. They are abandoned by the ‘official’ landowners who have the title deeds, but in practice they are not abandoned at all. In total, one third of Laikipia County is considered ‘abandoned land’. In some cases these lands were never used by Kenyan settlers at all. Kenyan political elites’ uptake of these abandoned lands during the early 1980s was not uncommon (LWF 2012; Williams 2013; Letai and Lind 2013; Evans and Adams 2016).
Post-independence Kenya was also after the individualisation of communal land, further undermining pastoral mobility (Okoth-Ogendo 1986; Fratkin and Roth 2005). In 1968, under the Land (Group Representatives) Act, group ranches were established on the so-called native reserves where the Maasai in Laikipia District and the Samburu in Samburu District were residing, which legalises the ownership and occupation of land by a group of people. Group ranches were established particularly in areas used by pastoralists: in 1976, thirteen group ranches were established in Laikipia and forty-seven in Samburu, supported by the World Bank (Letai and Lind 2013). Land ownership was seen as important, as it was thought by policy makers that resources would be better managed once secure ownership was established (Musembi and Kameri-Mbote 2013; Odote 2013). Group ranches were implemented to secure access and decision making rights to communal land for the communities in pastoral areas, as well as encourage settlement and investments into the land for sustainable and commercial ends. However, in Laikipia, group ranches failed in their objectives by not being able to provide sufficient grazing for the members of the group ranches and also because of the individual uptake of land for private benefits (Letai and Lind 2013; Odote 2013; Evans and Adams 2016). In Samburu, the group ranch concept never really took off – at least not until the establishment of community conservancies (Odote 2013; Pas 2018). Furthermore, especially in southern Kenya but also in the Samburu highlands and various individual cases in the Samburu lowlands, the group ranches triggered the privatisation of land held in common (Fumagalli 1978; Rutten 1992; Mwangi 2007; Lesorogol 2008). Although subdivision undermined mobility, more recently, sharing private land has been on the rise both in northern and southern Kenya (BurnSilver and Mwangi 2007; Lesorogol 2014).

Due to the small size of the group ranches in Laikipia – a total of 7% of the entire Laikipia County – and the fact that the group ranches were designated in the dryer zones, the group ranch members became increasingly dependent on mobility and access to grazing outside of the group ranches. In addition, the ability to cope with frequent droughts have been undermined by various reasons including the privatisation of community land (Lesorogol 2010b), inaccessibility of grazing areas, or lack of labour to support mobility. Samburu and pastoralists from Baringo, Turkana and Samburu counties are being increasingly reliant on the large tracts of land (Lane 2005; Evans and Adams 2016). This increase of usage of the so-called abandoned lands over the past thirty years not only occurs because of the large size of these unoccupied plots and their relatively favourable rainfall and pasture quality, but also, and over time more and more, because these lands are bordering the combined private ranch-conservancies\(^{31}\) where grass can still

\(^{31}\) During the 1980s, individual ranch managers decided to combine cattle ranching with private conservation of wildlife for high-end tourism (Lamers et al. 2014). This occurred
be found during dry seasons. These processes created growing difficulty (Article I), struggle and conflict (Article III and IV) in the process of accessing pastures, to which community conservancies are being placed forward to ‘prevent’ these complexities (Article II and III).

alongside the collapse of the Kenyan beef industry when other sources of income had to be made in order to maintain these private landholdings. The introduction of conservation areas led to a change of land management on these private landholdings, of which some were sold to investors from abroad who converted the previous ranches in nature conservation zones (Letai and Lind 2013).
Methodology

In this section, I describe my research strategy. I start by outlining the general research approach of mobile ethnography. I continue by providing a detailed description of the case study and motivate my choice for the study sites I selected. After more detailed explanations of the study sites, I describe and reflect on the different research methods I used and how I carried out fieldwork with the help of research assistants. I finalise by reflecting on my positionality during the research process and how I shared results with research participants in one of the study sites.

Mobile ethnography

Studying pastoral mobility, or to understand a fluid world with people and animals on the move, steers the methodology and asks for mobile ways of interaction and data collection. For the generation of information used in this research, I drew upon mobile ethnography, a form of ethnography which is intrinsically connected to practices of movement: ‘[m]obile ethnography draws researchers into a multitude of mobile, material, embodied practices of making distinctions, relations and places’ (Büsscher and Urry 2009, 105; see also Sheller and Urry 2006). Mobile ethnography is more than multi-sited ethnography alone (Sheller and Urry 2006; Marcus 1995). Besides the importance of studying people and processes not confined to one place, it focuses on the participation and actual involvement in patterns of movement while employing mobility as the analytic (Sheller and Urry 2006). This can be attained through walking with people and while doing so, one conducts ethnographic research (Sheller and Urry 2006; Lee and Ingold 2006; Evans and Jones 2011). While participating in the movement itself, one could conduct interviews, supported by observations and recording techniques (Anderson 2004; Finlay and Bowman 2017). As an alternative, the researcher could also first participate in the movement followed by interviewing people (Laurier 2002; Sheller and Urry 2006). Another approach could be to refer to the memory of the informant, and as such re-living the movement while talking about places and directions either with visual, cartographic, textual or technological information (Sheller and Urry 2006; Wario et al. 2015).
The approach to mobile ethnographies, where the movement patterns are central as well as the researcher’s active participation in these movements, allows for interactions and questions to arise in relation to the informants’ experience, embodiment, and emplacement concerning changes and stabilities in the relations between people and things (Büscher and Urry 2009). Furthermore, and especially in relation to pastoralists for whom movement is a rule, livestock movement shapes the world, the relations with people and the landscape. Hence, a mobile ethnography allows for an understanding of the interactions that occur as part of the movement, or to put it in the context of my research, how territories are (re)shaped and how access to resources is negotiated while people are on the move with their livestock. It also enables to understand how people talk about changes that have taken place in the environment, the landscape, and among the people (Herbert 2000).

‘Scenes of a Move’: the case of pastoral mobility

I chose the case study approach to gather in-depth qualitative data for the understanding of the underlying reasons, processes and impacts of the current grazing changes in the Ewaso region. I chose the case study approach because it enables a detailed understanding of situations, events, processes, actors involved and their understanding of their actions, interactions, justifications, and feelings (Gagnon 2010). A case study is well suited to investigate interactions between people and socio-spatial processes in a real-life context, for descriptive, explanatory and predictive purposes associated with a variety of phenomena at the individual, group and organisational levels (Yin 1994; Gagnon 2010; Crowe et al. 2011). Furthermore, it is one of the most appropriate research strategies for conducting studies containing more than one type of stakeholder, in which detailed information on each stakeholder is integrated in the final analysis (Yin 1994; Scholz and Tietje 2002). A further advantage of case-based research is the range of possible methods for information gathering and analysis as well as to triangulate within the case study by using multiple sources all focusing on the same process or event (Glesne and Peshkin 1992; Woodside and Wilson 2003).

This thesis represents the case of Samburu pastoral mobility and access to grazing areas, which I see as a case of a socio-spatial process (Lund 2014). Although the ‘boundaries’ of the case study (i.e. the process of Samburu pastoral mobility) are not clearly or exactly defined, the area depicted with the aim to study this case is the Ewaso region, through where the Samburu pastoralists are migrating with their livestock in search of pasture and water. Many interactions as a result of Samburu mobility occur within (and beyond) this area, and therefore fieldwork for the case study was not confined to one location only. Hence, I chose a mobile approach to allow me to understand the various processes involved regarding livestock mobility of Samburu
pastoralists. The study sites were intrinsically linked in various ways because each of the sites were part of the same wider interconnected Ewaso region. Moving between these locations allowed me to understand the type of connections and how people relate and interact with each other.

Study area
As mentioned, bound together by the patterns of mobility of Samburu pastoralists and the Ewaso Nyiro, the Ewaso region is highly diverse both socio-economically, politically and ecologically. Within this context, Samburu pastoralists move with livestock in search of pasture. In doing so, different patterns are followed and choices are made (Pas 2018). One of the directions chosen to access pastures is to the south, towards Isiolo and Laikipia. While I spatially followed the movement by interviewing a variety of actors at different locations within this area of Samburu pastoral mobility, a storyline of differences came to the fore depicting views, patterns, ideas and narratives. Simultaneously, studying the process of pastoral mobility and conducting interviews at different locations enabled me to see various scenes of the mobility processes at different moments in time.

While the Samburu move through the landscape, access is negotiated among Samburu pastoralists, but also between Samburu and Maasai pastoralists, and Samburu pastoralists and private landowners. Private landowners are either smallholder farmers or ranchers and/or conservationists managing large properties. In order to capture this diversity of actors and the variation in land use and ownership regimes in the Ewaso region, I purposively selected five study sites as part of the case study (Figure 3, see also Annex A). The sites were selected based on familiarity with the area as based on previous assessment; representation in relation to the research aim; capturing diversity; and risk and safety considerations (Gerring and McDermott 2007). This variation in study sites enabled the attainment of in depth qualitative insights and a dynamic overview of temporal and spatial variations covering the case of Samburu pastoral mobility (ibid.). During the course of the research, due to violent clashes, I shifted from Kipsing in Isiolo County to Nalare (Oldonyiro, Isiolo County) as study site.
Figure 3. Location of study sites indicated by coloured dots. (Source: modified from Figure 1).

**Lekiji - Sesia**

Sesia, located in *Lpurkel*, refers both to the administrative sub-location (Lodungokwe location, Samburu East sub-county, Wamba West ward) and to Sesia group ranch. Sesia residents are primarily semi-nomadic Samburu pastoralists primarily dependent on domestic animals: cattle, goats, sheep, camels, donkeys and chickens. The number and type of animals per family varies. Sesia group ranch is located in southeast Samburu and is one of the five group ranches that constitute Meibae conservancy. Sesia is located in...
the lowlands of Samburu, and is mainly covered with wooded grasslands with the acacia being the dominant species. The main ‘permanent’ water source for residents of Sesia is the Ewaso Nyiro. The Ewaso Nyiro separates the southern border of Samburu from Isiolo. Besides the Ewaso Nyiro, the rivers Sesia and Nagorowo are also important seasonal rivers where often only hand-dug wells make water available for people and livestock. Lekiji is one of the five larger settlements of Sesia. The others are Mabati, Nalepoboo, Lkalkaloi and Lekupe.

