

Marginalization of the Pastoralist Pokot of North Western Kenya

Beneah M. Mutsotso *

Department of Sociology and Social Work, University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya

*Corresponding author: bmutsotso@yahoo.com

Abstract The pastoralists Pokot have for over a century suffered systemic marginalization and neglect by successive governments of Kenya. The paper presents who the pastoralist Pokot are, where they live, origin, forms and manifestations of social marginalization they suffer. The paper traces the origin of the neglect and argues that the colonial government passed over the marginalization to the post independence government of Kenya with little or no change in perception. It utilizes diffusion of innovations theory by Everett Rogers to explain the lack of adoption of government/western ways of life which then, became the basis of marginalization. The paper draws upon primary, archival and other secondary data to demonstrate the social marginalization.

Keywords: *pokot, marginalization, adoption, pastoralist, government, Kenya*

Cite This Article: Beneah M. Mutsotso, "Marginalization of the Pastoralist Pokot of North Western Kenya." *World Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, vol. 4, no. 2 (2018): 69-74. doi: 10.12691/wjssh-4-2-1.

1. Introduction

This paper focuses on the pastoral Pokot (*pipatich or people of cattle*) who occupy the lower and drier territory of East Pokot of Baringo County and lower sections of West Pokot County. They number 950,609 (2.5%) of the national population according to the 2009 national population census [1]. They are differentiated from their agricultural brethren (*pipapagh or people of grains*) who occupy the highlands of West Pokot County in north western Kenya. This research was undertaken in July – November 2016 in East Pokot sub-county and the lower parts of West Pokot sub- County particularly Pokot Central, Pokot North and Pokot South administrative regions. The pastoral Pokot have been studied by quite eminent researchers including [2,3,4,5,6,7,8] but marginalization has not been presented. [9] discussed the impoverishment of pastoralists in Kenya and Uganda in general. This paper is focused on the pastoralist Pokot in particular. The Pokot are part of the Kalenjin group of the southern Nilotic and live in the north western part of Kenya [10]. They subsist largely on herding traditional livestock (mainly cattle) unlike the *pipapagh* who live on agricultural produce [11]. The pastoral Pokot are the enemies of the Marakwet [12] and efficient aggressors of the Karamojong and Turkana [13]. [14] termed the East Pokot as the *Suk*. Their original name was *Suk*, which was a Maasai nickname for ignorant cultivators who lived on the hills. They broke off from the original Nandi settlement on Mount Elgon and represent the most primitive form of the Nandi. Initially they lived in the region towards the western end of Cherangani hills at Mount Sekerr before they descended to the drier plans. After some experience with the Karamojong and Turkana

they acquired many of their cultural practices. The most prominent acquisitions were cattle, singing, baboon dance and *sapana* rite of passage [13]. Their original diet was mainly agricultural produce, honey and game. Initially they could not come to the plains because the Samburu could not allow them in the Kerio valley and the Turkana to the north- west. When the Samburu left the Kerio Valley and moved eastwards, this allowed the pastoral Pokot to descend from the hills to occupy the land vacated by the Samburu [2]. [17] Presented the East Pokot that their cattle wealth makes them rank above the Maasai as the most opulent Africans and their interests outside cattle were negligible. The negligibility of things outside cattle most strongly informed the coinage of the cattle complex phrase [3].

1.1. Origins of Marginalization

[9] Presented that pastoralist societies were dominant in East Africa before the Europeans arrived into the region. But today they are a pale shadow of their glorious past, for now they are more impoverished, marginalized, dominated, under-privileged, labeled as primitive, conservative and looked at with contempt. The negative attitude towards pastoralists was clearly evident in the colonial period but it did not change much even after independence. From the beginning of the British administration in Kenya there was an uneasy relationship with the Pokot pastoralists for they were found to be of little or no benefit. In addition, Pokot area was found marginal on two accounts. One was that the people were uncivilized and warlike. The other one was that the area was sparsely populated hence of no economic value [20]. According to [9] north western Kenya was declared a closed region hence only administrative/military posts were established but no development investment in the

areas for the focus was on the economically viable highland areas elsewhere. The closing of the region had substantial influence on how government and the people perceived each other. Hence the region remained neglected by the colonial government and even thereafter. The Sessional Paper No. 10 on African Socialism and Its Application to Planning in Kenya [22] became the blueprint for national development. Its core principle was investment in areas of high potential thereby farther alienating the Pokot pastoralists. Due to the undeveloped nature of the area livestock raiders became the de facto lords of the region [23].

