

POTENTIALS OF AFRICAN PASTORALISM: PRACTICE OF CITIZENSHIP FOR LIVELIHOOD IN EAST AFRICAN PASTORAL SOCIETY

Itsuhiro HAZAMA

School of Global Humanities and Social Sciences, Nagasaki University

ABSTRACT In non-Western societies, citizenship is often discussed as a conceptual tool to reinforce colonial rule and orientalism. In the African context, ethnic groups, which form the cultural basis of ethnic citizenship, are believed to hinder the maturity of nation-states. Thus, the term “citizen” with respect to Africa is often regarded as an empty concept. Along these lines, this paper examines citizenship in indigenous African communities by focusing on the everyday citizenship practices of autonomous East African pastoralist societies. Rather than claim citizen rights from the state, these pastoralists have constituted moral communities with alternative citizenship agendas, which serve to maintain public security and individual livelihoods. By addressing the question of the impasse to citizenship and the logic by which East African pastoralists challenge fixed Western categorizations, this paper highlights the need to flexibly reconceptualize citizenship to create new inclusive spaces uninfluenced by race, ethnicity, class, gender, or geography.

Key Words: Karimojong; Dodoth; Reversibility; Man-animal relationship; Citizenship practice.

ALTERNATIVE FORMS OF CITIZENSHIP

This paper concerns an autonomous community created under armed conflict and discusses the potential of citizenship in an East African pastoral society related to difficulties of citizenship in the modern world. While the word “citizenship” generally refers to full membership status in a community—typically a nation-state—and includes the basic principle of human equality, for minority groups it has meant forced assimilation and exclusion from the value standards of the majority. In particular, when citizenship is linked to a national community, it generates a national force where citizens in general are chronically intolerant of differences.

In non-Western societies, citizenship has tended to be discussed as a conceptual tool to reinforce colonial rule and orientalism, which serve to maintain European advantage (Mamdani, 1996; Majima, 2000; Isin, 2012). In Africa, external players (specifically from the West) have classified and ranked the various strata of societies as citizens, second-class citizens, noncitizens, or subjects within modern national systems on the basis of race, ethnicity, and geography. As such, citizenship is a core issue in the African context. The focus has been on constructing a state with simultaneous coexistence of ethnic attachments and national identities (Keller, 2014). The term “citizenship” with respect to Africa has often been

regarded as an empty concept referring only to the right and duty to live in a place such as a nation-state.

How, then, is a flexible citizenship possible that resides outside the dominant illusion that a nation-state is the only political unit that can confer citizenship in the modern world? It has been suggested, for example, that in Asian countries involved in global neoliberal economic development, citizenship might be flexibly and strategically utilized. A modern state has the power to not only define and protect its citizens but to specify the objects of protection (Agamben, 1998). The neoliberal governmentality of Asian countries situates workers in the neoliberal system by enclosing them in a protective zone, while defining an exceptional condition for peripheral people so that they are not treated as citizens. Within these specially designated zones, as states rearrange decentralized political spaces to facilitate the global flow of capital, inhabitants, including foreigners tied to such capital flows, are flexibly granted citizenship (Ong, 2006). It is clear in this situation that the boundaries between “us” and “others” are not simply national boundaries (Oomen, 2004; Oosterom, 2016). The present study does not consider the practice of citizenship in terms of a particular stratum crossing national borders. Rather, it focuses on the everyday life practices of citizenship that guarantee the sustainability of autonomous pastoralist communities.

THE KARIMOJONG AND DODOTH

I have conducted fieldwork among the Karimojong since 1998 and the Dodoth since 2002, both of whom reside in the Karamoja region, the dry savannah in northeast Uganda. They are Eastern Nilotic-speaking pastoralists, who include the Jie; the Turkana in Kenya; and the Toposa, Nyangatom, and Jiye in South Sudan. These pastoralists—along with the Teso, whose present-day subsistence depends strongly on agriculture—have maintained their cohesion as discrete social groups in the so-called “Karamojong Cluster” (or the Ateker). Few differentiations had been recognized among them until intense conflicts over cattle raiding divided them into separate, organized communities some 200 years ago (Lamphear, 1976).

After 1980, the proliferation of automatic rifles in the area gave rise to violent conflicts over the protection and acquisition of livestock, thus creating security problems. Prior to disarmament and the sedentarization program in this century, Karimojong and Dodoth families had allocated their members into *awi* (herding camps), which frequently relocated along with herds of livestock, and *ere* (semipermanent settlements), which rarely moved and could sustain small-scale rain-fed agriculture. Nomadic movement among herding camps has been greatly restricted since 2006, when the government began to implement sedentarization policies directed at pastoralists in connection with disarmament in the area (Hazama, 2016; 2017).

QUESTION OF THE IMPASSE TO CITIZENSHIP

Critical citizenship studies have found that fixing the boundaries of “us” has caused problems of repression and violence against the weak. Socially subordinate people have nothing except solidarity to break the dominant structure of the overwhelmingly powerful people. However, as solidarity grows, the hierarchy of the strong and weak strengthens (Nyamnjoh, 2007). In addition to this paradox, communities suppress various internal differences to maintain their cohesiveness and inwardness.

The conflicts regarding women’s freedom of marriage and freedom of education among second-generation Maghreb immigrants in France is an example (Takezawa, 2010). The community is faced with the constant risk of becoming another kind of power, and, in that way, it becomes the driving force of nationalism in a national crisis (Matsuda, 2013; 2016a). These difficulties in the world are linked to the problem of the closed nature of multiculturalism. This paper aims to describe African indigenous ways of practicing citizenship and to address the question of an impasse to citizenship.

I have been conducting anthropological work since 1998 embedded in a pastoral society in northeast Uganda. During the research period, armed conflict, triggered by the state’s disarmament, became serious. The international community tended to strongly align with the government’s assertions and accept the state as a single entity with an egalitarian social order.