Sesia has 8,763 residents. Furthermore, Sesia as a group ranch has 405 registered members. This number is relatively low because the moment Sesia group ranch was established, in 1976, only 37 people were willing to register. People were resistant to group ranches fearing that it meant that their land would be taken, and were still highly mobile, which lowered the need to register oneself to a specific area. In 1994 the registration for Sesia group ranch opened once again and 368 new members were registered in the group ranch book, adding to a total of 405 officially registered group ranch members. Since then, the registration to the group ranch has not been opened although I was told that, in January 2016, a new round of registration on Sesia group ranch would occur (Pas 2018).

Meibae conservancy was established in 2006 with the support of the Northern Rangelands Trust, and experienced start-up problems and resistance from within the community (Article II). There is no external donor for Meibae and there are no tourism facilities. Meibae consists of four group ranches (Sesia, Lpus, Ltitrimin and Ngaroni) to which people feel affiliated – a shift that started since the clear demarcation of each group ranch for the Meibae conservancy. The group ranches are not in agreement on the exact location of the headquarters and the conservation zone of the conservancy, as people fear this takes land away, which would mean a loss of grazing area. Because of the disagreement, a conservation zone has not been established and the current headquarters are said to be temporary. The various social and spatial transformations the conservancies put into motion are further described and analysed in Article I and II.

Sesia group ranch is managing its grazing by making use of the mpaka system. The mpaka, derived from the English word ‘Park’ or the Swahili word for boundary, is a system used throughout Samburu east to set land

32 People living in Sesia informed me that the amount of water flowing through the river has declined in recent years. In 2015 the river was for the first time totally dry, as we were told. Only hand-dug wells could be used to access the water.
33 September 2015 count – registered by sub-chief.
34 Since the introduction of Meibae conservancy, increased attention has been given to the management of grazing resources. The grazing coordinator together with a group of elders of the four group ranches plans grazing: they divide Meibae conservancy into blocks and each of these blocks has its own grazing plan (Figure 4). Such a grazing plan includes wet season grazing areas and dry season grazing areas. These grazing plans are based on the already existing plans and initiatives, such as the mpaka.
aside for managing grazing. The *mpaka* is a defined area that is set aside during the wet season where grazing is not allowed. Elders of the community that agreed on the *mpaka* are monitoring and controlling to ensure no one enters the *mpaka* before it officially opens. If someone enters the *mpaka* with livestock (either goats, sheep or cattle) while the *mpaka* is still closed, s/he will be fined. Often the fine consists of a goat taken from the responsible person of the herd that was grazing inside the *mpaka*. The elders will consume the goat. Once the *mpaka* is opened by the elders, all members of the community are allowed to graze in this area. With the introduction of Meibae conservancy, the management of grazing and resources has moved towards the grazing committee, consisting of a grazing coordinator and a selected group of elders from each group ranch within Meibae. The grazing coordinator together with the elders plan grazing where they divide Meibae conservancy into 16 blocks and each of these blocks has its own grazing plan (Figure 4). Such a grazing plan includes wet season grazing areas and dry season grazing areas. These grazing plans are based on the already existing plans and initiatives, like the *mpaka*. It is important to note that the making and execution of the grazing plans only will happen if there are grazing resources, which depend on rainfall (Pas 2018).

![Figure 4. To the left: Meibae Conservancy. (Source: NRT 2016). To the right: grazing blocks for Meibae Conservancy. (Photo: Annemiek Pas Schrijver).](image)

During my stay in and around Sesia group ranch, most of the residents were staying in a *lorora*. The *lorora* indeed were constructed for ceremonies that took place in 2014. However, during 2015, 2016 and early 2017 the *lorora* were still inhabited by the residents. Reason being that they became part of a
wider form of resistance against the construction of a power line. As part of Kenya's Vision 2030, the Government of Kenya has contracted the Kenya Electricity Transmission Company Ltd. (KETRACO) to plan and execute the Kenya-Ethiopia Electricity Highway Project, also known as the Eastern Electricity Highway Project. This project involves the construction of a 1,068km-long power transmission line from Ethiopia to Kenya as means to develop Ethiopia's hydropower potential and to overcome the power deficit primarily in Kenya. The power line is an example of one of the ambitious, large-scale and state-led development projects using the potential of the north to make Kenya a middle income country by 2030 (Mosley and Watson 2016).

The communities in northern Kenya were informed (instead of asked) to provide Right of Way. The project involved the provision of compensation, however the compensation rules and regulations were specifically adapted to agricultural societies of private properties and permanent structures – two premises which do not generally hold for Samburu pastoralists living in Samburu East. This meant that only owners of privatised sections of a group ranch (and other locations where the power line would pass) were to be compensated. When the news spread that some people were compensated for the power line while many others were not, Samburu living in Samburu East moved and established new homesteads ‘under’ the demarcated power line and demanded compensation. Clearly, people did not just demand compensation, but mainly demanded authority over their land and resources. However, KETRACO, not willing to compensate each individual who was settled under the demarcated power line, continued with the construction, which included the need to remove some of the highly valuable *Ltepes (Acacia tortilis)* trees.

**Nalare**

Nalare was, during my stay in 2015, a conservancy located in Oldonyiro ward, Isiolo County. Nalare is formed on former trust land. Oldonyiro borders the Ewaso Nyiro to the north and east, the private ranches of Loisaba, Sabuk and Ol Malo to the southeast (across the river), Meibae conservancy (Sesia group ranch) to the north, and Koija and Tiamamut group ranches to the south.

In Oldonyiro, rainfall is lower compared to the highlands of Laikipia. Lebarasheriki has 1200 residents, primarily Samburu pastoralists, and together with the residents of four other towns Tepes (500 residents), Mutaro


36 pers.comm. Meibae residents, 2015, 2016 and 2017
(200 residents), Lekiji (150 residents) and Namelok (400 residents), are members of Nalare conservancy. Nalare conservancy was established with the support of Sabuk Lodge, a private enterprise in Laikipia bordering Oldonyiro in 2009, for the purpose of keeping an area for conservation in front of the Sabuk Lodge. Sabuk in exchange provided rangers to ‘protect’ the conservation area from grazers entering the private conservancy ‘illegally’. The conservation area of the Nalare conservancy was enlarged, in order to border with Koija group ranch (where Koija has a conservation area established as well). As such, the communities of Nalare and Koija hope to solve boundary conflicts by sharing a conservation area. In January 2016, with the support of the Northern Rangelands Trust, Nalare conservancy was consolidated together with three other conservancies to become Nalare Community Conservancy. Lebarasheriki is the major town where conservancy issues and concerns are discussed. Nalare is mainly inhabited by Samburu pastoralists.

Nalare (generally Oldonyiro) is located in between Samburu and Laikipia. During the dry season or in times of drought, Samburu pastoralists move towards Laikipia cross Nalare and stay for a few days. In 2015, as I was told, this occurred peacefully but also ‘through force’ when some Samburu lmurran with livestock did not negotiate access to the Nalare grazing areas (Article III and IV).

Koija group ranch is located in Laikipia. In 1976, Koija was registered under the Land (Group Representative) Act 1968 as a group ranch by the ministry of lands and settlement and covers an area of 18,700 acres. Koija borders the Ewaso Nyiro to the west, Loisaba to the northwest (across the river), Mpala ranch to the southwest, and Ilmotiok and Tiamamut group ranches to the east. There are about 2500 people living in Koija group ranch, divided over four clusters called Koija, Munushoi, Lmutaru and Noserai. The residents of Koija are connected to the Laikipia Maasai. Koija group ranch is managed by the Koija group ranch committee, consisting of a group of seven elected members who fill the seats of manager, chairman, secretary, radio operator, treasurer and grazing coordinator. The grazing coordinator is manager of the grazing committee, which consists of the coordinator and thirteen selected elders who are in charge of managing grazing plans and settlements in Koija group ranch.

There are several tourism enterprises active in Koija group ranch: Lewaso Cottages and Koija Starbeds. Both Koija Starbeds and Lewaso Cottages have set aside an area for conservation, of which the latter is fenced and no grazing occurs. Koija Starbeds is a community owned tourism enterprise established in cooperation with Africa Wildlife Foundation (AFW) and
Loisaba.37 With the incentive to manage grazing, the enterprise developed the conservancy area as a place where the community lodge was established. Lewaso Cottage is a private conservancy, setting aside a large area of land for the promotion of wildlife and eco-tourism. Besides these two conservancy initiatives, the residents of Koija have opened negotiation with their Oldonyiro neighbours to establish a shared conservancy area (as has been described above), as a result of recurrent conflict regarding the boundary and grazing in that specific area. It was decided that shared efforts on the conservation of the boundary area would enhance cooperation and negotiation between the two communities. Through the conservancy, rules and regulations could be established that would be easily adhered to as well as enforced by the two communities. Currently, Koija group ranch is part of the larger community conservancy called Naibunga, an NRT-supported effort to manage grazing collectively amongst the group ranches in Laikipia north. With the inauguration of Naibunga, Koija is supposed to add another conservation area for planned grazing within the group ranch. As opposed to the two conservancy-zones, this conservation zone will be more actively grazed and planned for. In 2015, similar to what happened in Nalare, Koija became an area where pastoralists arrived with their livestock from Samburu to temporarily settle and access private ranches and conservancies for grazing (Article III and IV).

**Karashira**

Karashira is the name used by the Samburu and Laikipia Maasai for a 30,000 acre area of land, also known as Mathira 1, a so-called ‘abandoned land’. Karashira is located in the Mathira sub-location, Laikipia west constituency. Karashira farm, a large-scale ranch, was bought by the land-buying company called Mathira Kihindwi Gitaraga Kahonoki Farmers Company Ltd. in 1973.38 A total of 4,900 individuals became members of the land buying company who purchased the land, and was subdivided in 1984. All the members, mainly Kikuyu and Turkana, had title deeds to their plots. Karashira is located along the Ewaso Narok, a tributary to the Ewaso Nyiro. Karashira borders the private ranches of Ngorare and Ol Maisor. Currently, the main residents of Karashira number around 3,000 Samburu and Mukugodo Maasai pastoralists, as well as about 1,000 Kikuyu tomato farmers. Karashira is divided in four clusters: Mathira, Sukutan, Ngilois and Karashira. According to both Samburu and Laikipia Maasai pastoralists, Karashira is good for rearing cattle and especially good for rearing sheep because of the quality of the pasture.