The result of the social exclusion for over one hundred years is that today the Pokot pastoralists and the entire region they occupy lag far behind other parts of the country and other communities in several ways. In Pokot Central sub county for instance with a population of 34,000 there are fifteen police officers, no visible police presence for security, Police to public ratio is 1:2,226 compared to the UN average of 1:400 and a national average of 1:350 [24], hostile administration and police attitude towards the people, frequent armed forces operations against the people; most areas are inaccessible by road, low access to schooling due to few schools and many others closed due to insecurity and some without government teachers, low enrolment, high drop-out rate, low levels of school completion; distant health centers in excess of 20km, lack of health staff and a doctor patient ratio of 1:173,456; no radio and television reception in over 90% of the area, low immunization rate, persistent food insecurity, lack of investment in agriculture and livestock despite the great potential. In addition to these deficiencies, the Pokot have been regular victims of communal punishment by armed forces, government confiscation of livestock in addition to thirteen armed forces operations between 1979 and 2015.

The development indices (derived from an authoritative and official government document) demonstrate that the level of access to modern services in the counties where the pastoral Pokot live is far lower than the more favored counties. This is largely a consequence of systemic marginalization for over a century. The total population in East Pokot section of Baringo County is 173,429 and the doctor patient ratio is 1:173,429 compared to the section where the agricultural Tugen community lives in the county at 1:57,381. Average distance to a health facility is

20km in pastoral Pokot areas compared to between 10-15km in Tugen areas [25].

The contemporary social marginalization is not a product of a single factor but a combination of many, and over a long period.

1.2. Non-Adoption of Innovations, Practices and Ideas

Diffusion of innovation theory associated with Rogers [26,27] explains how ideas or products gain acceptance or spread to a particular social system. The theory assumes that some people adopt the new innovations or ideas but at different levels. It describes the non-adopters (the laggards) as those least impressed or convinced about the usefulness of the new artifacts. The laggards are considered those still bound by their traditions and therefore skeptical of things un-tested. The theory gives an account of why some people adopt new ideas, it also explains partly why some fail to adopt even in the face of positive changes. It does not however help students interested in pastoral studies understand why the whole Pokot community failed to adopt western ways and remained faithful to their traditional way of life even in the face of coercion. Adoption of innovations literature shows that innovations that are: incompatible with the existing system, complex to learn, difficult to try, with unknown expected results, risky to attempt and have a high potential to disrupt the routine ways are unlikely to be adopted. In addition, innovations that have no known profitability, impractical, those that are undemonstrable or in conflict with the known and whose messenger has a strange outlook are unlikely to be adopted [28]. In the context of the pastoral Pokot none of the innovations introduced by government and/or through its many agents resonated with their way of life. Diffusion of innovations theory is now equally applicable to situations beyond its original formulations. It is now relevant in institutional innovations and policy transfer [29]. Policy transfer defined as knowledge about how policies, administrative arrangements, institutions and ideas in one setting is used in the development of policies, administrative arrangements, institutions and ideas in another setting [30]. The pastoral Pokot did not adopt the administration system, new grazing system, new leaders, ways of worship, education or modern agriculture.