Most pastoralists have historically and routinely experienced the government as raiders making assaults. The concept of citizenship as the primary way to define the relationship between the state and the individual—as well as other aspects of the nation-state—has become ubiquitous around the world. However, East African pastoralists, including those in northeast Uganda, have not sought to claim this right from the state. Rather, they have historically constituted moral communities with political agendas of citizenship. This paper focuses on the everyday practices of indigenous citizenship and flexibility among pastoralists who face significant difficulties sustaining their livelihoods under armed conflict.

CITIZENSHIP AMONG EAST AFRICAN PASTORALISTS

Since the 1990s, ethnographers have described citizenship claims or “better citizenship” as the process by which people are defined in a top-down approach as opposed to a bottom-up process of self-construction or the technologies of the self (Ong, 1996). These collective demands progress by insisting on the framework of self-construction as a component of the state embodied through local conceptualizations of citizenship. These mainstream frameworks of citizenship are premised on a clearly conscious entity that attempts to stay out of the hegemonic discourse and might fail to perceive the way that citizenship is formed and reformed through perceiving, negating, and negotiating with the state, particularly when people meet with state power and when rights are

claimed, exploited, or denied in daily life.

Given the prevailing illusion that the nation-state is the only entity that can grant citizenship in the modern world, it might seem impossible that an informal, hidden, and thoughtful government system and flexible citizenship concept that sustains many lives could even exist. Citizenship is a Western concept based on a political understanding of people as members of civil society. Ekeh (1992) defined two public entities in African civil society: the “primordial public,” consisting of ethnic groups; and the “civic public,” which emerges in the process of modern state formation. According to Ekeh (1992), in the case of African civil society, we should consider not only the agency of the civic public but also that of the primordial public. Citizenship as the civic public’s membership in the modern state has been adopted without considering both types of public entities. Infinite political space without the presence of a state is given to the primordial public of Africa, and provisions that support daily life are given in this public entity. Ndegwa (1997) pointed out that people in Africa do not acknowledge the legitimacy of state sovereignty; instead, they participate in forms of ethnic citizenship by demonstrating loyalty and engaging in political actions and conflicts. These behaviors overlap considerably with those of East African pastoral societies, including the Karimojong and Dodoth.

Among studies of citizenship in East African pastoral societies (Feyissa, 2010; Cleaver et al., 2013; Enns & Bersaglio, 2015), Konaka (2016) is the only one that sheds light on the practice of citizenship by socially vulnerable people facing overwhelming direct and structural violence. He argues that the key concepts of citizenship should be the basis for the ways that internally displaced persons should be supported in Africa. Internally displaced persons live within their national borders, and an aspect of their protection is that they are under the jurisdiction of that state. However, in areas where conflicts and poor state governance do not realize citizenship in the sense of guaranteed rights by the state, it is difficult to approach the state about its responsibilities. Furthermore, there is no guarantee of protection from the international community based solely on human rights’ concepts. It could be effective to recognize a provisional role for citizenship practiced by internally displaced refugees and to form links between the international community and local communities regarding emergency humanitarian assistance from international sources (Konaka, 2016).

This paper concerns East African pastoralists’ forms of citizenship regarding the maintenance of public security and the security of individual livelihoods. Moreover, it explores the logic by which East African pastoralists have outlasted the West’s stalemate between the community and the individual.

In the sections that follow, the changeability of belonging will be highlighted as a characteristic interactional mode of East African pastoralists, wherein collective identity does not oppress interpersonal relationships. Next, I discuss the ecological culture of pastoral societies in relation to social interaction. Then, cases in northeast Uganda are analyzed, describing everyday life in clusters of refugee cattle camps. Separation from their home villages shows that new spaces of citizenship in pastoral society lend visibility to identities and interests that

are given shape by political decision-making and an action system based on direct democracy. Next, I describe the emergence of other multiethnic cattle camps based on ecological citizenship, which have ended the forced sedentarization policy. Last, I consider the practical meaning of East African pastoral citizenship in relation to the predicament of bounded citizenship.

REVERSIBILITY OF BELONGING IN EAST AFRICAN PASTORAL SOCIETY

The savanna zone in Uganda's northeast is the Karamoja region where Nilotic pastoralists live. Since the 1970s, large numbers of automatic rifles have flowed through trade and looting into the Karamoja region from Sudan, which was in an intermittent civil war, as well as through the civil war in Uganda, which arose after the collapse of the military dictatorship.

The Ugandan government has had a military presence in the Karamoja region since the 1980s to implement its policy to disarm the pastoralists. Pastoralists have faced various problems, including the violence that ensued in the course of the forced disarmament. Intervention was intended to deter killings among the pastoral community, which has been a consistent aspect of the disarmament policy since 2000 (Hazama, 2012a). However, the pastoralists are not mutually exclusive or homologous, and they are able to avoid a full-out war based on absolute conflict between “enemies” and “comrades” as collective and homologous categories.

I. Direct Relationship

In Karimojong and Dodoth society, the territory and boundaries with neighbors are unclear. Even when there is frequent raiding and fighting between ethnic groups, they continue to share pasturelands, cooperate in livestock camps, have mutual visits, and exchange goods and livestock. For example, they strongly and consistently focus on the immediate context of social interaction. Therefore, they sometimes fight with members of their own ethnic group and help members of other ethnic groups, even opposing ones, with which they share pasture and cooperate in the camp. In the historical “Year of Matakul” case described below, the Jie and Karimojong formed an alliance in a successful effort to eliminate raiding related to an alliance between the Turkana and the Karimojong (Hazama, 2012a; 2013).

Case 1: Year of Matakul⁽¹⁾

In 1988, when there was no rain, even in the rainy season, and severe drought forced people together from different groups, Jie and Karimojong herders (including the Bokora, a territorial group from west of the Karimojong and from the Matheniko, a territorial group from east of the Karimojong, as well as the Pian, a territorial group from south of the Karimojong) set up a joint camp at

the eastern foot of Mt. Nyakwae. Although herding camps are usually named after the group leader, they rejected naming the camp after their leaders and instead referred to it as a “mixed herd of the herders.” This camp was so large that “there were cattle as far as the eye could see” enclosed by an outer fence. Inside the camp, families were spread out and not ethnically clustered, with members of both groups sleeping around the same fire.