The Karashira grazing committee was established with support from the neighbouring ranch Ngorare. The grazing committee has as its main task to establish relationships with neighbouring private ranches. With the managers of these ranches, the grazing committee negotiates a grazing agreement, which concerns the number of cows that are allowed to graze on the ranch under specific circumstances and conditions. After that, the ranch manager will hand out grazing permits to each individual cattle owner, of which the grazing committee has confirmed that the cattle owner is a resident of Karashira. Besides being the mediator for the grazing arrangements, the grazing committee also collects the money that has to be paid to the ranch manager, and controls the people and their grazing patterns on the private ranch (Article III). Also on Karashira, which is divided during the wet season into two areas (the area where you can graze, and the area that has to be set aside for grazing when the rains have stopped) the grazing committee checks to ensure adherence to the rules. If one does not comply, the grazing committee chooses a goat to be taken from the herd that has been grazing on the wrong side.

**P&D and Kirimun**

Peris and Day (P&D) is a 54,803 acre plot previously owned as a ranch by the Day family who sold it to President Moi in 1996. Moi sold the plot to the Settlement Trust Fund of the Ministry of Lands and Settlement, who subdivided it into 945 plots of 50 acres that were, after some pressure applied by the political leaders at the time, supposed to be allocated to mainly Samburu families. The allotment letters after subdivision were given to the people who were residing on P&D at the time and who came from Samburu County, Rumuruti and Laikipian group ranches. In total, 180 people were given individual allotment letters for individual plots; others had to share (two people were given one allotment letter for one plot). However, a majority of the plots have not been officially allotted and the area is mainly used by Samburu pastoralists who have either settled or graze their animals seasonally. Most likely, as I was told, Pokot, Turkana and Kikuyu who reside on P&D only own individual plots if they purchased the allotment letters recently from a Samburu pastoralist. Currently, the Pokot are slowly returning to P&D after they left due to the violent clashes between the Pokot and Samburu in 2009. Samburu had also left P&D, but have begun to return from 2012 up to now. A few individuals who had official allotment letters for P&D have sold their land to be consolidated into large-scale properties, called Kamogi and Tangamous.

Kirimun, consisting of 39,000 acres, is a former livestock holding ground man-aged by the African Livestock Organisation Marketing of the colonial
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40 Ibid.
government from 1944-1964. From 1964-1972, the Livestock Management Division took over management, followed by the Kenya Livestock Development Programme from 1972-1980. In 1980, the National Youth Service (NYS) took over Kirimun. In 1991, President Moi donated Kirimun to Laikipia County for ‘wildlife conservation and the development of tourism’, after which the County Council gazetted the area as a national game reserve. However, the ownership of Kirimun is highly contested between the County Council of Laikipia, NYS and the Ministry of Livestock. Therefore, Kirimun is not yet managed as a National Reserve and is currently in the process of becoming a community conservancy with the support of Northern Rangelands Trust, The Nature Conservancy and Loisaba Conservancy.41 Kirimun is home to a population of around 6,000 people (2,626 households), mainly Samburu pastoralists of which 776 individuals (38 Turkana, 18 Kalenjin, one Kikuyu and the rest Samburu) are ‘registered squatters’ of Kirimun; the rest are officially categorised as ‘unregistered squatters’.

P&D and Kirimun are officially separate land holdings because of their different tenure systems; however, the land use and management issues that people are facing are very similar. Both P&D and Kirimun have a grazing committee, although P&D is considered to be very strong and capable of managing their area and grazing rather well. The area chief is chief of both Kirimun and P&D. The majority of the population on both landholdings are Samburu pastoralists. Both the residents of P&D and Kirimun graze the same areas: either on P&D and Kirimun, or on the private ranches such as Loisaba through grazing arrangements or by night (Article III and IV). Livestock from P&D and Kirimun are also brought to the ‘abandoned lands’ within Laikipia during dry spells. As a result of the strong grazing committee on P&D, there is a special area set aside for ‘visiting’ grazers during the dry spell, called Nkiloriti. In Nkiloriti, the non-residents who come to P&D in search for grazing are supposed to settle there and graze on the areas where the residents of P&D graze as well. These visitors in Nkiloriti are not supposed to settle permanently in that area. In 2015, the majority of the residents in Nkiloriti were Samburu pastoralists who came from Isiolo, Kipsing area, who had fled from the conflict between Samburu and Turkana. Other visitors who came specifically for grazing and negotiated access with the grazing committee were also residing in Nkiloriti. In 2015, large numbers of people arrived with livestock on P&D and Kirimun to access community and private land for grazing, which led to struggle and
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sometimes conflict between the residents and the temporary ‘visitors’ (Article III and IV).

Research methods

Fieldwork

This thesis is structured around field data that was collected mainly between January and December 2015, with two follow-up visits of two months each in 2016 and 2017. In 2015, I moved around from a central base Nanyuki (Laikipia County) to visit group ranches, private ranches, government agencies, NGOs, markets, temporary settlements, and homesteads in the three counties of Laikipia, Isiolo and Samburu. For these long distances, I made use of a car, which allowed me to give rides to people and animals. I was able to create friendships by giving rides and have interesting discussions and exchange ideas with many different people (Figure 5).

I divided the major fieldwork into two phases: the first phase ran between February and May 2015 and the second phase between July and December 2015 (Annex B1 and B2). The first fieldwork phase mainly took place in Laikipia and is based on qualitative fieldwork methods that I describe in more detail below. During this period, I mainly interviewed respondents who had their residential base in Laikipia, such as the private landowners and managers, Maasai group ranch members and Samburu and Maasai pastoralists from the ‘abandoned lands’. I also interviewed other key informants such as governmental and non-governmental representatives. Although information was collected on a wide variety of subjects, focus was placed on the grazing arrangements that existed between different land users within and beyond Laikipia, as well as the views and perceptions of Samburu pastoralists coming to Laikipia in search of pasture.

During the second phase of fieldwork in 2015, I spent more time in Isiolo and Samburu, and finally decided to primarily focus on Sesia, Samburu for four months42 (Hage 2005). I stayed in Sesia and other parts of Samburu in order to acquire a more in-depth understanding of local struggles and politics and gain further insights into Samburu pastoralist perceptions of landscape and land use changes; changing mobility patterns; re-constellation and renegotiations of access arrangements within the pastoral land tenure system; and the impact of community conservancies on mobility and access. I camped in Sesia and other places in Samburu in order to access the more isolated areas far away from towns to conduct my fieldwork (Figure 6). It was especially during this phase of fieldwork that I applied methods to

42 During these four months, I regularly moved to towns such as Wamba, Arhcers Post, Isiolo and Nanyuki to fuel up food and petrol.
conduct interviews in line with the mobile ethnography approach. Furthermore, as I spent a significant amount of time at the locations where I conducted research; my ‘presence’ allowed me to grow familiar with the area, the people and their daily routines through observations, chatting and participating (Bernard 2006).

After this long stretch of fieldwork in 2015, I returned three times to conduct follow up interviews: two months in March-May 2016, two months in March-May 2017 and one more month in July 2017. Both my longer stay in Sesia, and the fact that I returned three times, brought me close the area and the people. I created relations of trust and friendship with women, elders and Imuran while drinking tea and walking to different places.

**Figure 5.** Multiple journeys with the car. (Photos: Annemiek Pas Schrijver, Daniel Lentipo and Daniel Lenkaina).

Besides longer stays at the different study sites, I also consider my time in Wamba, Archers Post, Isiolo town and Nanyuki as part of my fieldwork. The towns were places where I had informal conversations with residents and researchers, but also where I conducted interviews with employees of NGOs, Trusts, government authorities and other actors. It was also here that I observed events related to Samburu grazing in Laikipia, for example, in the prison of Laikipia where many Samburu herders were brought by the Kenyan military.43 When moving around between places, from one study site to the other, I observed many details. gave rides to people, mostly pastoralists, who would give me accounts of the recent events related to their
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43 General Service Unit or GSU.
livestock and grazing. Once I gave a ride to an elder who had to go and pay a fine because his sheep had climbed under the fence of a private ranch. Certain challenges are part of doing such fieldwork. For instance, the long, hot and difficult roads to be traversed, the lack of water and sanitation, sudden heavy rainfalls removing bridges and roads, and being stuck in a ‘dry’ riverbed with the car. These observations, informal conversation and personal experiences during the fieldwork, both in and beyond the study sites, have assisted me in understanding some of the dynamics that were ongoing. All the articles presented in this thesis have gained from these insights.

Figure 6. Staying in the field. During our stay in the field, we had to dig shallow wells to collect water. (Photos: Daniel Lenkaina and Annemiek Pas Schrijver).
Semi-structured interviews

Both during the first and the second fieldwork phase, I conducted formal and informal interviews with individuals and groups (Table 1). Individual interviews were held with men and women of all ages (Annex B1 and B2). Respondents often recommended that we talk to certain people and as such I followed their advice, which lead me to key informants. I also interviewed people more randomly at various livestock markets, providing lifts and spending some time close with one family. The interviews lasted between thirty minutes and two hours. Interviews with small groups sometimes grew into interesting discussions with a constant flow of participants coming and going. The interviews were semi-structured, focusing on topics depending on whom I was interviewing and based on interview guides (Annex C).

Table 1. Overview of main research participants at the different study sites.44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Research Participants</th>
<th>Study Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samburu pastoralists</td>
<td>Sesia, Nalare, P&amp;D and Kirimun, Karashira (Samburu, Isiolo, Laikipia counties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maasai pastoralists</td>
<td>Koija, Karashira (Laikipia County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchers and conservancy managers and employees</td>
<td>Laikipia County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Conservation) NGO’s/Trusts</td>
<td>Laikipia, Isiolo, Samburu (counties); Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government authorities</td>
<td>Nanyuki, Rumuruti, Kimanjro (Laikipia County); Isiolo Town (Isiolo County); Maralal, Wamba, Archers Post (Samburu County)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the first phase of my fieldwork I mostly interviewed landowners and managers of private ranches and conservancies, NGO employees, grazing coordinators, group ranch representatives and governmental officials (Article III and IV) (Figure 7). I conducted part of the interviews in English without a research assistant. I recorded and transcribed these directly after the interviews. For the interviews in Swahili or Samburu I was supported by either of the two research assistants whom I worked with in Laikipia. Also, these interviews were recorded based on informed consent and transcribed directly after the interviews in the presence of the research assistant.