Table 1. A Comparison of selected development indices between counties where the Pokot live (West Pokot and Baringo with other sampled 'favorable' counties across Kenya

County	Women access to mass media once a week %	Age at first sexual intercourse in years	Total fertility rate	teenage pregnancy and motherhood %	Current use of a modern contraception	Last birth delivered by a doctor	Place of delivery- health facility	Fully vaccinated 12-23 months children	Men using condoms	No education – women	No education – men
West Pokot	6.7	17.0	7.2	22.8	13.3	14.7	25.8	31.2	79.3	33.8	18.9
Kirinyaga	8.7	18.9	2.3	9.2	75.6	36.8	92.5	92.3	87.6	0.8	0.7
Vihiga	12.0	18.1	4.5	10.8	56.6	16.5	50.2	94.4	83.0	0.4	0.3
Baringo	4.3	17.6	4.8	10.5	33.1	11.5	53.5	69.4	91.7	9.3	5.9
Machakos	10.2	18.3	3.4	12.2	67.5	24.1	62.9	90.0	88.1	0.2	0.3
Nairobi	16.5	19.3	2.7	13.1	58.3	44.8	88.7	74.4	93.1	1.7	0.0
National Average	10.7	-	3.9	14.7	53.2	31.1	61.2	74.9	86.5	7.0	-

Source: Kenya Demographic and Health Survey 2014.

The colonial government introduced a centralized system of government. The new government administrative system did not resonate with the pastoral Pokot system hence their rejection of much of what government introduced. The non-adoption was later christened as the pastoralist Pokot resistance to change [31]. A review of government records from 1900 – 1962, ethnographies and other scholarly writings considerably informed the background to marginalization.

Next I present the innovations which were frowned upon, avoided and not adopted. To a great extent, lack of adoption even in the face of coercion formed the basis for the subsequent government marginalization of the pastoralist Pokot.

The social organization of the pastoralist Pokot did not allow for an over-arching leader who enjoyed overall influence over everybody. Power was diffused into neighborhood leaders and none had total control over two villages for instance. The acephalous nature of pastoralist Pokot organization made it difficult for the government to set up an administration. Hence the centralized government structure did not resonate well with the diffuse Pokot structure. Therefore the appointment of chiefs / headmen with overall control over the people was resisted. The Pokot had neither patience nor experience of the 'big man' that the government introduced/imposed on them, nor were they ready to experiment with it. Hence attempts by the chiefs to confine the peoples movement within the neighborhood was found foreign as they were used to moving freely in different seasons. Chiefs were not respected, they were insulted in public and often threatened with magic and non-payment of tax in order for them to lack salary. In order to resonate with the people, chiefs evaded their responsibilities and they were openly contradicted [32]. The British administration deliberately ignored to recognize and use the diviners who were respected because their role (in governments' view) was closely associated with law breaking [31]. The attempt by the government to arrest Erimat, the respected Pokot diviner and his immediate death thereafter in Uganda where he had fled to distanced the pastoral Pokot farther from the government initiatives. In their view the government had killed Erimat [31]. [34] observed that no tribe in northern Kenya and Uganda had an effective centralized political leadership to make it powerful enough to capture government attention. Contrary to expectation, they were conceived as a threat to government interests. Therefore on these accounts the pastoralist Pokot did not appeal to government and they suffered/suffer the consequences.

In order to consolidate its administration and control local affairs, the government created native councils to help in tax collection and administration but the organ remained largely dysfunctional. A report [17] shows that during a native council meeting the District Commissioner (for West Pokot district) presented the budget and introduced all other aspects on the agenda. The pastoralist Pokot chiefs and other local representatives in the meeting concentrated instead on discussing irrelevant issues, obstructed all other deliberations and openly showed lack of interest in what the District Commissioner presented. The apparent lack of interest in government plans negated the government view of the pastoralist Pokot people as a whole.

Given the government preference for crop agriculture for export, attempts were made to introduce it and divest pastoralist Pokot interest from pastoralism. The Pokot frowned upon adopting maize farming on the account that it involved a lot of work especially digging which was very tiresome [36]. The decline to adopt crop based agriculture to some extent informed the subsequent governments' negative view of the pastoralist Pokot. The pokot were used to grazing in a standing and upright position yet maize cultivation required them to bend, a condition they found strange and too overwhelming.