One early morning in September, raiders from the Turkana-Karimojong alliance attacked them and stole all their livestock. To escape, the Turkana-Karimojong needed to cross the rocky plain, which has no shade and is so hot and dry that its name is “Matakul,” which means “so thirsty for water that you drink your own urine.” A watering place named Atapalkakinei is at the southeast end of Matakul and members of the Jie-Karimojong alliance ambushed and surrounded the Turkana-Karimojong there, where a two-day battle ensued.

The Turkana-Karimojong formed small groups of several people and fought in a rotational strategy, with those at the front of the fight changing places with others who rested at the rear, but, before long, they began to be routed. Finally, the Jie-Karimojong succeeded in recovering 4,000 cattle. Less than one herd and only a few Turkana-Karimojong people escaped eastward to their homeland.

In this case, the shared experience of cohabitation in the camp could serve as a basis for alliances beyond ethnic group identity, which is assumed to force together even those who had never seen each other before. Hostile relationships and alliances between diverse groups are flexibly modified according to social situations. These people who coexisted and cooperated in everyday life were directly connected, and their social relationships were with people inside and outside their ethnic groups. Ethnic groups that are hostile toward each other experience solidarity through interpersonal relationships that cross ethnic lines. This allows the same situation to be defined as hostile in terms of ethnic identity but amicable based on interpersonal identity. It is not unusual for people’s convenience choices to reverse the taxonomic hierarchical relationships between ethnic groups and individuals, and to prioritize action selection from the viewpoint of the individual actor rather than ethnic identity. On the one hand, a particular ethnic identity is not fixed as the sole basis of the self; on the other hand, it does not go beyond any specific identity or drift from real-life situations. The boundaries between the upper and lower parts of the hierarchy become ambiguous and inconsistent since various segments contact and cooperate with each other through life practices.

Among the Karimojong and Dodoth, raiding, giving, and exchanging animals were basic life practices. These things occurred, when possible, after each pastoralist and the relationships between groups had been analyzed, interpreted, agreed upon, and in accord with the processes and rules of social interaction (Hazama, 2013; Kawai, 2013). The flexibility with which specific actions were selected through social interactions and negotiations is incompatible with the deterministic principle in which interpersonal behavior is regulated based on a social class system (e.g., biological classification) that organizes hierarchies by specific types of difference. Enclosure within groups—such as standardized ethnic

groups and clans—and their collective decisions are disrupted by resilient interactions between people across the ethnic groups.

Another characteristic is that they were mutually indifferent to each other regarding past hostilities. The history of raiding among ethnic groups is ancient and contains numerous sorrowful memories of murdered friends, brothers, spouses, or children. However, the people trusted that they were all indifferent to the fixed dichotomy of hostility or amity. Thus, from the perspective of the ethnic group or clan, everyday interpersonal practices were performed by the smallest units, but from the other perspective, large group units were in a subordinate position. Among Eastern Nilotic-speaking pastoralists, the directness of relationships between individuals serves as a socially effective reality.

II. Reversible Hierarchy

In East African pastoral society, one clan exist across different ethnic groups, and there are alliances between clans of different ethnic groups. These complex relationships offer a mechanism with which total confrontation between ethnic groups is prevented (Matsuda, 2016b). Social anthropologist Schlee (1989) analyzed the clan principle among northern Kenya's Gabra, Sakuye, Rendille, and Borana groups with reference to the fact that a common paternal clan existed across phratries and ethnic groups. He noted that a characteristic of these societies was the existence of multiple forms of identity related to a single ethnic group. Nakamura and Naito offered interesting observations on group members with dual memberships as Rendille and Samburu pastoralists in North Kenya (Naito, 2004; Nakamura & Naito, 2009). Ethnic groups opposed to each other have alliances between clans and subclans across ethnic groups. People could define one situation as either conflict by using the ethnic identity or as amicable by using the clan identity.

East African pastoral society allows people to choose identities that fit the situations of their lives. Vertically positional relations in a hierarchical structure of ethnic groups and clans can be reversed (Matsuda, 2016b). The pastoral identity does not designate a particular ethnic identity as its sole basis and does not deviate from actual situations. Thus, the boundary between the upper units in a hierarchical classification (such as a phratry) and ethnic groups is unclear since the lower units interact and cooperate with each other in daily practice.

The reversibility of intergroup and interpersonal relationships observed in the Dodoth and Karimojong may not be limited to Eastern Nilotic-speaking pastoralists. Sagawa (2011), who studied ethnic relations focused on the Daasanach, Eastern Cushitic-speaking pastoralists, found that crosscutting ties across ethnic boundaries were formed through exchanges of goods and mutual visiting. These ties do not depend on relations between influential persons or on institutionalized amicable relations. Instead, they are generated by concrete mutual interactions and a will to form networks and, as such, is individualistic. A shift in interethnic relations from enmity to amity suggests the dynamism generated by face-to-face interaction with an enemy rather than enclosure into

groups informed by self-contained collective representation. Responding to others through action is the driving force that prevents the boundary between “us” and “them” from becoming permanent.

The sense of an indispensable person underlying reversible pastoral identity could derive from the mutual relationships in East African pastoral society where people and livestock interact and become entangled. From the perspective of East African pastoralists, within the categories are individuals, each of whom draws attention to the irreplaceable and indispensable person. This is contrary to modern Western thinking, which has led to a hierarchical taxonomy among domestic animals and people, with the “group” being a taxonomic category above the “individual.” In the next section, I explore the principle of primordial individualism in East African pastoral society, where interspecific differences do not operate according to human supremacy or “species-narcissism” (Kymlicka & Donaldson, 2014; Sugawara, 2017).

INDIVIDUALISM BEYOND DIFFERENCES OF SPECIES AND ETHNICITY

Violence has often been essentialized in models for understanding conflict. In the case of African pastoral society, a stereotype of “warlike pastoralists” has been interpreted as deriving from coercive and unilateral animal husbandry. According to the analogy, animal domestication created a relationship of domination and subordination between humans and domestic animals, and day-trip herding could be accomplished only through a pastoralist’s aggressive and controlling behavior. Thus, pastoralists developed cultures that behave aggressively and dominantly toward others (Moritz, 2008).