For the second phase of fieldwork I stayed for longer periods in Lekiji, Sesia (Article I and II). Key elders and women, group ranch committees and conservancy committees were specifically approached for interviews (Figure 7). Both residents and non-residents of the mobile herding community, including men, women, and young individuals were interviewed during my stay in Isiolo and Samburu. Together with the research assistant, who was fluent in Samburu, Swahili and English, we made notes and recorded most of the formal interviews. Informants were asked if they agreed to have the interview recorded. Most, but not all, agreed. After the interview, I would go
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44 An in-depth description of the research participants and the type and occurrence of the methods used can be found in Annex B1 and B2.
through the notes together with the research assistant for clarification, which often ended up in interesting discussions between the assistant and myself. These discussions have helped considerably in my further understanding of the issues discussed during the interviews. Often, the field assistant would explain more about the tone in which certain topics were discussed as well as other background information that myself as a visitor would not be able to decrypt. The same day, if electricity allowed, I would transcribe the interview together with the research assistant. Other interviews were transcribed by myself or the research assistant at a later stage. Interviews that were not recorded were typed up in a word-file based on the notes that both a research assistant and myself made during the interview.

Group interviews were part of the information gathering during both stages of the fieldwork. Formal group interviews were conducted with group ranch committees, grazing committees and groups of elder representatives, women representatives, and imurran (Article I, II and III). These formal group interviews were prepared by the research assistant. Informal group interviews would occur spontaneously, as it is not uncommon that people passing by would join a conversation that I was having with a specific individual. Often these people would join the conversation and discussion.

Figure 7. Interviews in Samburu (top left and right) and Laikipia (bottom left). (Photos: Daniel Lenkaina and Daniel Lentipo).
Doing semi-structured interviews allowed me to gain in-depth insights from the perspective of the informants on issues such as how livestock migration is carried out, in what way the landscape has changed and how other events such as the establishment of the community conservancies have had an influence on livestock mobility patterns. Also, through conducting semi-structured interviews with the research assistant, we gathered insights into personal and daily experiences regarding being on the move with animals, grazing by night, how it was to be an *lmurrani* in the past, and specific struggles and conflicts. These interviews have all been very informative and provided me with narratives of change from many different points of view. These narratives have been of major importance and partly formed the basis of the four articles.

Some informants were very open to us and the conversation ran smoothly. During other interviews, however, it was harder to keep the conversation going. In the latter case, I would draw upon more structured questions that I had formulated as a way to deal with conversations falling silent. These interviews would generally not last as long. Although in general we gathered many insights through these semi-structured interviews, they were not sufficient. Nevertheless, the interviews did bring me to locations and homesteads where I would not have entered if it were not for the interview, and visiting homes provided insights into their daily routines of herding and milking livestock, which I could sometimes participate in. As such, the interviews were most often an entrance point for creating trust-relations with the research participants. Especially in Lekiji, Sesia, where I spent most time, this was of vital importance. Hence, while being in and around Lekiji, I would often meet a person whom I had interviewed and we would have an informal conversation. While I do not directly use all the insights I gathered during formal and informal semi-structured interviews and conversation, these informal conservations strengthen the trust-relations and provided me with more insight and context.

Walking interviews with herders

I had planned to follow cattle movements for long periods of time over long distances. However, in 2015 when I carried out fieldwork, the cattle had not been home for more than a year and were in areas considered remote and dangerous. Furthermore, during fieldwork, I learnt that mobility is more patchy and works in a different way than I had anticipated. It became clear that no clear paths or lines are followed. Instead, mobility occurs in relation to specific points of interest (Ingold 1986; Watson 2010). As such, my initial plans and the constant need to change them gave me insights into the actual process of livestock mobility.

I participated in various activities, including daily migrations with herders from the residential base to grazing and water sources for their livestock, although I did not walk along for weeks as initially planned. Paths
were guided by the informant and always had a clear destination as they were part of the daily routines of the informants. During these moments of interaction with herders, informal discussions on migration routes, landscape changes and narratives on certain frictions concerning access to pasture could take place (Figure 8). Hence, while walking I conducted semi-structured interviews, which were not recorded. After each walk, together with the research assistant, I would summarise the conversation, as well as other interpretations of the walk and the landscape.

Walking along allowed for a different set of questions to be asked, and informants would start talking about things we would see or that would happen along the way. Hence, these moments were great opportunities to learn more about decision-making patterns concerning migration routes; the different terms and concepts used in such decision making, as well as how the landscape is classified based on both location and vegetation and such, is of certain value for mobility with livestock (Wario et al. 2015). While walking along, the herders were pointing at places near and far sketching out the landscape and depicting where routes were leading (Evans and Jones 2011). As such, both the informant, the research assistant and myself created an understanding of the use of the wider landscape, the directions chosen for grazing with certain livestock, the specific classifications made on the landscape and most of all the social relations, rules, rights and boundaries that exist (Anderson 2004). For instance, while walking and crossing dry river beds, I was told that the other side was an area used by a specific clan.
People I walked with would explain to me that that specific clan has prior access rights to the seedpods of the *Ltepes* (*Acacia tortilis*). Also, while walking we discovered abandoned settlements of homesteads and ceremonies.\(^4^5\) I was told why people had chosen to place their homesteads in that specific location – often related to pasture and water – and how they had to negotiate with others in the area for the placement of their settlements. These conversations, while walking and seeing, gave me more insights in rules and regulations regarding movement and settlement (Article I).

Apart from allowing for a wider understanding of the landscape and values given to the landscape through walking interviews (Lee and Ingold 2006), my walking along also allowed me to be accepted by the community. For the Samburu, who walk long distances to schools, markets, meetings and most of all, with their livestock, walking takes a central place in one’s daily life. I was often challenged in my ability to walk long distances, and my velocity while doing so. One of the informants wanted to have a running battle with me in order to ‘measure’ me. Therefore, conducting walking interviews also allowed me to show that I had local skills as I was able to walk under various circumstances. Walking along, then, became more than a way to understand the environment; it became a way to create connections. As Vehrs (8) states, ‘walking becomes an instrument of sharing experiences and creating a shared space’.\(^4^6\) Besides creating connections and helping me understand the wider landscape, walking also enabled me to understand how Samburu ‘do’ livestock mobility: how people and livestock move during a day in search of grazing and/or pasture and how people interact with other herdsmen while being on the move.

**Participant in group discussions and meetings**

In addition to interviews, walking along, and spontaneous group discussions, it was of interest to attend council meetings and other social gatherings in which discussions were held and decisions made. Because I cooperated with Lauren Evans from Space For Giants, I was allowed to participate (as an independent researcher) in the meetings of the Laikipia Grazing Task
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\(^4^5\) Abandoned homesteads, *murua* in Samburu, show signs of temporary settlement. Often the thorned Acacia fences still surround the former homestead area showing livestock divisions. The *murua* no longer has standing structures – as people take the material to construct houses along when moving to another place – but it is clear that people resided there. Often, while moving with livestock, *lmurran* will use the *muruai* (pl.) to set up their temporary cattle camps.

Force.47 I had joined various official meetings between county governments, NGOs and other key decision makers within the landscape. An example of this is the two meetings48 organised by the Food and Agriculture organisation (FAO), where the County Governments of Marsabit, Samburu, Isiolo and Laikipia were represented and discussed the transboundary landscape use by pastoralists and the ‘grazing pressure’. During these two-day meetings, various representatives presented their role and position in relation to the ‘grazing pressure’ in Laikipia. I also attended group discussions49 with Maasai pastoralists in two Laikipia community conservancies50 organised by the Laikipia Grazing Task Force on grazing management, perceptions of conservancies and current frictions and conflicts in Naibunga and Il Ngwesi community conservancies. Within these discussions, all attendants were made aware of my role as a researcher and my topic of investigation.

Being a participant at the FAO County Government meetings turned out to be very interesting.51 During these meetings, there were open discussions on the grazing issue in Laikipia as the desired output set in the meeting was ‘to get a clear roadmap towards sustainable natural resources management, organised grazing and access to resources within and/or between the four counties’.52 Structured around presentations given by government officials, community representatives and NGO employees, there was ample time for questions leading to interesting discussions. The recommendations, as followed from the deliberations during the meeting, included the need to come up with a coordinated and unified inter-county system to manage and organise grazing, preferably lead by the Northern Rangelands Trust. These

47 The Laikipia Grazing Task Force (LGTF) was a task force composed of representatives of Northern Rangelands Trust (NRT), Northern Rangelands Trust-Trading (NRT-T), Laikipia Wildlife Forum (LWF), Space For Giants (SFG), and a private consultant.
48 The first meeting: Eighty nine participants from Isiolo, Laikipia, Marsabit & Samburu Counties attended an EU-SHARE funded stakeholder meeting on Natural Resource Management (NRM) and grazing management convened in Nanyuki on the 9th & 10th of September 2015. Participants included community representatives, the Deputy Governor of Samburu, CEC’s from line Ministries, CO’s, Ward Administrators, directors from various County Government Ministries, Managers of Conservancies, NGO’s, NRT, KWS, NDMA and FAO. The second meeting: Community conservancies and NRM in Isiolo County Isiolo, Tuesday, 18th and Wednesday, 19th August 2015.
49 These discussions were termed Focus Group Discussions by the LGTF. However, the FGDs were used as a group interview by the moderator (Jakobsen 2012).
50 Ilngwesi & Lekurruki Conservancy members April 23rd 2015 and Naibunga Conservancy members April 30th 2015.
51 Aims set by FAO were to: discuss the current situation and approaches to Natural Resource Management and Grazing: discuss best practices and constraints; identify the future of livestock and range management: discuss the way ahead in terms of livestock mobility, migration, conservation, range and access to grazing resources.
meetings gave me a detailed understanding of how the more powerful actors think about and plan for pastoralist grazing and mobility (Article II).

The group discussions organised by the Laikipia Grazing Task Force with community conservancy members tended to ‘simply replicate interactions between researcher and interviewee on a group scale’ (Jakobsen 2012, 113). Both group discussions were well attended ‘comprising of equitable representation’, yet especially leading elders were gradually chosen as representative to speak for the rest of the group. The aim of the discussions was to obtain background information and viewpoints from Laikipia Maasai on Samburu pastoralists who had arrived on community land in Laikipia to access pastures. The discussion turned emotive at times, especially when participants expressed their discontent with various organisations showing up and asking the community questions while promising to solve their problems:

NRT has been here, Laikipia Wildlife Foundation has been here. All the time when there is a problem, they write papers. Is it [the case that] what they write, never reaches anywhere? Are you another government to solve this problem? Because this is just making us tired (Il Ngwesi elder, 2015).54

The discussion moved further towards an explanation of events in relation to Samburu pastoralists arriving on community land in Laikipia. Although termed a focus group discussion, participants did not have the opportunity to discuss the matter, as the main focus was to answer the questions as posed by the moderator. Both the explanations of the events that happened regarding the Samburu herders, as given by the participants of these group discussions, as well as how the discussion evolved, provided me with useful insights. The discussions showed the interaction between the different actors participating in the meetings, and the expectations that came to exist. These insights form an important part of the background to Article III.