The Carter Land Commission [37] reported that the pastoralist Pokot had over 300,000 cattle which were too far beyond their subsistence needs. Instead of forceful destocking, as it did in other areas of the country, the government preferred promotion of selling pastoralist Pokot cattle to other places [38]. However, the pastoralist Pokot declined to sell their cattle to other communities, but instead sold them among themselves (pastoralist Pokot) hence no destocking took place. Consequently the government destocking policy was not adopted hence it failed. The white settlers demand for quarantine in the pastoralist Pokot region was exploited by the pastoralist Pokot as an excuse not to sell cattle. According to [31] the Pokot view of the quarantine policy was that the government wanted to make them poor by focusing on them while the European farmers had equally more cattle yet they were not subject to destocking policy. In addition the destocking policy was contrary to Pokot traditional social ranking in which the more cattle numbers one owned bestowed on him a high social status hence, the system where a man with 100 cattle was rich, 10 cattle poor and no cattle was considered a dead man. The failure by the pastoralist Pokot to read the government logic in destocking did not elicit a kind view towards them. On cattle, it was clear the government and the pastoralist Pokot had utterly opposed views over their management.

In 1934 a Special Districts Law Ordinance was enacted. It conferred on the Provincial Commissioner of the Northern Frontier District powers to define grazing and water boundaries as a way of controlling human and livestock movements as well as overgrazing. To effect this directive, large territories were set aside as well as guards to police it [39]. However, the pastoralist Pokot still had their own traditional system of setting aside land for dry and wet season grazing and it had worked for them without undue duress. Given the new imposition onto the indigenous one, the pastoralist Pokot did not see the need for the government system as theirs was already working and adequate. They did not even understand its purpose hence they then violated it with impunity to the effect that most crimes reported between 1934 and 1945 were about violations of the by-laws on controlled grazing. The Pokot did not see merit in the government by laws. They regarded government officers as pessimists constantly complaining and warning of eroded land (they ignored the warnings) yet their cattle were fat. They vehemently disputed the government notion that their cattle were of inferior breed nor did they find the need for cross breeding of cattle [31]. The anti government stance taken by the pastoralist Pokot made the government to lose interest in them.

In the context of contribution of labor on white settler farms the situation was that of non-involvement. For instance only 600 Pokot were employed on white settler farms at the end of 1931 (op. cit. 36). The number reduced to 500 only fifteen years later [41]. Therefore the more the colonial government entrenched itself with modernization, the less the pastoralist Pokot imbibed it. This in itself did not endear the Pokot to the government and vice versa.

The pastoralist Pokot did not embrace modern education and Christianity since they did not appeal compared to traditional education which was centered on cattle. In the schools that were introduced in the pastoralist Pokot territory the majority of the pupils however became non-Pokot. For instance a school in a heavily populated area of Pokot territory (Kapenguria) only had ten Pokot pupils. The few Pokot pupils also irregularly attended school compared to children of members of other communities [17]. The Kapenguria School had 102 pupils but the Pokot constituted less than 50 and that the Pokot pupils did school work casually [43]. The Pokot dislike for school was based on: concentration on the more appealing herding; dislike for Europeans and their ways of life; the attractiveness of being a pastoralist Pokot child was too appealing than being in school. Given the dislike for western education, the western educated government officers could not recruit pastoralist Pokot people into civil service and farther it became the justification for their subsequent exclusion later on from the government mainstream for many years thereafter.

Christianity did not appeal to the pastoralist Pokot compared to their traditional religion. The requirements for Christianity on the pastoralist Pokot were just not affordable and besides they were impracticable and boring. They included: live near a church, desist from free movement, submission to a church man in the vicinity, abandon polygyny, abandon circumcision and abstinence from certain cultural practices [31]. A church leader in Kapenguria lamented that in the 25 years of missionary work in the pastoralist Pokot region he had converted not more than five people [31]. Given that government leaders and church leaders had a strong affinity, whatever one group avoided was avoided by the other. In the government view those who adopted Christianity obviously accepted the whitemans' and/or governments' ways. Since the pastoralist Pokot avoided Christianity they became and remained the governments' backwater for many years to come.