This interpretation of humans violently controlling other humans and animals is the reflex of the modern Western self-image. Many definitions of domestication include the significant idea that it caused morphological and behavioral changes in domesticated animal species for human economic gain (Clutton-Brock, 1987: 21). Relationships between East African pastoralists and animals do not align with the logic of humans dominating animals. For example, the Karimojong and Dodoth have coexisted closely with animals in ways that involve daily rapport. Pastoral livelihoods are based on communication in which animals and pastoralists identify each other as individuals and share interests and attention (Hazama, 2015).

The animals of the Karimojong and Dodoth are recognized and raised as herds, and as subunits with their family lines, sexes, and stages of growth. A compact gathering of animals as a herd is formed for day-trip herding. Interactions between the herd and pastoralists, the sharing of “grazing context” between both parties, and many responsive behavioral communicative chains are represented (Hazama, 2006). Pastoralists identify animals individually. Cattle and goats react spontaneously and precisely with the expected reactions to multiple species’ sounds that the pastoralists emit, adjusting for the hearing ability of the animal addressed, during daily milking and herding. Pastoralists use different vocalizations

and movements depending on an animal's sex and stage of growth. When pastoralists call cattle by name, the animal being called responds while the surrounding animals do not react at all (Hazama, 2015). Animals establish interspecific communications at the group level of the herd, at the subgroup level based on sex and stage of growth, and with individual pastoralists based on individual identification and calling by name.

In Western Asian and European studies, it has been argued that various methods of human domination—such as slavery, surveillance, and social control—developed from pastoral management techniques such as castration and herding (Foucault, 1979; Tani, 2010). Relationships of domination and subordination between humans and animals do not fit with the Karimojong and Dodoth methods of everyday pastoralism. In the African savanna, one's own desires and those of others are characterized by positive feedback based on pastoralists' methods of raising animals using rapport to meet the animals' needs. Interspecific pastoral relationships are based on the synergy of desire and delight.

The individuality of animals among the Karimojong and Dodoth lies not only in being objectively recognized, classified, and having objective characteristics different from those of other animals but also in the commutative fact through the voice and body of the human person individually identified by the animal. In such entanglements, the person who constitutes the social structure of the animals and works inside their social boundaries is the pastoralist. Animals are not simply coded objects of cognitive salience, symbolic meaning, or material value; they are entities directly addressing the pastoralist's body. In this sense, animals comprise the other party that directly faces and interacts with humans, without an intermediary of self-contained representation.

When people deeply depend on nature, it can provide material for a way of thinking about how people interact with each other since it is closely related to life experience and emotions. Earlier, I described how intergroup relationships between East African pastoralists are based on direct relationships without the fixed dichotomous attributes of others. Thus, their independence from the intermediacy of self-contained representation could derive from their eager attention to individual animals. The following pastoral lyric, composed by an elderly East African pastoralist, is based on a primordial individualism beyond interspecific differences:

Oh, Longoriakou, my friend
 Dodoth said, "Kill father of Ekales"
 Father of son, Longoriakou said, "I kill you"
 Longoriakou, my friend, father of Akwangorok
 "Kill raiders who take your cattle"
 Longoriakou did not see other's spear taking away Merilem
 (Nakiru Merilem, composed February 2003)

This is a song called an *emong* in the language of the "Karamojong cluster," which is part of the Eastern Nilotic-speaking group (Murdock, 1959). A

characteristic of the *emong* involves identifying individual humans and cattle (or goats or sheep) describing life events that the composer experienced (Hazama, 2012b; 2015). Identification is the phenomenon of dealing with animals, especially cattle, and humans as undifferentiated. As is well known, Evans-Pritchard, who brought a humanitarian turn to anthropology based on his research on Nilotic-speaking society, confirmed the oneness of the Nuer people of South Sudan with their cattle (Evans-Pritchard, 1956: 248–271). The Turkana who composed this song superimposed himself on a hornless, black-and-white spotted ox (“Merilem”), his son on an ostrich-like black ox (“Ekales”), his friend on an ox with big brown spots on the neck and head (“Longoriakou”), and the son of his friend on an ox with big black spots on a white background (“Akwangorok”), thereby expressing the oneness of animals and humans.

The composer visited the home of his Dodoth friend by crossing the escarpment on the Kenya-Uganda border. Suddenly, Dodoth warriors entered the home. They said the son of the head of the homestead (the composer’s Dodoth friend) was killed in the land of the Turkana, where they had plotted a cattle raid. The Turkana had raided the father and son’s herds the year before. When the warriors realized the guest there was Turkana, they pressed the father to kill him. However, the father rejected the idea, saying, “I will kill you if you kill him.” He protected the Turkana from the “other’s spear.” Here, the attention to individuals that prevents collective confrontations between groups takes the form of the pastoralist’s eager gaze into the cattle herd, which is expanded to include ethnic others while simultaneously breaking interspecific differences.

Ohta (1987) considered independent action as the social psychology of the Turkana in terms of the individual identification of animals. Independent action refers to the liability of action selection through direct face-to-face interactions without assuming a collective normative consciousness or transcendental existence (Goldschmidt, 1965: 404). As a narrative of pastoral song, although the language referring to animals is transformed via metaphor to refer to humans, a way of interpersonally relating that is peculiar to pastoralists is expressed. Animals of the Karimojong and Dodoth embody a sense of individualism. The boundaries in interactions with animal others and human others is permeable, insofar as animals resonate with the bodies of humans.

CITIZENSHIP PRACTICE AMONG PASTORALISTS

The previous section confirmed that the sense of individuality in pastoral society breaks down interspecific boundaries. Their sociality is based on synergistic and direct relationships with the others that they face. This sociality leads pastoralists into political solidarity in relation to the state. This section describes pastoralists’ attempts at autonomous communities and the logic by which they organize themselves to sustain livelihoods.