Documents and media

Besides collecting information during fieldwork based on semi-structured interviews, walking along, and participating in various meetings and focus group discussions, I also collected a wide variety of official and unofficial documents during the course of this PhD project. These documents include maps, reports, presentations, news articles, social media posts, plans, laws, bills, acts and surveys.

These documents served to provide both the context of the research area and the understanding of the social, political and economic processes.

54 Il Ngwesi & Lekurruki Conservancy members April 23rd 2015.
involved in relation to pastoral mobility in general, and Samburu mobility and community conservation in particular. Additionally, I used some of the documents gathered to gain further knowledge on how different actors ‘talk’ about grazing and conservation in the Ewaso region. Some examples are: ‘The Guide to Establishing Community Conservancies – the NRT Model’\(^55\) (Article II); Laikipia Grazing Reports\(^56\) (Article III); presentations given by government and conservation actors during the county government meeting organised by the FAO (2015) (Article II); and The Trespass Act\(^57\) (Article III). Furthermore, I examined rainfall data from the Survey of Kenya, and maps and reports from the Samburu County Government – Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Livestock on the livestock economy, diseases, stock routes and maps (Article I and II). Most of these reports have been used as background information.

In relation to the conflict in Laikipia, media sources were of significance as the media was an important means whereby the conflict was communicated. Some expressed their viewpoints in social media such as Twitter, Instagram and Facebook with the user-names: ‘LaikipiaLandInvasions’,\(^58\) and ‘thisislaikipia_thetruth’.\(^59\) Samburu and Laikipia pastoralist friends mainly used Facebook and WhatsApp as social media platforms to communicate and express their opinions; however, I was not always allowed in these, often closed, groups. I informed myself using the social media sources as a way to be in touch with how different people talk about the conflicts, and how the conflict evolved. Kenyan and international newspapers also served as an important source of secondary data, especially in relation to the Laikipia grazing conflict (Article III and IV). Even if I did not analyse these media sources and documents directly, they served as important background information.
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\(^{55}\) King, J., T. Lalampaa, I. Craig and M. Harrison 2015. A Guide to Establishing Community Conservancies – the NRT Model. NRT, Isiolo. [https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5653e896e4b0a689b3fada97/t/56b84a0707eaa046d4e7d0f8/1454918248931/AGuidetoEstablishingCommunityConservancies_Final_SinglePages_LowRes.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5653e896e4b0a689b3fada97/t/56b84a0707eaa046d4e7d0f8/1454918248931/AGuidetoEstablishingCommunityConservancies_Final_SinglePages_LowRes.pdf).

\(^{56}\) Space For Giants 2015.


\(^{58}\) ‘Twitter, stating “Illegal land invaders in laikipia are destroying wildlife, livelihoods and property. Urge the Government of Kenya to put a stop to this.”’

\(^{59}\) Instagram and Twitter, stating “Welcome to @ThisIsLaikipia. Watch this space for truthful and relevant information about Laikipia.”
Analysis of data

Data gathered during fieldwork consisted mainly of recorded interviews, field notes, and observations. I documented the notes made during the interviews in notebooks, as well as notes from informal conversations and observation. Alone or together with a research assistant, I transcribed the recorded interviews (conducted in Samburu and Isiolo) in English. I sorted interviews based on land use and land ownership in relation to each study site. Manually, I mapped out livestock movements, and places of struggle and conflict. I structured the grazing arrangements in Laikipia using excel. I analysed qualitative data using a manual coding system where I used coloured pencils to identify processes, narratives and strategies. Moreover, I adapted a narrative analysis based on themes that emerged during fieldwork, interviews, observations, conversations as well as during transcribing and coding. By triangulating notes, interviews and observations between the study sites and research participants, I reconstructed narratives on interactions, cooperation, struggle and conflict between the different actors. Access to land, land control, livestock movements, illegal grazing, grazing arrangements, grazing management and community conservancies were central themes in the coding process.

Research assistants

I chose to work with research assistants due to my lack of knowledge of both Swahili and Samburu languages. This, obviously, has a significant influence on the outcomes of the research as part of the process of knowledge production. The interactions during an interview are subjected to and loaded with power relations between interpreter-informant, informant-researcher and researcher-interpreter (Watson 2004; Temple and Young 2004; Deane and Stevano 2016). In order to create a bridge of connection, I followed Swahili lessons and invested a significant amount of time to learn the basics of the Samburu language all throughout my stay, particularly focusing on the vocabulary related to the topic of this research. I did not, however, become fluent in either of the languages. Hence, prior to starting the fieldwork I discussed comprehensively with each research assistant the topic of research and objectives of the interviews. We discussed the topic-list of the interview and conducted pilot interviews. After each interview during fieldwork, I would spend time with the research assistant to review the content of the interview and ask for clarifications in order to more deeply understand the context and what the research informant conveyed.

This research was authorised by the National Museums of Kenya. In order to conduct research in the five locations, I announced my presence to the local chief by presenting the research permit and explaining my affiliations to the National Museums of Kenya as well as Stockholm
University so that my presence was officially acknowledged. The respective research assistant would join me in these meetings.

Since I was working in three different regions, I cooperated with three different research assistants. In Laikipia, on the Maasai group ranches and ‘abandoned lands’, I mostly worked with Timothy Ole Larpei from the Maasai community. Most often you will find Timothy in the remote areas of northern Kenya conversing with elders, women and the youth on different legal issues. Timothy is referred to as ‘wakili’ (Swahili for lawyer) by both young and old, as he has finalised a graduate diploma in Environmental Law and a post-graduate diploma for the Advocates Training Programme. Timothy spends most of his time doing voluntary lawyering by helping pastoralist communities overcome the legal hurdles in the criminal justice systems in Kenya. He is currently helping communities transit from group ranches into community land under the new Community Land Act. He also helps pastoralist communities lodge historical land injustices complaints with the National Land Commission.

Also in Laikipia and Isiolo, I worked together with Daniel Lentipo from the Samburu community, who used to be an elephant researcher at the NGOs Space for Giants and Save the Elephants. He has a long history of working with communities that surround private wildlife conservancies. For the second fieldwork phase in Samburu, I worked with Daniel Lenkaina from Lekiji, Sesia. Daniel was an lmurrani himself while we were carrying out our research. He was a very important gatekeeper as we could draw upon this strong network of lmurran because of his own position (Turner 2010; Mandel 2003). Daniel is pursuing a bachelor of commerce (BCOM) at Kenya Methodist University in Meru, and currently works as village administrator of Sesia village in Samburu County. His work is to administer county functions at the village unit and act as contact person between the county government and the community.

All the interviews were conducted in the first language of the informants and the research assistants. Each research assistant knew, and was known in, the respective locations where we conducted interviews either because he was a resident of the area, or because of previous work experience with the communities. Initially, during interviews, the research assistants sometimes filtered my questions or tended to answer the question themselves. Being from pastoralist communities and from the specific areas, it was often the case that the research assistant would already know the answer to my questions or wanted to share his opinion with me. Clearly, the role of the research assistant in the community, as well as his or her views and opinions about social and political processes, play a role in how interviews are conducted, interpreted and translated (Turner 2010). Although the views of each research assistant were very interesting to me, I needed to make sure that the answers of the informants were also clearly conveyed during the interviews. This was sometimes further complicated when the research participant would question the research assistant ‘why are you asking this,
you know this already’. At the same time, by being insiders, the research assistants were of major importance and help during the fieldwork. It enabled a quick establishment of trust towards me and opened up doors that otherwise would not have been accessible. Furthermore, the assistants’ familiarity with the people allowed for their awareness of the issues at stake, relations between people, and related struggles, as well as mediating my position. As such, the role of the research assistant was provided invaluable assistance (Edwards 2013; Sanjek 1993).

**Reflexivity**

In research, there is a high need for reflexivity both during data gathering as well as when writing up qualitative research (Robson 1997; Sultana 2007; Faria and Mollett 2016). This is true for the research I conducted as well. My presence, as a white researcher from Stockholm University, influenced the roles and relations between me (the researcher) and the research assistants/research participants. These roles and relations had an influence on the daily processes and outcomes of the interviews, but also on my interpretation and presentation of the interviews (England 1994). Being a white European researcher with many privileges, and with limited Swahili and Samburu skills, there were various ongoing processes constructing ‘the other’ (Said 1978; Faria and Mollett 2016). In this section I will shortly discuss reflections that I made during the field and while writing up (Twyman et al. 1999; McCabe and Holmes 2009).

**Positionality**

Whiteness, as argued by Lopez (2005), continues to ‘reflect the values of the colonial regime’ (13), maintaining its desirable status (ibid.). Being in an area where wildlife and biodiversity conservation plays an important role, conservation in general continues to have a strong colonial character and is directly linked to being white (Garland 2008; van den Akker 2016; Fox 2018). Especially the Laikipia highlands, also referred to as the ‘White Highlands’, there is a long history of white foreigners arriving in the region for a variety of purposes. This started with colonial settlement for ranching, followed by post-colonial land purchases for conservation, tourists visiting the private conservation areas to admire ‘pristine natures’ and wilderness (Neumann 2002), and young volunteers supporting various ‘development’ projects. Hence, white people are associated with conservation, flows of money for tourism, conservation and development, which might benefit people in the area, but which might also be seen as sources of competition for natural resources in the area. As the research I carried out took place at the intersection of natural resource use by pastoralists, and conservation
mostly by white Kenyans and (white) foreigners, a certain fear and anger towards me was expressed in different ways at different points in time.

Being white in Samburu, I needed to show that my intentions were not to start a conservation project and thereby take land away from grazing. Additionally, as conservation is often directed towards certain ‘charismatic species’ (Adams 2017), people feared I came to protect the cheetah, which is a major source of concern for livestock keepers as they intend to chase goats. Hence, I and the respective research assistant had established a procedure of introducing ourselves when meeting people either along the way or specifically for an interview. In this introduction, we clearly stated the objective of my presence and the interview. This information, then, could lead to informed consent as well as refusal to take part in an interview. The introduction often helped to clarify what we were doing and in most cases people were willing to talk to us.