1.3. The notion of Pride among Nilotes

The notion of Pokot superiority over European and other communities' ways of life contributed considerably to rejection of modern ways [31]. Their pride did not endear them to government, a fact that to a considerable extent accounts for their social exclusion. The superiority notion is not however peculiar to the pastoralist Pokot, for it has been found common among all Nilotic communities largely due to their possession of cattle. Cattle is then intertwined with all other aspects of their life. [47] recorded the proud nature and contempt towards foreigners among the Nuer – Shilluk of Sudan. The conservatism and feeling of inferiority to none was evident among the Nuer [48].

[37] observed the pride, satisfaction and unwillingness to change among the Turkana even after being conquered by armed European force. Similarly the Nandi were found proud, conservative and contemptuous of all other people who were not like them. They did not like Europeans whom they compared to women for putting on clothes. Even when they feared gun-power of the Europeans they still resisted them [38]. The Elgeyo were not moved by aspects of modernity including bicycles, cigarettes, shirts, shorts or football. Those things meant little to them. They were in no hurry to change [39]. The appeal of the Maasai equally attracted Europeans. Government workers posted to the Maasai districts became so involved in Maasai life that they lost their effectiveness. They had to be transferred [26]. [38] noted greater resistance to modernization among pastoralists compared to the agriculturalists who easily imbibed western culture within a short period of interaction with Europeans.

Generally, pastoralists' resistance to European ways is mainly explained by their preoccupation with cattle (the cattle complex). The devotion to cattle made their life incompatible with the European ways [31].

1.4. Forms of Systemic Marginalization

Given the anti-European posture, the pastoralist Pokot were not in good books of the government and other communities. They were subsequently held in contempt in addition to the negative labels they were assigned including being uneducated, primitive, warlike, inconsiderate, appropriators of other communities' livestock and so on. The government report noted that both the Tugen and Il Chamus communities (ethnic groups neighboring the pastoral Pokot to the east and were early in enjoying the advantages of imbibing European ways) remained aloof at the plight of the pastoralist Pokot during and after the Kolloa affray in 1950. Contempt was openly expressed by the Tugen for the stupidity of the Pokot in believing the teachings of Lukas Kipkech [40]. [41] in the Kolloa Affray demonstrated how the government neglected the pastoralist Pokot and only woke up when *Dini ya Msambwa* arose and easily converted thousands of Pokot quickly and easily in an area the government and church had failed for half a century. However, when the government set to capture Lukas Kipkech and disperse or arrest his followers that is when they realized that there was no road (after 50 years of colonial rule), so they had to make the road as they moved. It took eight hours to cover a distance of 30 km. From then on nobody spoke positively of the pastoralist Pokot. Thereafter, the pastoralist Pokot were annihilated in many ways by the government: *Dini Ya Msambwa* followers were rounded up in thousands; all Pokot spears were confiscated; it became an offence for a Pokot to carry a spear (in an environment teeming with wildlife); government officials addressed them with contempt; a government levy force was stationed in Pokot for two years at Pokot expense; reduction of hut tax for the Tugen to Kshs 6 and a simultaneous increase for Pokot hut tax to Kshs 12 per annum; a halt to government economic development for the pastoralist Pokot; Pokot to surrender thousands of cattle to pay for the cost of the government administration. Of the 27 primary schools in Baringo District for instance,

only 1 (3.7%) was in pastoralist Pokot while the only Tugen teacher was so bad and scarcely taught to the effect that all pastoralist Pokot pupils consistently failed entrance examinations to join intermediate schools [42]. Further out of 5,658 pupils enrolled in school only 5 (0.1%) were Pokot, 60 (1.1%) Il Chamus and 98.8% Tugen [42]. Therefore the government deliberately ignored to construct schools in pastoralist Pokot territory while it concentrated among the friendly Tugen ethnic group who were crop producers therefore found more important to the national agriculture oriented economy.

A senior government official confirmed this systemic neglect by saying that, “The pokot tribe has been much neglected in the past few years due to reduction of administrative resources” [43].

