

Ethnographic Empathy and the Social Context of Rights: “Rescuing” Maasai Girls from Early Marriage

Caroline S. Archambault

ABSTRACT Esther is one of many young Maasai girls in Kenya “rescued” from early marriage. Her story is conventionally portrayed (trans)nationally and locally as a struggle between conservative pastoral patriarchs and the individual right of young girls to an education. I offer an ethnographic contextualization of the underlying factors giving rise to practices of early marriage, among the Maasai in Enkop, highlighting the contemporary predicaments of pastoralism in the face of population growth, climactic instability, and land-tenure reform and the insecurities and challenges around formal education. Through the intimate portrayal of Esther’s case, early marriage is situated not as a relic of tradition and malicious patriarchy but, rather, as a contemporary adaptation to livelihood insecurity. I illustrate how prevailing concepts of “tradition,” “culture,” “victimhood,” and “collective rights” in human rights theory obscure important structural factors that give rise to early marriage and deflect attention from effective policy initiatives. [*human rights, early marriage, education, pastoralism, Kenya*]

Esther was the first of five young women in line to talk to me. We sat on the steps of the boarding house of a Maasai school on the edge of town in southern Kenya. Esther is tall, thin, and, even at the young age of 17, has an air of confidence about her. Without much prompting on my part, she dove into her story—one she has clearly told many times before.

My father wanted to give me away. I went to my sister in Kiserian and she sent me to school. My mzee [father] came to remove me from school. I got help from my brother and a teacher. They brought me to the District Officer. He wrote me a letter to bring to the head teacher. I came here and started in class 2. Now I am in class 5. [interview, June 24, 2007]

Esther is one of several young Maasai girls in Kenya who have been “rescued” from early marriage, taking up residence in centers specifically created to shelter, feed, and educate them. The centers, first pioneered almost two decades ago, are largely funded by international donors. They have gained considerable momentum following Kenya’s Free Primary Education initiative in 2002 and the growing popularity of a rights-based approach to development. The centers are part of a wider network of initiatives and organizations that support the second and third Millennium Development Goals: namely, gender equality, female empowerment, and the rights of all children to an education. Maasai practices of early marriage and the associated practice of female

circumcision, in particular, have come under fire internationally, as they constitute some of the most obvious examples of gender-based violence and infringements on the rights of the child.

Several years prior to this meeting with Esther, as part of my doctoral fieldwork on Maasai education, I volunteered at a Maasai boarding school known for pioneering the rescue-center service. I was encouraged by the administration to interview several of the 22 “rescued girls” that took refuge in this center. As they explained, getting their stories out to the public was an important strategy in finding sponsors to support the girls’ continued studies. In 2007, I returned to follow up on these interviews and met Esther for the first time. Esther’s story shared a distinct narrative structure with the stories told to me by the other girls. A typical narrative begins with a father or uncle’s marriage plans for her, is followed by a brief explanation of her narrow escape, and concludes with the girl happily ever after in pursuit of an education. This story line is usually framed by a set of prevailing binaries that distinguish violators from victims, patriarchy from female empowerment, tradition from modernity, and collective culture from individual rights. I came to recognize this as the narrative form commonly used to depict early marriage in the international media, in development circles within Kenya, and even locally in Enkop, Esther’s home. Although such a framework may be effective in mobilizing

public support, it essentializes and renders static notions of “victimhood,” “tradition,” “culture,” and “rights”; it obscures the real structural underlying factors that give rise to the practice of early marriage, among the Maasai; and it deflects attention from important policy interventions that could more effectively address the issue. Because Esther had run away from Enkop, the community where I have been working for more than seven years, the profound limitations of these conventional narratives were apparent to me. Interviews with her friends, family members, and other members of the community, as well as regular periods of fieldwork on a variety of topics, brought out the complexity of the issue of early marriage and the importance of ethnographic contextualization for effectively addressing this problem.³