In Laikipia and Isiolo – where I conducted interviews in areas bordering private ranches and/or conservancies – my whiteness was directly linked to land ownership and conservation. For example, I was repeatedly asked during an interview at the border of a private conservancy if I could please take the lions back home with me so that these private conservation areas could be used by pastoralists for grazing. There were occasions where people did not want to be interviewed by me. Being white in an area where most of the grazing is accessed on land that is either owned or managed by a white person made some respondents suspicious towards me, fearing that I was a daughter or a sister of the person in charge. We decided to overcome this in two ways. First, I would approach people through my research assistant who had his own cattle with family members grazing by night in the private ranches. Through his network I was accepted by his family and friends, which created an opening and trust between us. Secondly, I chose a place where the lmurrany would water their animals, further away from the ranches and conservancies; in these places there seemed to be less tension and my existence was more easily accepted and less challenged. It turned out to be important to conduct the interviews further away from the place where they were grazing by night, especially as many of the informants were suspicious on the intentions of the interview. In addition, due to the highly sensitive nature of the issues discussed, including the potential illegality of some grazing activities, anonymity was crucial. Therefore, I did not record full names. We explained to the informants that transcripts and recordings will be stored anonymously.

Apart from being white, I am also a woman. Being a white woman doing research among cattle herders influenced the research in various ways (Golde 1970; Bell et al. 2013). In most cases, I was not generally seen as being a threat and people were willing to talk to us. Interactions with the lmurrany, who have strong cultural rules regarding interactions with women, had to be negotiated by the elders. As stated earlier, Daniel Lenkaina was an lmurrany himself during our fieldwork, which was key to my access to the
*lmurran*. This connection proved of vital importance (Mandel 2003). Not only was he able to introduce me to them, he also enabled the conversation to happen and took an important position in negotiating my presence and identity (Turner 2010). Even though *lmurran* are not supposed to consume food and beverage in front of women, there were moments when my gender was negotiated by the key elders and I was allowed to be present, up to the point that the *lmurran* were joking and considered me to be an *lmurrani* so that they could enjoy their tea during my presence. It was interesting that my gender could be negotiated and that, even though I was a woman, I could talk with people and access places that would otherwise be unapproachable.60

I already mentioned earlier that the use of the car was of benefit in moving over long distances but also in giving rides to people and their livestock, which allowed me to establish a different kind of relation and have different kinds of conversations. Besides all the beneficial sides of having a car at my disposal, such as giving rides to markets and hospitals in times of need, there were also downsides to it regarding the reproduction of differences. First, the car played a significant role in the construction of me as a privileged white outsider, which maintained colonial power relations of ‘a strong ‘rich-poor’ differential between the researcher and the researched’ (Robson 1997, 67; Lopez 2005). Secondly, the car that I was using was a specific blue car, the same car and colour used by the government authority in charge of the electricity line in Samburu. This electricity line is highly contested since the residents in Samburu where the line will be constructed demand compensation, something that the Kenyan government promised but no longer acknowledges. As a result, certain people thought I represented the government, which shaped their expectations of a specific role on my side. It made people speeding up to go home when they saw the car passing by, assuming that a meeting would be held that they did not want to miss.

**Reciprocity**

While being in the field, informants repeatedly asked how I could contribute to bringing grass to the dryer areas and provide solutions to existing conflicts. Although I could not provide the solutions, we promised to compile the obtained information in a booklet with the most relevant research results for the Sesia region, Samburu County (Figure 9). As such, the booklet allowed me to report back, share and communicate some of my findings (Moseley 2007; Årlin et al. 2015). The booklet includes maps, photos, historical pathways of grazing management and current practices as well as challenges related to grazing and mobility. The focus of the booklet is Lekiji in Sesia.

---

60 I conducted a considerable number of interviews with women. However, especially in Samburu I participated in daily cattle herding and food events with *lmurran*. 

---

67
Figure 9. Front and back cover of the dissemination booklet distributed to primarily schools and research participants in Lekiji - Sesia. (Pas Schrijver, Annemiek and Daniel Lenkaina 2017).

I had the booklet printed in English and distributed among the schools in the Sesia sub-location. I had chosen schools for distribution in accordance with key informants from the area and teachers of the schools. They informed me that they preferred a written text in English. They stated that school children, who also learn to read and write in English, would be good receivers of the booklet.\(^{61}\)

---

\(^{61}\) Most of the research participants were illiterate. I would have liked to present my findings in a more audio-visual form in order to make them accessible. Due to various constraints, I did not manage to do so during the course of my PhD. The booklet was therefore chosen as a way to bring the results back to the field. They would be kept at the schools and used for teaching. Research participants later informed me that some of the school children had told them about the content of the book.
In this section, I provide a brief summary of each article on which this thesis is based. Each article builds on empirical and theoretical work carried out during the course of the PhD research. Although the emphasis in each of the four articles is on one or two research questions, there is also overlap, as all articles are based on the wider interconnected landscape of resource users and uses, as well as conservation futures. All articles contribute to the overall understanding of current patterns of livestock mobility and access, and the transformations therein, in relation to the new pastoral commons in the Ewaso region (Figure 10).

The order of the articles is based on one of the many mobility patterns followed by Samburu pastoralists. Starting with Article I, I explore the current patterns of access and control over resources in relation to pastoral mobility, as well as the shifts and transformations towards new rules of access. Findings show that the principle of reciprocal access to pasture between pastoralists is giving way to conditional access based on membership of more formal, territory-based institutions such as the community conservancy. This article focuses on Lekiji, Sesis. In Article II, we discuss the large-scale implementation of the Northern Rangelands Trust (NRT) community conservancies in northern Kenya. The paper focuses on Meibae conservancy in Samburu County and Songa, Jaldesa, Shurr conservancies in Marsabit County. We analyse, through the concept of the boundary object, how so many groups despite their different interests accepted these conservancies so quickly. This article also explores in more detail the spatial and territorial effects of conservancies on livestock mobility and access to resources. In Article III, I describe the grazing arrangement for accessing private property in Laikipia. In this article, I specifically focus on the process of Samburu pastoralists arriving in Laikipia in search of pasture, and how this transforms existing grazing arrangements into something more disciplinary in nature. Article IV builds on the conflicts described in Article III. In Article IV, we zoom in on the case of a public-private conservation alliance and how conflicts, following their own internal logic, interrelate and steer the relations between multiple actors.
Figure 10. Diagram illustrating the relations between the four articles and the study sites. The numbers shown in the map represent the four articles. (Source: modified from Figure 1).
Article I


This article is a contribution to a special issue on changing livelihoods under climate change. I conceptualise pastoral mobility as vital and the most effective strategy to make use of constantly shifting resources. However, mobile pastoralism as a highly-valued strategy to manage grazing areas and exploit resource variability is becoming more complex, due to recurrent droughts, loss of forage, government-led settlement schemes, and enclosure of land for community conservation, among other reasons. In this article, I seek to understand how Samburu pastoralists in the drylands of northern Kenya use and govern natural resources, how livestock grazing and mobility is planned for, and how boundaries and territory are constructed and performed both within and beyond the context of (non)governmental projects. More specifically, I provide a comprehensive picture of current patterns of access and control over resources ‘at home’ from the viewpoint of Samburu pastoralists residing in Lekiji, Sesia (Samburu). In addition, I highlight the shifts and transformations towards new rules of access while practicing mobility. Findings show that, although access was previously generated based on the value of reciprocity, the creation of new forms of resource management results in conditional processes of inclusion and exclusion based on membership of more formal, territory-based institutions. Livestock mobility, then, involves longer periods and more complex distances due to both a shrinking resource base and these new rules of access. Opportunities to support institutions that promote mobility have been given insufficient attention, as policy and project interventions have historically been driven by the imperative to secure land tenure and improve pasture in bounded areas.

Article II

Pas, Annemiek and Elizabeth E. Watson. “Community Conservancies as Boundary Objects: Alliances, Dissonances and Spatial Formations in Northern Kenya.”

In this article, we conceptualise the implementation of community conservancies, which are established in northern Kenya in association with

---
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Northern Rangelands Trust (NRT), as a ‘boundary object’. The concept of boundary object provides an entry point for explaining how so many groups have so rapidly and quickly adopted the conservancies despite their different interests. In this article, we explore the visions of community conservancies as held by a diversity of actors and their interests, starting with more powerful actors such as NRT, county governments, large-scale landowners and donors. We further demonstrate, by drawing on two case studies of community conservancy-making in northern Kenya, how community conservancies ‘touch down’ on the ground in particular places, and how they are understood and experienced by pastoralists. By discussing the alliances and dissonances, we identify tensions that may be overlooked in the process, and highlight the significance of the spatial dimensions of conservancies.

For the donors, the community conservancies are a way to improve resilience, development, security and biodiversity. For some of the large-scale landowners, the community conservancies represent a means to protect the wildlife on which a large part of their livelihood depends, as well as a form of governance that could prevent the incursion of livestock herders, whom they feel will otherwise keep pressurising their borders. For the county governments, or at least most of them, NRT is a valuable source of expertise, a means to get something done relatively quickly, and a valuable conduit to investors and donor funds, at a time when they are in the process of becoming established. For the pastoralists, the NRT community conservancies are a source of investment, employment, transportation, security, and hopefully of a share of revenues. Perhaps most of all, they are a way to secure claims to land that may otherwise be claimed by others.

What exists on paper is a standardised ideal of community conservancies as institutions that enable inter-group communication, sharing of resources and mobility across areas, which are accepted and important parts of pastoralist resilience and peace in the region. In practice, however, the institution is increasingly interpreted – by pastoralists in particular – as a means through which certain groups can obtain and secure access to land. We argue that the conservancies have the potential to become just another means through which the drylands are being enclosed by people (pastoralists) in conjunction with the other actors (NRT, county government, donors etc.).

Article III

Pas, Annemiek. “Cattle for Control: Grazing and Governmentality in Laikipia, Kenya.”

In this article, I offer an in-depth analysis of the creation and evolution of access through grazing arrangements to private pastures by pastoralists in
Laikipia, Kenya. Using a governmentality approach to frame the analysis, I address how the grazing arrangement is employed in various ways to mediate the relationship between landowners and pastoralists. Drawing on fieldwork in several locations, I demonstrate how grazing arrangements came into being as a means to solve ‘illegal grazing’ in large-scale and highly valued ranching and conservation areas while simultaneously securing private tenure. The article continues by discussing the shifting conditions of the grazing arrangement. Starting with granting access to Maasai and Samburu pastoralists (‘resident’ neighbours to the large-scale landholdings) through a process of responsibilisation, the grazing arrangements transformed to function as a buffer zone to keep Samburu pastoralists from further afield away from private land. I argue that, while these arrangements make private property in Laikipia dynamic and open to the flexibility inherent to common property traditions, they also enable for exclusion as an endeavour for spatial control. In doing so, the conduct of pastoralists is directed to be compatible with the goals and objectives defined by the ranch and conservancy managers (and external authorities). Nevertheless, illicit grazing on private land – by night or even during the day – continues to be a common practice, which shows that the grazing arrangements do not exert total control over pastoralists. Consequently, there has been a return to more coercive and authoritative measures. Exclusionary measures such as fences and armed patrols and punitive methods such as impounding cattle are all means of attempting to shape inflexible relations with neighbouring communities, making it likely that conflicts will return.