In the context of law and order, members of the Pokot ethnic group were found more criminal than the members of the neighboring agricultural ethnic groups. For instance, out of the 40 accused persons, 24 were committed for trial and only two were convicted. Of the 40 accused, 35 of them were pastoralist Pokot, 3 Tugen 1 Uasin Gishu and 1 Turkana yet the arrests were made in an area where the Tugen farmers were majority [41]. The pastoralist Pokot had to raise their own money to fund water projects in their territory while in the Tugen farmer’s area government sponsored water projects [44]. Before 1950 government presence was only felt during periodic cinema shows to drum up payment of tax [41]. The government used pastoralist Pokot in forced (and free) labor to construct roads, airstrips, health centers and the steel bridge across River Kerio at Tot [41], [7] and [17] reported the systemic marginalization of the Pokot as follows;

“The pastoralist Pokot claim that they wanted freedom from colonial control was dismissed by the white missionaries and settlers. Their life had not changed; they live as they had lived before the 50 years of colonial administration. Pokot land was never a major source of labor nor did government sponsor any economic or social betterment schemes. Pokot land was the government’s backwater. Pokot were more bent on appropriating the herds of their Turkana and Karamojong neighbors”

Drawing from qualitative sources, the marginalization tempo has been sustained to the present. Key informants presented the following as examples of continuing marginalization: until 2010 there was no tarmac road in the pastoral Pokot region, few distant and non functional schools in an area that covers about 8000Km²; many and expansive areas without roads or any semblance of government presence, most schools have no government teachers; Pokot retirees on government watch list for criminals; between 2014–2016 the National Youth Service only recruited Tugen youth to construct the Bartabwa – Yatya road which terminated at the Pokot boundary and Pokot youth were only employed after consistent violent protests against discrimination by the government. In 2014 a total of 19 police officers were killed by suspected Pokot attackers after mistaking them for disguised Turkana warriors. The attack took place about 25km into Turkana County in Kapedo area. However, the government response to the attack involved a savage security forces operation with clear anti-Pokot undertones. Members of the Pokot ethnic group who lived as far as 120km away from the scene of the attack place were

victims of armed forces brutality. Pokot infrastructure including schools e.g. Chesitet and Chesakam primary schools (about 50km from the scene of the attack) were burnt down by the armed forces. Shops and hotel businesses in Ameyan, Chemolingot, Nginyang and Tangelbei some as far as 125km away were destroyed and looted by the security forces. The security forces also shot hundreds of Pokot cattle, and loaded onto their trucks several goats and motorcycles forcefully taken from the people. The savage nature with which the Pokot were attacked smacked of in-built hatred by government. Many homesteads in-between the point of attack and stretching beyond 120km away were burnt down by the security forces. Under the Economic Stimulus Programme launched by the government to restart the battered economy following post election violence in 2007/2008, the pastoralists Pokot were clearly sidelined by the dominant Tugen. In Baringo County for instance, diverse infrastructure were improved or constructed in all but Pokot area received no infrastructure [25]. In terms of education, out of the 656 primary schools in Baringo County only 106 (16.1%) are in Pokot area and of the 134 secondary schools 6(4.5%) are in Pokot area. Students enrolled in secondary school are 1,318(5.0%) Pokot compared to the total enrolment of 26,169 students [25]. There is no government initiative to increase access to education in the Pokot territory. Following incessant attacks and deterioration of security in North Rift Region of Kenya from early 2000, the government recruited Kenya Police Reserve (KPR) to bolster security. The recruitment and posting was discriminatory against the pastoralist Pokot as shown by the following distribution: Turkana 200; Laikipia 200; Samburu 70; Tugen 293 and Marakwet 240 Pokot 00.0 [45].