I. Sedentarization and *awi ngina ngikeyain* (Army Barracks Herding Camps)

After the sedentarization policy of 2006, people and their animals were forced to establish one huge herding camp per subcounty (as an administrative unit covering clusters of *ere*) and were prohibited from migrating from it. The Karimojong and Dodoth referred to these as “herding camps,” which were set up in army barracks (the *awi ngina ngikeyain*, or army barracks herding camp), but the government called them “protected kraals.” In these camps, the amount of grazing time, locations of day herding, and the movements of the camp were controlled. Many pastoralists who refused to stay in these camps run by military operations lost their herds and crossed national borders as refugees. The pastoralists organized the camps themselves with their own people and those of other ethnic groups. These pastoralist refugee camps were maintained until 2013 when free movement was again allowed. Then, the Dodoth escaped to a mountainous region near the border with South Sudan, whereas the Karimojong and the Jie sought refuge in Kenya.

II. Community and Democracy in a Refugee Camp

The following is a case of the Dodoth who constructed clusters of camps with the Toposa from South Sudan and the Turkana from Kenya.

Case 2⁽²⁾

In December 2006, the Dodoth suffered an attack by the Turkana and the army, and they entered the Toposa herding area where they built eight *ngakwaria* (si. *akuwar*) (clusters of camps that shared one fence). Participants in this self-governed community included the Dodoth victims, their relatives, neighboring communities, and those who were already there (the Toposa and Turkana). Approximately 4,600 people, mostly young people, lived as refugees in clusters within sight of each other, which pastoralists referred to as *akigunya* (neighbors). Eight councilors and two representatives were selected to facilitate discussions and to be responsible for conducting proceedings.

These pastoralists were successful at self-organization, which was like a hidden democratic and informal governmental institution that helped to sustain many lives. Everyone was allowed to participate in a public place of collective decision-making in a direct democracy. People discussed agreements, including one in which each cluster would maintain a security system using a rotational guard duty system for the herd and camp.

The camp clusters were a type of self-defense for the community, which was built on equal sharing of responsibilities and tasks, such as labor and risk-taking. In one *akuwar* (cluster), 4,000 cattle were managed by a shepherding group composed mainly of boys and a team of young male security guards for day herding, and a team of night security guards, who ambushed raiders at night.

The functioning of the cluster depended on the volunteer participation of the

members, and almost all of the men participated as representatives, councilors, or security guards without compensation. Each cluster comprised individuals with equal citizenship and equal access to welfare services. People who lost property could borrow a milk cow or other necessities. Giving gifts of livestock through begging also actively occurred. A reciprocal economy was practiced based on mutual assistance. Therefore, the camp clusters, as a refugee camp, provided an important space to provide welfare and defense services that offered protection to the weaker and more disadvantaged members of the community.

This refugee camp was characterized by unstructured political decision-making in the meetings, in which everyone was allowed to express disagreement with the dominant view, and all members waited for consensus through careful deliberation. Pastoralists clearly understood that this unstructured direct democracy differed from that of assemblies, such as the peace meetings hosted by the government and nongovernmental organizations. They told the assembly that everyone could participate in the process as *atuko* or *ekisil angikirionok* (people's peace) unlike modern types of assembly where only select individuals could speak as representatives as *ekisil apukan* (peace of government).

I was often confused when people would suddenly speak up and say, "*Meere ikongina!*" (loosely translated as "Disapproval!" or, literally, "Not like that!"), when agreement was not being sought. Anyone could announce at any time to the entire group that he or she did not agree. Residents of modern states with representative governments tend to think that the absence of "harmony" will threaten group integration. Pastoralists could solve this "crisis" by finding common ground between disagreements. Their "representative" was a facilitator who mended discord by using humor and helping other participants share their stories.

The dilemma of community involves the tension of suppressing various internal differences to maintain cohesiveness (Nyamnjoh, 2007). The refugees' consensus-building process, where "Disapproval!" from any participant is accepted as thoughtfully contemplated, does not generate an impasse in which the community becomes another power. This potential of pastoralists is undoubtedly related to the attitudes that value direct individual relationships.

III. Changing Belonging and Citizenship, Including that of Animals

Pastoralists organized a self-governing mechanism as an emergency response to armed conflict that became serious upon disarmament, and they created and maintained defense and relief systems. This community of joint responsibilities and joint rights was sustained for several years but disappeared with the assurance of guaranteed state relief and protection. The autonomous community of pastoralists did not become self-purposed, persistent, or fixed. Secured by flexibility and transience, the pure functionality and utility as a community was expressed in a new form, including the nation-state mechanism after 2013.

The following case study concerns a group of multiethnic cattle camps who negotiated with the state and ended the forced sedentarization policy by claiming that pastoralists were ecological citizens. In this sense, ecology refers to the

wisdom of pastoralists who understand humans in relation to nature, in which people's lives are understood as comprehensive close interrelationships with elements outside of human beings. Pastoralists conceptualize citizenship as relatively more inclusive through everyday practices of pastoralism and its narrative.

Case 3: Migration and the End of Sedentarization⁽³⁾

In August 2013, the Dodoth, Karimojong, and Jie, who had refused the protected kraal in Uganda, decided to reenter Uganda. The pastoralists in refugee camps where the Dodoth, Toposa, and Turkana live in South Sudan were suffering from hunger, disease, and hepatitis E during the dry season. In addition, the animals were suffering from a lack of pasture caused by drought, resulting in diseases, such as anaplasmosis, contagious bovine pleuropneumonia, East Coast fever, and scabies. Pastoralists in the refugee camp assembled and decided to send youth groups with information about their willingness to migrate to Uganda. Then, messages were sent back from ere, saying that governmental institutions and soldiers in districts would not "punish" pastoralists if returnees to Uganda brought back guns voluntarily when crossing the border. Then, they migrated to Uganda from South Sudan.

Immediately after moving to Uganda, the pastoralists who had set up herding camps in the Karamoja region and neighboring pastoralists gathered and held a peace conference. The Dodoth, Karimojong, Turkana, and Jie negotiated with the government and nongovernmental organizations to mediate the *ekisil apukan* (peace of government). This meeting was held in August as a large gathering that included three district governors and a division chief, who led the infantry, and a couple hundred or more pastoralists from the herding camps of the Dodoth, Karimojong, Turkana, and Jie.