Article IV


In this article, we contribute to the debate on the multidimensional nature of resource-based conflicts in political ecology by building upon Luhmann's Social Systems Theory. We conceptualise conflicts as particular kinds of discourses that emerge, exist and change, partly through their interrelations with other conflict discourses. Drawing on the case of Loisaba conservancy, northern Laikipia (Kenya), we studied the persistent and shifting nature of conflicts as well as their dependencies on other conflicts in and around Loisaba conservancy. Decades of more or less peaceful regional co-existence with neighbouring ranches and community conservation areas has recently transformed into conflictual, sometimes even violent, situations. These conflict dynamics in northern Kenya are commonly addressed in the media or (academic) literature in terms of their potential causes such as
climate change, overpopulation, landscape degradation, resource scarcity, lack of government, or elections in Kenya. In this article, we demonstrate that the persistency and dynamics of conflicts affect the dynamics of other conflicts. We argue that the nature of conflicts makes them difficult to manage or fully comprehend. This suggests that no single actor has clear agency to steer its developments, nor can we trace a clear linear historical development given the complex triggering of conflicts. That conflicts relate to wider societal change is nothing new. However, by emphasising their interdependency with other conflicts, we contribute to a further understanding of how conflicts become structured by, or help structure, socio-material change.
Synthesis

This study presents a case of shifting rules of access and control of livestock resources, the spatial effects of large-scale community conservancy implementation, and two contemporary case studies that relate the re-assertion of the commons to conflict in northern Kenya. The four articles address the research objectives from different empirical areas and theoretical viewpoints. In Article I, guided by the first research question on how Samburu access and control natural resources, I set the stage by introducing grazing management and resources government in Sesia, Samburu. Here, I employ concepts of institutions, access and control in order to identify past and present regulations regarding the governance of grazing and mobility. I approach Sesia as a ‘home’ area where grazing institutions are at work. Over time, waves and legacies of frontier processes have led to multiple complex and overlapping tenure systems that regulate access as a combination of historical pastoral institutions (e.g. lokere) and (post)colonial state interventions (e.g. grazing schemes). Importantly, new rules of access regarding ‘home’ grazing institutions have been formed, which affect reciprocal access rights in relation to pastoral mobility. This occurs not only in Sesia but, based on empirical evidence, throughout the lowlands of Samburu (Article II). Hence, while increasing droughts and the loss of grazing resources force pastoralists, along with their livestock, to try and access grazing further afield for longer periods, these distances become more complex. Access to pastures and water has to be negotiated as multiple boundaries are crossed. Whereas processes of inclusion and exclusion used to follow the pastoral logic of reciprocity, or ‘open access’ (Moritz 2016), access is currently based on an increasingly complex set of interactions and relations. Furthermore, as recurrent droughts and livestock losses continue, herders are turning to areas beyond their social networks, crossing private property boundaries without permission to access pastures, which leads to increased struggle and conflict (Article III and IV). Within these overlapping spaces, processes of inclusion and exclusion continue to be exercised according to varying rules and regulations. Although the conceptual

63 i) To understand how mobility and access are played out; ii) To understand the role of (non)governmental organisations and their projects in the transformation of pastoral livestock mobility and access to resources.

64 How is access to pasture, water and land gained, maintained and controlled by the Samburu, and how is this similar or different to historical patterns of access and control?
approach to describe and explore existing institutions of access and control to grazing resources proved productive, it provided less room to study the processes of struggle over power and authority that is associated with the emergence of such institutions. Especially because these processes delineate stronger connections to a certain place with clear spatial boundaries, and therefore opportunities for struggle are also created (Korf et al. 2015; Sikor and Lund 2009; Ichinkhorloo and Yeh 2016; Pas 2018).

New forms of resource management through territory-based institutions that control access to land are, as discussed in Article I, largely produced by community conservancies. In line with the second research question about how development and conservation interventions shape the practices of pastoral mobility and resource governance, Article II shows the tension between what conservancies offer and what they actually accomplish. We employ the concept of boundary object to show to what extent the actors agree or differ regarding their interests and objectives concerning community conservancies. Furthermore, Article II explores in more detail the role of community conservancies in the spatial process of territorialisation and the enclosure of pastoral areas. We show that conservancy blueprints follow a rigid understanding of spatial boundaries demarcated on the land and link rangeland management and revenues to these bounded spaces and its ‘members’. After implementation, these conservancies have changed the ways in which Samburu pastoralists perceive boundaries and access to resources. This is because, intentionally or unintentionally, local practices have reshaped rules of inclusion and exclusion (Article I and II). We also show in Article II that various forms of exclusion are unfolding: access is provided to ‘good conservancies’, i.e. people from conservancies who actively engage in rangeland management. Conservancies that are not considered active enough are rendered ‘bad conservancies’ by members of other conservancies. Depicting certain areas as ‘bad’ shapes the processes of inclusion and exclusion based on an environmental conditionality. In Marsabit, we also demonstrate how processes of inclusion and exclusion become linked to ethnicity, and therefore ‘harden’ the lines between ethnic territories (Schlee 2013; Watson 2010).

As mentioned, pastoralists are moving increasingly southwards to access pastures for their livestock, partly due to the fading of reciprocal access and community conservancy restrictions (Article I and II). The influx of Samburu pastoralists towards Laikipia, as extensively discussed in Article III, changes the structures of existing arrangements and institutions of access, which enabled ‘settled’ Maasai and Samburu pastoralists to graze ‘legally’ into private property. The changing circumstances, however,
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prompted the reshaping of the grazing arrangement towards the formation of a buffer zone aimed at having the ‘settled’ pastoral population protect, control, and maintain control of the private ranches and conservancies. This is analysed in detail in Article III in response to the second research question on discursive processes in relation to territorial and resource control. As part of the arrangements, those pastoralist communities allowed to graze on private ranches must keep ‘other’ pastoralists out in order to secure their own access. The creation of buffer zones is mainly an attempt by private ranches and conservancies to curtail the ‘large scale invasions’ and ‘forceful incursions’, but also to continue the control of illegal grazing and trespassing by local communities and neighbours. Through an analysis of the evolution of the grazing agreement, I explore various ways in which people’s conduct is steered by adopting a governmentality approach, following Fletcher (2010, 2017). By analysing resource governance as the working of institutions and multiple governmentalities, the results highlight the complex set of rules and regulations that control access to natural resources, as well as the movements and bodies of ‘unruly’ people. Benevolence, paternalism, responsibilisation, conditionality, and coercion are ways in which people are incentivised to make certain decisions or to pre-empt them from doing so. At the same time, however, illicit and night grazing continued and worsened in some periods, showing the limitations of exercising power through combined forms of governmentality, as enacted by different actors (Fletcher 2010; Johnsen and Benjaminsen 2017). Hence, the use of multiple governmentalities to analyse grazing arrangements in Laikipia and its outcomes was fruitful in that it enabled me to study struggles over power and control beyond the institutional level. This overcame the limitation that I touched upon earlier in this section regarding Article I. Article III therefore concludes that institutions regulating and controlling access to resources are a technology of government.

Following the same topic as Article III, Article IV conceptualises conflicts as discourses that have ‘a life of their own’. By identifying different conflicts at work, we not only relate conflicts to other events in society, but also to other conflicts: the dynamics that occur in one conflict-discourse influence other conflicts. The different ways in which conflicts relate and influence each other are further explored in the article. We approached the various conflicts and their interdependencies by applying the Social Systems theory by Luhmann (1995; 2013), which supported the characterisation of the relations between conflicts. Although not new, we argue that viewing conflicts as discourses is of major importance when considering ways to solve them, which often provide fuel for conflicts to endure, or to return. I believe it is valuable to see conflicts as discourses offering insights as to why and how they persist, however, I also believe that the approach of studying conflicts’ interdependencies entails a lack of attention to the role of power in discourses and the often uneven outcomes of conflicts and interventions.
Although seemingly different, these processes of the increased influx of pastoralists towards Laikipia, and the establishment of community conservancies, are interlinked. As we discuss in Article II, the implementation of conservancies on community land can be seen as the formation of a buffer zone. The members of community conservancies are subjected to environmental education intended to alter mind-sets so that they ultimately manage and control ‘their’ conservancy in a proper manner. As such, they are expected to actively engage in ‘better’ rangeland management and have more grazing resources available, which aims at reducing the need for livestock mobility. Furthermore, the establishment of a conservancy will steer the community towards controlling their land and resisting non-members with their livestock. Obviously, the establishment of community conservancies is related to another set of processes and dynamics as well. As Li (2007, 7) states, ‘the identification of a problem is intimately linked to the availability of a solution’. The assemblage of landowners, conservationists, (inter)national conservation NGOs, donors and governments, are as powerful actors maintaining a discursive authority when it comes to conservation. The establishment of community conservancies is justified by narratives of poor land management by pastoralists, in combination with insecurity in the region and a general perceived need for development. As such, community conservancies embrace a more technocratic and ‘modern’ vision of pastoralism and rangeland management, with strong assumptions about productive land use and management while creating areas in which both people and the land can be supervised and controlled (Morton 2010). This allows NRT, the State – through local governments – and private conservationists to make people compatible with their conservation objectives and practices, while submitting pastoralists to disciplinary tactics of control (Regassa et al. 2018). Furthermore, conservancies, in clearly defined territories, aim to bring economic development and security through wildlife and nature conservation. These are thus actually highly politicised forms of spatial administration used to control mobile pastoralists and their practices. The conservancy approach, as such, clearly undermines the need for pastoral mobility to make effective use of the fluctuating resources. For various reasons, despite the risk of being punished, many pastoralists decide to cross these conservation ‘territories’ – both communal and private – to access resources, even if this means exclusion from future resource use and the threat of being punished. Hence, the attempts at territorialisation through fences, grazing arrangements and community conservancies has only been partially successful as means to control people and resources. Illicit grazing by day or night, as a form of counter-power, is an everyday manifestation of these projects and demonstrates that people cannot simply be ‘controlled’ according to plan.
Conclusion

Pastoral mobility is seen as the most effective strategy to make use of constantly shifting resources. In northern Kenya, mobile pastoralism as a highly-valued strategy to manage grazing areas and exploit resource variability is becoming more complex. Policy and project implementation has historically been driven by the imperative to secure land tenure and improve pasture in bounded areas through State-led territorial settlement schemes. Relatively recently, increased (inter)national interests in nature and wildlife conservation on community land in the northern regions see conservation and development as crucial and urgent requirements for stimulating economic growth and security in pastoralists areas.