As my interview with Esther’s father illustrated, the fathers, who are commonly viewed as responsible for these incidences of early marriage, are often not the caricature of the traditional, conservative, pastoral patriarch. Esther’s father proclaims himself to be “a very good man of education” (interview, November 3, 2007). Formal education, he hopes, will offer his children alternatives to the exclusive practice of pastoralism in a region where rapid land fragmentation and dispossession, continued neglect by the state, increased climactic instability, and heightened population pressure have all compromised the viability of a pastoral livelihood for Maasai youth. With three wives and 26 children, his educational record is rather exceptional compared to the average family in Enkop. Despite never attending school himself and raising his children in a time when it was uncommon to send many children to school, Esther’s father has served for years as the chairman of the primary school management committee. He has managed to send all but eight of his 26 children to school. Esther’s mother, who never attended school herself, has had three of her seven children (two boys and one girl) pursue secondary studies—a remarkable feat by Enkop standards. Esther, the fifth-born child and fourth-born daughter, together with her eldest sister, were the two children in her family who were not sent to school. “[Esther] was not a school girl,” her father explained. “She was a girl of the home. . . . We tried to educate all our children but it depended on our cows and goats and poverty. . . . I have had children in six different schools, so I am a very good man for education. The problem is [too few] animals” (interview, November 3, 2007). Esther’s father decided it best to secure her future as a pastoralist by marrying her to a good family and husband at the age of 14.

Esther resisted her status as a “girl of the home.” Shortly before her marriage, she secretly enrolled herself in school under the pretense of visiting her sister. When news reached her parents, her mother was sent to retrieve her, and the wedding plans were expedited. The night of her wedding, when friends and family of the bride and groom were in attendance and the festivities had started, Esther ran away to the center with the help of her brother and a local teacher. The wedding had to be cancelled, and initial bridewealth payments returned to the groom and his family. Following

her escape, domestic conflict ensued: Esther’s father suspected his wife and son of colluding with his daughter and forced them to temporarily leave their home. On visiting the center to retrieve Esther, Esther’s father was told by the headmistress that she was now “a school child.” “Esther will be your child,” he replied. “You will give her a husband and she will never set foot in my house again. I don’t count her as a child in my family” (interview, June 1, 2007). Esther was disowned.

Years have passed and because Esther has been successful in her studies, her father has now accepted her back as his daughter. He recognizes and appreciates her as a “girl of school” and hopes that education will provide her with a secure livelihood and a good husband.

There are significant limitations to the conventional view of Esther’s story as a simple tension between culture—patriarchy—tradition and a girl’s right to an education. In this article, I offer novel research findings by ethnographically contextualizing the underlying factors giving rise to practices of early marriage among the Maasai in Enkop. The investigation provides a unique perspective on contemporary predicaments that the practice of pastoralism encounters in the face of land-tenure reform, political marginality and state neglect, climactic instability, and population growth. It demonstrates the insecurities and challenges associated with formal education. Through the intimate portrayal of Esther’s case against this backdrop of societal change, early marriage is situated not as a relic of tradition and malicious patriarchy but, rather, as a contemporary adaptation to livelihood insecurity. This case study illustrates how prevailing concepts of “tradition,” “culture,” “victimhood,” and “collective rights” in human rights theory obscure important structural factors that give rise to early marriage and deflect attention from effective policy initiatives. This article responds to recent calls for a critical anthropology of human rights, one that not only pursues an ethnography of human rights practice but also uses its findings to reflect back on basic theoretical and practical dimensions of the human rights project (Goodale 2006, 2009a, 2009b).

THE TRANSNATIONAL VERSION: HUMAN RIGHTS TALK ON EARLY MARRIAGE

Kenya has signed and ratified all major international human rights treaties that carry provisions to protect young girls from early marriage. Protections against early marriage have also been nationally legislated through the 2002 passage of the Children Act (Cap 586, Laws of Kenya). Article 2 of The Children Act entitles all children to free, basic, and compulsory education. Article 14 stipulates that “no person shall subject a child to female circumcision, early marriage or other cultural rites, customs, or traditional practices that are likely to negatively affect the child’s life, health, social welfare, dignity, or physical or psychological development” (Government of Kenya 2001).