The plenary session held in the shade of a big acacia tree in the boundary area of the Turkana, Jie, Dodoth, and Karimojong proceeded so that the pastoralists stood one after another to express their opinions. The pastoralists who respected animal subjectivity strongly expressed their opinions at the conference. They demanded that the freedom and peace of animals must be brought about, stating, for example, that "animals should not be trapped in one place by the government," and, "We should not continue to raid cattle, which takes them away from their shepherds and families and makes cattle suffer with hearts full of agony." In addition to the negative obligations to livestock (e.g., rights "not to...") to meet positive responsibilities (care, healthcare, habitat), pastoralists complained that withdrawing the forced sedentarization policy (protected kraal system) was essential, stating, for example, that "taking care of cattle is our duty," "We have never forgotten to secure a place where the cattle sleep and walk with grass to eat," and "It is us, as fathers, who can prevent our dependent cattle from digestive disorders [by migrating to places where there are effective medicinal plants]." When pastoralists of the Karamoja region wanted to relocate their herding camp, they were required to obtain written consent from the governor of the district

and the military. Opposing this order, they claimed they were the ones who understood the animals' needs and that they could convince the army's division chief, who had expressed disapproval before. The elder gave a speech from the Jie side, stating, "Dodoth should come south and be near the Turkana and Jie, so it is easy to follow stolen animals, so that it will be easy to get cooperation from many people and search out the perpetrators who raided them." The Turkana, Karimojong, and Dodoth also expressed opinions, such as, "It is wonderful to be together rather than dividing each settlement by ethnic group." They all agreed to construct a new large joint herding camp. The Dodoth family with which I lived decided to relocate immediately after this peace conference with their neighbors to Koputh, an area adjacent to where the Jie, Turkana, and Karimojong were harmonious.

In this case of the Dodoth pastoralists' relocation to Uganda, their sense of belonging, citizenship, and flexibility is evident. First, in their migration decision-making regarding relocation from South Sudan to Uganda, in which they expressed a respect for people's convenience, it was not that the pastoralists agreed with violence or that they opposed the government. The pastoralists, who were interested in the survival of animals, and who were not interested in other concerns—such as seizing state power—rejected the government's domination over the well-being of the animal and human community, and did not accept any cooperation from antigovernment armed groups.

For example, an antigovernment force (the Lord's Resistance Army), which controlled an area in northern Uganda to southern South Sudan, had developed a force equal to that of the state's army. There were no pastoralists involved in the resistance army, which wanted to overthrow the government. A network of violent opposition was formed by young pastoralists in response to the oppression and violence that accompanied the sedentarization policy, and they consistently fought against the government. However, after the August 2013 peace conference, they returned home promptly from South Sudan to Uganda, turned their guns over to the government, and disbanded as though they had never been organized. This suggests that the pastoralists only wanted to sustain their livelihoods and fulfill their responsibilities to animals.

Second, the pastoralists' inclusive sense of citizenship was observed in their statements regarding improved livelihoods made at the conference and their recognition that there was a strong duty of care created because of interdependence. The pastoralists had a positive plan for interactions between humans and animals, and demanded approval of their essential positive obligations related to their human-animal relationships. Humans and animals are "persons" because of their individuality—they are both citizens of an autonomous society. Pastoralists discussed their concerns with the government based on this citizenship, which included cattle as cocitizens.

Pastoralists insisted upon abolishing the protected kraal system from the standpoint of animals as cocitizens sharing life and emotions with humans. The Karimojong and Dodoth resisted the state because of animal resistance under the protected kraal system. For example, cattle refused to lie down inside the

protected kraal. Goats and sheep jumped over fences. All animals would lie down during day-trip herding and resisted grazing. Cattle ignored shepherds as they called their names. Cattle, goats, and sheep refused to return to the protected kraal every evening. The cattle were returned by force, but they would break through the fence. These resistance behaviors were fully recognized as such by the pastoralists. In pastoral society, everyday forms of resistance are not limited to humans. Scott (1987) used the term “weapons of the weak” to refer to actions such as faking ignorance, rejecting commands, taking breaks without permission, and breaking equipment. Cattle, goats, and sheep used such “weapons of the weak” to resist the protected kraal. Animal resistance had the effect of translating, through pastoralists as their cocitizens, animals’ political subjectivity based on their everyday behavior. The practice of ecological citizenship can include animals and humans across pastoralists’ ethnic boundaries because it is based on the common ground of pastoral ecology.

When the pastoralists related to other groups through pastoralism, they did not understand them merely as raiding opponents or hostile enemies. To overcome the conflicts that impeded daily pastoralism, the pastoralists developed ties to each other through their joint resistance to violence. Their flexibility in belonging and citizenship enhanced their awareness of the reasons for the raids and mutual aggression, and it generated pressure for an active response to raids and violence.

Pastoralists later devised various mechanisms, including establishing collaborative herding camps across ethnic boundaries and cooperative/joint meetings to prevent raiding and conflict. Furthermore, a new collaborative effort was created across the borders with Kenya, South Sudan, and Uganda that included a determination of the method of compensation for livestock losses and selection of investigators at the subcounty level to search for stolen animals.

In the pastoralists’ new self-control of armed force inside the group, each ethnic group and its territorial groups clarified the teams responsible for the groups. In South Sudan, the differences between ethnic groups were abandoned and a merged group was formed, whereas multiethnic cooperation seemed to be a translocal system. Given that the ecological problems of pastoral livelihood cannot be contained within national borders, the ecological citizenship of pastoralists as cocitizens with their herding animals can find meaning through practice outside the scope of activity associated with nation-state citizenship.

The pastoralists tried to negotiate with the state while practicing flexible and inclusive citizenship. As a result, the activities of the raiding group no longer threaten herds or pastoral families. The government’s repressive policy suddenly and completely ended as of 2016. The *awi ngina ngikeyain* (army barracks herding camps) have been abolished and the pastoralists and their herds freely move again.