1.5. Selective use of Communal Punishment

Communal punishment as a way of controlling livestock theft was frequently used by the colonial administration [46]. Cattle rustling and general insecurity characterizes the north western part of Kenya and involves all the ethnic communities in the region: Pokot, Turkana, Il Chamus, Tugen, Samburu and Marakwet. Government attempts to address the problem has unfortunately been selective against the pastoralist Pokot. Communal punishment has been meted against the pastoralist Pokot to the exclusion of the communities involved in the cattle rustling and general insecurity. Qualitative sources captured the following: the Pokot had suffered at least 14 communal punishment operations by the Kenya Armed Forces; the most infamous was in 1984 (commonly referred to at *Lotiriri* in Pokot language) when armed forces confiscated 15,000 Pokot cattle (some estimated that 10,000 of them died at Kacheliba Police Station); many other cattle were driven to unknown places (Pokot elders interviewed at Sekerr, Kacheliba, Omblion and Marich villages in May 2016). In the 2005 communal punishment, the security forces confiscated 3,867 cattle and 500 goats from the Pokot in Tangelbei, Mukutani and Komolion areas and gave them to the Il Chamus at Ngambo Primary School [47]. A newspaper captured the security forces operation as follows,

Robbing Pokot to pay Njemps (Il Chamus); Out-cry over compensation system; and it does not augur well for

both communities. It was hurriedly done to please a section of the population and definitely does not solve the problem [48].

Therefore subjecting the pastoralist Pokot to communal punishment exclusively and not other communities in a region of ethnic warfare is a testimony of the social exclusion and discriminatory treatment of the Pokot by the government.

Acknowledgements

The preparation of this paper benefitted from the efforts of many people. The staff at the Kenya National Archives in Nairobi were very kind and facilitated my access to the relevant files. The respondents in Baringo and West Pokot Counties were particularly useful in providing primary data. They willingly provided useful information on the various aspects of their interaction with the government. Their views helped me to obtain a clearer view of marginalization from historical and contemporary perspectives.