This study presents the case of Samburu pastoral mobility within the context of such shifting social and environmental circumstances. It focuses on changing rules of access and control of livestock resources. These transformations are analysed in the context of the large-scale establishment of community conservancies and what role these conservancies play in the actual use and transformation of space for pastoralists. Empirically, this thesis is based on a total of eighteen months of fieldwork, including semi-structured interviews and observations in Samburu, Isiolo and Laikipia. It demonstrates how the principal of reciprocal access to pasture between pastoralists is giving way to conditional access based on membership of more formal, territory-based institutions such as community conservancies. It further shows how access to private land may be open for negotiation through the formation of grazing arrangements, which are also used to control pastoralists’ movements beyond enclosed land. In spite of a rhetoric acknowledging the multiple benefits of livestock mobility, these policies and processes entail a continuation of past policy and project implementation as prescriptions still revolve around conservation enclosures and settlement politics.

The thesis argues that, in the Ewaso region, processes of government to steer and regulate the behaviour of people, have shown to be interacting closely with the ordering and re-ordering of socio-natural relations in this contested space. Space is controlled by steering the movements of individuals, groups of people and livestock, albeit in more or less subtle ways, in the name of conservation. Yet, the study does not merely represent spaces of control, as various dynamics to counter and reshape processes of government are multiple. The shifting rules of access to resources, the
acceptance of community conservancies, and night grazing on private property, as articulations of resistance, are not merely a result of (post)colonial policies and practices gradually changing resource governance and territories through processes of government. Instead, they are also the results of the interpretation and implementation by pastoralists and their strategies to reach their own goals. The thesis concludes that, at finer scales, such processes of territoriality are likely to produce unexpected and potentially disappointing outcomes, while struggle and conflict persist.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sesia Lekiji</th>
<th>Nalare Lebarasheriki</th>
<th>Koija</th>
<th>P&amp;D and Kirimu</th>
<th>Karashira</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Samburu</td>
<td>Isiolo</td>
<td>Laikipia</td>
<td>Laikipia</td>
<td>Laikipia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Tenure</td>
<td>Group Ranch</td>
<td>Former Trust Land, in process of becoming Community Land</td>
<td>Group Ranch</td>
<td>P&amp;D: Private land Kirimu: Public (Government) Land</td>
<td>Private land owned by absentee smallholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Status</td>
<td>Communal used</td>
<td>Community used</td>
<td>Community Used</td>
<td>P&amp;D: Individual plots commually used</td>
<td>'Abandoned land'; community used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Communities</td>
<td>Samburu</td>
<td>Samburu, Rendille, Laikipia Maasai</td>
<td>Laikipia Maasai, Samburu</td>
<td>Samburu, Pokot, Turkana, Kikuyu, Laikipia Maasai</td>
<td>Samburu, Laikipia Maasai, Kikuyu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of land owners, users, shareholders (approx.)</td>
<td>8,763 registered administratively; 405 registered members of the group ranch (2015)</td>
<td>1,200 residents (2015)</td>
<td>2,500 residents (2015)</td>
<td>12,000 residents; 6,000 in P&amp;D and 6,000 in Kirimu (2015)</td>
<td>4,000; 1,000 Kikuyu, 3,000 Samburu and Maasai of which 50 title deed holders (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Land Use</td>
<td>Pastoralist grazing, one agricultural plot</td>
<td>Pastoralist grazing, agriculture to some degree in towns near boreholes and along Ewoso river</td>
<td>Pastoralist grazing, agriculture to some degree along Ewoso river, tourism</td>
<td>Pastoralist grazing</td>
<td>Pastoralist grazing, agriculture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex B1. Schematic overview of field methods (Phase 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method used</th>
<th>Research participant</th>
<th># Semi-structured interviews</th>
<th># Group interviews (≤6 participants)</th>
<th># Focus group discussions (≥10 participants)</th>
<th># Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owners and managers of private ranches and conservancies</td>
<td>10 owners</td>
<td>10 men</td>
<td>1 pastor</td>
<td>10 men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smallholder farmers on abandoned land</td>
<td>11 managers</td>
<td>6 men</td>
<td>2 women</td>
<td>6 men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government authorities</td>
<td>all men, age 40-76</td>
<td>4 men</td>
<td>2 women</td>
<td>4 men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lakiopia</td>
<td>1 man</td>
<td>1 man</td>
<td>1 woman</td>
<td>1 man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[II] Nearest Lokururu group ranches, Lakiopia</td>
<td>6 elders</td>
<td>6 elders</td>
<td>3 junior elders</td>
<td>6 elders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Settlements on &quot;abandoned land&quot; in Lakiopia</td>
<td>6 elders</td>
<td>6 elders</td>
<td>3 junior elders</td>
<td>6 elders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGOs, Trusts and other key informants</td>
<td>15 Tourism</td>
<td>15 Tourism</td>
<td>15 Tourism</td>
<td>15 Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method used</td>
<td># Semi-structured interviews</td>
<td># Group interviews (3-6 participants)</td>
<td># Focus group discussions (10-15 participants)</td>
<td># Walking interviews</td>
<td># Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lekiké, Sería</strong></td>
<td>22 imurrán*, age 18-30</td>
<td>4: imurrán</td>
<td>1: imurrán, women and elders</td>
<td>4 imurrán</td>
<td>2: NRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 elders, age 31-86</td>
<td>1: women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1: electricity line committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 women, age 25-55</td>
<td>3: elders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1: county government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (sub)chiefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 key-informants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nalure</strong></td>
<td>5 elders, age 40-60</td>
<td>2: imurrán</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 imurrán</td>
<td>1: peace meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 imurrán, age 18-30</td>
<td>1: elders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1: County gathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (sub) chiefs</td>
<td>2: women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: NRT meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 key-informants</td>
<td>1: elders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 women, age 21-60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Koilé</strong></td>
<td>4 imurrán, age 18-30</td>
<td>1: group ranch committee</td>
<td>1: Latipia Grazing Task Force</td>
<td>2 imurrán</td>
<td>1: group ranch meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 women, age 25-55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1: NRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 key-informants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 chief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kiriman and P&amp;D</strong></td>
<td>5 elders, age 32-59</td>
<td>2: imurrán</td>
<td>2 imurrán</td>
<td>1: peace meeting</td>
<td>1: NRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 imurrán, age 18-30</td>
<td>1: group ranch committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 women, age 24-63</td>
<td>1: elders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 chief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 ex-councillor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 key-informants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Karakihira</strong></td>
<td>6 imurrán, age 18-30</td>
<td>2: imurrán</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 imurrán</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 women, age 15-47</td>
<td>1: women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 elders, age 31-68</td>
<td>2: elders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 chief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 key-informants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NGOs, Trusts and other key informants</strong></td>
<td>12 male employees, age 25-65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6: NRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 female employees, age 25-55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3: ILRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government authorities</strong></td>
<td>8: Samburu</td>
<td>1: County representatives</td>
<td>1: County representatives</td>
<td>2: Second FAO inter-county meetings County representatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4: Laikipia</td>
<td>Samburu, Isiolo and Laikipia</td>
<td>Samburu, Isiolo and Laikipia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5: Isiolo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4: Marsabit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3: Government of Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Young unmarried men (pl.) Singular: Imurrán. Often transcribed as ‘bachelor-warriors’.
## Annex C. Interview guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant(s)</th>
<th>Interview themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maasai pastoralists, Samburu pastoralists (residents Laikipia)</td>
<td>In what way are local water and pasture managed and controlled?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who is allowed to make use of these resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is your relation with the neighbouring private ranches and/or conservancies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do pastoralists from further afield arrive here to access grazing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the impact of pastoralists from further afield on the local organisation regarding access to resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has the arrival of pastoralists from further afield changed your relations with private ranches and/or conservancies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In what way could these problems be resolved according to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchers and conservancy managers and employees (Laikipia)</td>
<td>What is the status of the ranch and/or conservancy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How are past encounters with (neighbouring) pastoral communities described?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Which are the key policies/forms of interaction with neighbouring communities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How have past events let to the unfolding of the current situation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you provide grazing to pastoralist communities? How is the arrangement set up?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What problem are they to solve?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What was the role/level of participation with the local communities when agreeing upon the arrangements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who is eligible for these arrangements and who is not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In what way does the ranch and/or conservancy benefit from these arrangements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will the arrangements be used in the future also or would they need to be adapted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does illegal grazing/incursions/encroachments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Samburu pastoralists</strong>&lt;br&gt; (residents of Samburu; moving within Samburu, Isiolo and Laikipia)</td>
<td>How are resources governed and controlled at place of residence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what way did grazing and livestock mobility occur in the past? (decisions, institutions,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what way has the landscape changed over time? What is the effect of these changes on livestock mobility?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the role of community conservancies in the shaping of current mobility patterns?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is grazing governed and controlled similarly/differently in Samburu, Isiolo and Laikipia from the perspective of mobility?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are private ranches or conservancies accessed for pasture?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the role of conflict in relation to livestock mobility?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is seen as the main problem? What is seen as the best solution?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sesia (Samburu)</strong></td>
<td>In what way are pastures and water resources governed locally? How has this changed over time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What rules and regulations exist surrounding these local resources? Who is allowed to use these resources and under what conditions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the role of the community conservancy? What are the benefits? What are the disadvantages? Who benefits? Who does not?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How was the conservancy started? By whom? How did this process evolve?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How was the group ranch set up? What is the role of the group ranch in the governance of resources? What is the role of the group ranch in relation to the conservancy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government authorities in three counties</th>
<th>What is the role of the county government in the establishment of securing access to water and pasture for livestock?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the role of the county government in mediating conflict existent between counties?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the role of the county government in the establishment of community conservancies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the role of the county government in processes of the demarcation and adjudication of land, e.g. group ranches?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is seen as the main problem? What is seen as the best solution?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Conservation) NGO/Trust staff</th>
<th>What is the role of the NGO/Trust in the establishment of securing access to water and pasture for livestock?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the role of the NGO/Trust in mediating conflict existent between counties?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the role of the NGO/Trust in the establishment of community conservancies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the role of the NGO/Trust in processes of the demarcation and adjudication of land, e.g. group ranches?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is seen as the main problem? What is seen as the best solution?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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