CONCLUDING REMARKS: INCLUSION AND FLEXIBILITY OF CITIZENSHIP

Ndegwa (1997) discussed two parts of Kenyan citizenship: national and ethnic citizenships. When no effective services for or protections of people existed from the state, then the intermediary device of nepotism was invoked as an alternative to the state system, which was activated through ethnicity. Pastoralists in the Karamoja region had sought cooperation in creating communities that could adapt to conflicts caused by the proliferation of firearms, armed violence, and the implementation of disarmament and sedentarization policies. They practiced citizenship in indigenous contexts. This represents an informal expression of citizenship beyond ethnic citizenship, which is based on mutual interests in sustaining everyday life. Belonging to an ethnic group and ethnic citizenship was relativized by allowing ethnic boundaries to fluctuate and be crossed, which allowed for the emergence of new and flexible identities that are mutually complementary rather than exclusionary. In this sense, the citizenship practiced by pastoralists differs from ethnic citizenship.

Jean and John Comaroff (2001; 2007) reported that, in South Africa, discourses of autochthony were applied to animals and plants as well as to people. In East African societies, identification or oneness between human beings and cattle is common. Pastoralists treat and identify cattle as irreplaceable others (Ohta, 1987; 2001) and as “individuals” with which they communicate. In the worldview of East African pastoralists, sociality comprises interactions in which pastoralists understand livestock as interacting persons facing the pastoralists’ selves (Hazama, 2015). Humans and animals are hybrid forms of existence, and neither can be understood as purely natural or cultural entities.

Through this natural-cultural interaction, pastoralists have practiced ecological citizenship. McEwan (2005) discussed alternative citizenship spaces as rarely inclusive and often reliant on oppositional processes of identity formation for the creation of a common purpose. The creation of identity-based participatory spaces might not only allow marginalized people to mobilize but also deepen the exclusion of other groups or minorities. However, the inclusiveness of the forms of citizenship of East African pastoral societies was realized through the natural-cultural interpersonal relationships shared beyond the boundedness of ethnic identity.

A critical challenge in contemporary society is the reconceptualization of “citizenship” to create political, cultural, social, and economic spaces for excluded individuals. Such inclusion is best guaranteed by flexible forms of citizenship (Ong, 1999; Nyamnjoh, 2007; Isin, 2012) uninfluenced by race, ethnicity, class, gender, or geography. In this type of citizenship, space should be created at different levels for its expression from global to local, ethnic to civic, and individualistic to collective. Contrary to the Western-derived worldview, where natural or animal others are unified, fixed, categorized, and ranked, in East African pastoral societies, the individualities and personalities of pastoral animals are expressed in everyday life outside of specific categorization and form the basis of a dynamic sense of human others.

NOTES

- (1) This case study is based on two daily conversations by four Karimojong men from the Matheniko on November 4, 2008 at Moroto (51 minutes) and by five Karimojong men from the Bokora on November 20, 2008 at Kangole (123 minutes), and a supplementary explanation given immediately after each conversation by a Karimojong man from the Bokora as research assistant.
- (2) This case study is based on participant observation and open-ended discussions in the camps, of which the family which have accepted my stay and research since 2012 are the member, at the border between Uganda and South Sudan; Nyaakuj in December 2006, Makwaj in September 2010, Kaamorok in September 2011, and Lokali in March 2012. I spent one to two weeks living in each site, joining in their daily chores (looking after the animals grazing in daytime, guarding the animals outside of the fence in the night, cooking, fixing the hut, milking the animals, etc.), and attending the meeting.
- (3) I conducted multi-sited ethnographic research and participant observation for three weeks in August 2013 and for three weeks September 2014 in Kaabong District.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS This paper is based on my paper presented at the Sixth African Forum of ‘African Potentials’ project organized by Kyoto University, December 9–11, 2016. The Symposium was sponsored by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (S) “‘African Potentials’ and overcoming the difficulties of modern world; Comprehensive area studies that will provide a new perspective for the future of humanity’ Grant no. 16H06318 from Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS).

REFERENCES

- Agamben, G. 1998. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Cleaver, F., T. Franks, F. Maganga & K. Hall 2013. Institutions, security, and pastoralism: Exploring the limits of hybridity. *African Studies Review*, 56(3): 165–189.
- Clutton-Brock, J. 1987. *A Natural History of Domesticated Animals*. Cambridge University Press, London.
- Comaroff, J. & J.L. Comaroff 2001. Naturing the nation: Aliens, apocalypse and the postcolonial state. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 27(3): 627–651.
- 2007. Law and disorder in the postcolony. *Social Anthropology*, 15(2): 133–152.
- Ekeh, P.P. 1992. The constitution of civil society in African history and politics. In (B. Caron, A. Gboyega & E. Osaghae, eds.) *Democratic Transition in Africa*, pp. 187–212. CREDU, Ibadan.
- Enns, C. & B. Bersaglio 2015. Enclave oil development and the rearticulation of citizenship in Turkana, Kenya: Exploring “crude citizenship.” *Geoforum*, 67: 78–88.
- Evans-Pritchard, E.E. 1956. *Nuer Religion*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Feyissa, D. 2010. The cultural construction of state borders: The view from Gambella. *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, 4(2): 314–330.
- Foucault, M. 1979. *Omnes et Singulatim: Towards a Criticism of “Political Reason,” The Tanner Lectures on Human Values. Delivered at Stanford University, October 10 and 16, 1979*. Online. <http://tannerlectures.utah.edu/lectures/documents/foucault81.pdf>