References

- [1] GoK. (2010). National Population Census 2009. Central Bureau of Statistics. Government Printer. Nairobi.
- [2] Beech, M.W.H. (1911). *The Suk: Their Language and Folklore*. Clarendon Press. London.
- [3] Herskovits, M.J. (1926). "The Cattle Complex in East Africa" *American Anthropologist*. Volume XXVIII No's 1,2,3,4.
- [4] Schneider, J.G. (1953). *The Pokot (Suk) of Kenya with Special Reference to the Role of Livestock in their Subsistence Economy*. University Microfilm. Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- [5] Schneider, J. G. (1955). "The Moral System of the Pokot" in *Encyclopedia of Morals* (ed) Vergilius Ferm Philosophy Library, pp 403-409. New York.
- [6] Dietz, T. (1987). *Pastoralists in Dire Straits: Survival Strategies and External Interventions in a Semi Arid region at the Kenya/Uganda Border: West Pokot 1900-1986*. PhD Thesis.
- [7] Bianco, B.A. (1996). "Songs of Mobility in West Pokot" *American Ethnologist*. 23(2): 25-42.
- [8] Bollig, M. (2000). "Staging Social Structures; Ritual and Social Organization in an egalitarian Society; the Pastoral Pokot of Northern Kenya".
- [9] Zwanenberg, R.M.A. and King, A. (1975). *An Economic History of Kenya and Uganda 1800-1970*. Palgrave Macmillan. UK.
- [10] Gregersen, E.A. (1977). *Language in Africa: An Introductory Survey*. Gordon and Breach. New York.
- [11] Tanaka, J. (1980). Residential Pattern and Livestock Management among the Pastoral Pokot, in Tanaka, J. (ed) *A Study of Ecological Anthropology on Pastoral and Agrico-Pastoral People of Northern Kenya*. Kyoto University, Primate Research Institute. Inuyama.
- [12] Kurita, K. (1982). *A Market on Boundary: the Economic Activities of the Pokot and Marakwet in Kenya*. Laboratory of Human Evolution Studies. Faculty of Science. African Study Monographs. Supplementary Issue 1: pp 71-103.
- [13] Lamphear, J. (1992). *The Scattering Time: Turkana Responses to Colonial Rule*. Clarendon Press. Oxford.
- [14] Stewart. (1950). Quoted in GoK 1950. Baringo District Annual Report. National Archives. Nairobi.
- [15] GoK. (1951). Baringo District. Annual Report. National Archives. Nairobi.
- [16] Ogot, B.A. (1968). Kenya Under the British 1905-1963, in Zamani, A Survey in East African History. East African Publishing House. Nairobi.
- [17] GoK. (1965). Sessional Paper No. 10 on African Socialism and Its Application to Planning in Kenya. Government Printer. Nairobi.
- [18] Magaya, G. and Ogalo, J. (2012). "Living on the Edge: Rustling, Raids and Banditry in Kenya's North" *Maseno University Journal* No. 2.
- [19] GoK. (2016). *The Kenya Demographic and Health Survey 2014*. Central Bureau of Statistics. Nairobi.
- [20] GoK, (2013). *Baringo County Integrated Development Plan*. Central Bureau of Statistics. Nairobi.
- [21] Rogers, E. (1962). *Diffusion of Innovations*. 3rd edition, The Free Press. New York.
- [22] Rogers, E. (1969). *Modernization among Peasants: The Impact of Communication*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston. New York.
- [23] Rogers, E. (2003). *Diffusion of Innovations*. 5th edition. The Free Press. New York.
- [24] Stone, D. (2012). "Transfer and Translation of Policy" *Policy Studies* 33(4): 1-17.
- [25] Sharman, D.M. (2009). "Policy Diffusion and Policy Transfer" *Policy Studies* 30(3): 269-288.
- [26] Schneider, H.K. (1959). "Pokot Resistance to Change" in Bascom, W.R. and Herskovits, M.J. (eds) *Continuity and Social in African Cultures*. University of Chicago. Chicago.
- [27] GoK. (1920). West Pokot District. Annual Report. National Archives. Nairobi.
- [28] Barber, J. (1968). *Imperial Frontier: A Study of Relations Between the British and the Pastoral Tribes of North Eastern Uganda*, East African Publishing House. Nairobi.
- [29] GoK. (1952). West Pokot District. Annual Report. National Archives. Nairobi.
- [30] GoK. (1937). West Pokot District. Annual Report. National Archives. Nairobi.
- [31] Meek, C.I. (1953) Stock Reduction in the Mbulu Highlands Tanganyika. *Journal of African Administration* 5: 158-166
- [32] GoK.. (1932). West Pokot District. Annual Report. National Archives. Nairobi.
- [33] GoK. (1947). Baringo District. Annual Report. National Archives. Nairobi.
- [34] GoK (1948). West Pokot District. Annual Report. National Archives. Nairobi.
- [35] Butt, A. (1940) *The Nilotes of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan and Uganda*. International African Institute. London.
- [36] Pritchard, E.E.E. (1940). "The Nuer of the Southern Sudan" in *African Political Systems* (eds) Fortes, M. and Pritchard, E.E.E. Oxford University Press. London.
- [37] Gulliver, P. (1951). *A Preliminary Survey of the Turkana*. Communication from the School of African Studies. University of Cape Town. N.S. No. 26. pp 5-12.
- [38] Huntingford, G.W.B. (1953). *The Northern Nilo-Hamites*. International African Institute. London.
- [39] Hennings, R.O. (1951) *Africa Morning*. Chatto & Windus, pp 166-67.
- [40] GoK (1950) Baringo District. Annual Report. National Archives. Nairobi.
- [41] Kipkorir, B. (1972) *The Kolloa Affray, Kenya 1950*. *Trans African Journal of History*. Volume 2, Issue2: pp 114-129.
- [42] GoK. (1954). Baringo District. Annual Report. National Archives. Nairobi.
- [43] GoK. (1924). Baringo District. Annual Report. National Archives. Nairobi.
- [44] GoK. (1949). Baringo District. Annual Report. National Archives. Nairobi.
- [45] Daily Nation April 13, pp 11, 2017.
- [46] Anderson, D. (1986) Stock Theft and Moral Economy in Colonial Kenya. *Africa* Volume 56m Issue 4 pp 399-416.
- [47] Mutsotso, B. m. (2010). *The East Pokot on the Precipice: Conflict and Social Change in a Pastoralist Community*. PhD Thesis, Department of Sociology and Social Work, University of Nairobi.
- [48] *The East African Standard*. April 25, 2005, pp 7.