- (Accessed May 10, 2012).
- Goldschmidt, W. 1965. Theory and strategy in the study of cultural adaptability. *American Anthropologist*, 67(2): 402–408.
- Hazama, I. 2006. Peculiar unity within the boundary of domestic goat herds and herd management of Karimojong in Northeastern Uganda. *MILA: A Journal of the Institute of African Studies*, 7: 8–20.
- 2012a. The sequence of disarmament operations in Karamoja, Northeastern Uganda. (in Japanese with English abstract). *Asian and African Area Studies*, 12(1): 26–60.
- 2012b. Daily life as poetry: The meaning of the pastoral songs of the Karimojong in Northeastern Uganda. *Nilo-Ethiopian Studies*, 17: 27–49.
- 2013. Intergroup and face-to-face relations among East African herders. In (V.Y. Mudimbe & A. Simpson, eds.) *Recontextualizing Self & Other Issues in Africa*, pp. 35–52. Africa World Press, Trenton.
- 2015. *Embedded Mutualism for Co-Living in African Pastoralism: Ethnographic Studies of the Karimojong and Dodoth in Northeastern Uganda*. (in Japanese). Kyoto University Press, Kyoto.
- 2016. Social body and conflict: Illness and non-violence among the Karimojong and Dodoth in north-eastern Uganda. In (B.M. Pirani & T.S. Smith, eds.) *Embodiment and Cultural Differences*, pp. 108–133. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne.
- 2017. Violence and medical pluralism among the Karimojong and the Dodoth in northeastern Uganda. *African Study Monographs Supplementary Issue*, 53: 69–84.
- Isin, E.F. 2012. Citizenship after orientalism: An unfinished project. *Citizenship Studies*, 16(5–6): 563–572.
- Kawai, K. 2013. Forming a gang: Raiding among pastoralists and the “practice of cooperativity.” In (K. Kawai, ed.) *Groups: The Evolution of Human Sociality*, pp. 167–186. Trans Pacific Press, Melbourne.
- Keller, E.J. 2014. *Identity, Citizenship, and Political Conflict in Africa*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- Kymlicka, W. & S. Donaldson 2014. Animal rights, multiculturalism, and the left. *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 45(1): 116–135.
- Konaka, S. 2016. Citizenship among internally displaced persons: The case of East African pastoral society (in Japanese). In (A. Nishikida, ed.) *Citizenship for Migrants and Refugees: A Comparative Study of Institutions and Practices of Inclusion and Exclusion from Nation-States*, pp. 60–80. Yushindo, Tokyo.
- Lamphear, J. 1976. *The Traditional History of the Jie of Uganda*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- McEwan, C. 2005. New spaces of citizenship? Rethinking gendered participation and empowerment in South Africa. *Political Geography*, 24(8): 969–991.
- Mamdani, M. 1996. *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. Princeton University Press, New Jersey.
- Majima, I. 2000. The historical usage of concept of citizen and its limit: From the Republic of Liberia (in Japanese). In (S. Takeuchi, ed.) *Conflict in Africa: History and Subject*, pp. 293–353. Institute of Developing Economies, Chiba.
- Matsuda, M. 2013. The difficulties and potentials of anthropological practice in a globalized world. *Japanese Review of Cultural Anthropology*, 14: 3–30.
- 2016a. African potentials to prevent conflicts: How community policing is domesticated in contemporary Kenya (in Japanese). In (M. Matsuda & M. Hirano-Nomoto, eds.) *Culture to Resolve Conflicts: Incompleteness and Practice of Bricolage*, pp. 237–275. Kyoto University Press, Kyoto.

- . 2016b. Social and cultural characteristics of “African Potentials” (in Japanese). In (M. Matsuda & M. Hirano-Nomoto, eds.) *Culture to Resolve Conflicts: Incompleteness and Practice of Bricolage*, pp. 1–28. Kyoto University Press, Kyoto.
- Moritz, M. 2008. A critical examination of honor cultures and herding societies in Africa. *African Studies Review*, 51(2): 99–117.
- Murdock, G.P. 1959. *Africa: Its Peoples and Their Culture History*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Naito, N. 2004. The formation of multiple ethnic identities of Ariaal pastoralists: Belongingness constructed on “sharing of the same experience” (in Japanese). In (J. Tanaka, S. Sato, K. Sugawara & I. Ohta, eds.) *Nomads: Living in the Wilderness of Africa*, pp. 567–592. Showado, Kyoto.
- Nakamura, K. & N. Naito 2009. Construction of self and others in the East African pastoralists’ societies: Flexibility and plurality of identities (in Japanese). *Kyoto Working Papers on Area Studies*, 69: 1–20.
- Ndegwa, S.N. 1997. Citizenship and ethnicity: An examination of two transition moments in Kenyan politics. *American Political Science Review*, 91(3): 599–616.
- Nyamnjoh, F.B. 2007. From bounded to flexible citizenship: Lessons from Africa. *Citizenship Studies*, 11(1): 73–82.
- Ohta, I. 1987. Livestock individual identification among the Turkana: The animal classification and naming in the pastoral livestock management. *African Study Monographs*, 8(1): 1–69.
- . 2001. Motivations, negotiations, and animal individuality: Livestock exchange of the Turkana in northwestern Kenya. *Nilo-Ethiopian Studies*, 7: 45–61.
- Ong, A. 1996. Cultural citizenship as subject-making: Immigrants negotiate racial and cultural boundaries in the United States [and comments and reply]. *Current Anthropology*, 37(5): 737–762.
- . 1999. *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. Duke University Press, Durham.
- . 2006. *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty*. Duke University Press, Durham and London.
- Oomen, B. 2004. Vigilantism or alternative citizenship? The rise of Mapogo a Mathamaga. *African Studies*, 63(2): 153–171.
- Oosterom, M.A. 2016. Internal displacement, the camp and the construction of citizenship: Perspectives from northern Uganda. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 29(3): 363–387.
- Sagawa, T. 2011. *An Ethnography of Violence and Hospitality: War and Peace in East African Pastoral Societies* (in Japanese). Showado, Kyoto.
- Schlee, G. 1989. *Identities on the Move: Clanship and Pastoralism in Northern Kenya*. Manchester University Press for the International African Institute, Manchester.
- Scott, J. 1987. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Sugawara, K. 2017. *Animal Borders: From Phenomenology to Naturalography of Evolution* (in Japanese). Koubundou, Tokyo.
- Takezawa, S. 2010. *What is Society? From System to Process* (in Japanese). Chuokoron-shinsha, Tokyo.
- Tani, Y. 2010. *The Deployment and Start of the Domestication of Sheep-Goat: The Birth of the Herders* (in Japanese). Iwanamishoten, Tokyo.

———— Accepted November 23, 2017

Author's Name and Address: Itsuhiro HAZAMA, *School of Global Humanities and Social Sciences, Nagasaki University, 1-14 Bunkyo-machi, Nagasaki 852-8521, JAPAN.*

E-mail: hazama [at] nagasaki-u.ac.jp