Since passing this legislation, Kenya has experienced a flood of activity by international, national, governmental,

and nongovernmental organizations that are campaigning against and monitoring gender-based infringements on the rights of the child. The term *early marriage* is powerfully constituted as it simultaneously signifies an inappropriate age to marry (also captured in the term *child marriage*) as well as an inappropriate time to marry, implying that one ought to be doing something else during this period of childhood (mainly, pursuing an education). Thus, even if not explicitly addressing early marriage, these organizations often take issue with many practices associated with or implicated in what has come to be defined as *early marriage*, including child marriage, female circumcision, girl child education, reproductive rights, and arranged marriage or betrothal (Shell-Duncan and Olungah 2009). This conceptual overlap makes early marriage a powerful infringement of child rights, one that has become a prevalent concern among many organizations addressing Maasai development, most centrally the recent network of rescue centers.

Rescue centers and rights activists have played a key role in perpetuating a particular narrative of the early marriage issue that circulates transnationally and locally. An article from the news brief section of the UN Population Fund website (2005) describing a rescue center in Kenyan Maasailand serves as a typical illustration of this popular early marriage narrative:

Silvia Selula looks dazed and lost. A faint wrinkle creases her otherwise cherubic face. Occasionally a furtive smile appears at the corner of her mouth. Her face says a lot about what she has endured, especially in the last few weeks, and about her optimism about the future. Silvia is the latest addition to the Tasaru Ntomonok Girls Rescue Centre in Narok, Kenya.

Most of those who listen to her mumble her story shake their heads and wonder how the fate that almost befell Silvia could be tolerated in Kenya today. Silvia is nine years old. A few weeks ago, her father married her off to a 40-year-old man. She had no say in the arrangement. Neither did her mother, who reluctantly acquiesced. It is, after all, still a man's world on the rolling plains of the Southern Rift Valley, the home of the Maasai.

The writer continues on to explain how the events of Silvia's marriage were progressing as Maasai "custom" and "tradition" would dictate, with Silvia being "frog marched" to her fate as a fourth wife. The rescue center proceeds to "free" Silvia from the common fate of "child marriage" and "the harmful practice of female genital mutilation/cutting (FGM)" that is inflicted on so many young Maasai girls. Readers are assured that the center has "reconciled" girls with their families and that education of these girls will help put an end to "gender-based violence" by promoting "gender equality" and, ultimately, empowering women.

This prevailing narrative form is characterized by the use of a story line structure and the framing of issues through morally unambiguous and emotionally charged dichotomies—rhetorical techniques that Emery Roe (1994) and others (Gasper and Apthorpe 1996; Stirrat 2000) argue serve only to simplify complexity and render social life manageable and more amenable to policy action. The story

line limits the issue to a problem between traditional patriarchy and progressive daughters. Esther, Silvia, and other young women are cast into the role of innocent victims fighting against the evil intentions of fathers or uncles whose actions are propelled by the force of "deeply rooted" and "patriarchal" "traditions" and "customs" in which wives and daughters "acquiesce" and "have no say." "After all it is still a man's world," concludes the UNPF article. The simple story with its simple characters becomes more than a fight between a girl and her father. It is a battle waged against patriarchy in the name of women's rights, against tradition in the name of modernity and progress. There is, thus, no doubt about who should win. Action is imminent, inaction morally reproachable. Such narrative frames effectively obscure and render irrelevant the larger and more complicated context giving rise to early marriage.

Anthropologists have been on the forefront of criticizing representational frameworks within human rights discourse (Wilson 1997). "Legalistic" accounts of human rights violations are said to strip events of their social meanings and subjectivities and conceal the ambiguities and contingencies that are at the heart of acts of injustice. This goes against the very goal of ethnographic investigations of human rights practices, which aim to restore subjectivity and contextualize rights violations by exploring their local interpretations and "vernacularizations" (Goodale 2007; Merry 2006a, 2006b).

LOCAL VERSIONS: PROLIFERATION OF RIGHTS-BASED DISCOURSES IN ENKOP

Enkop, the predominantly Maasai community and central site of this study, stretches over 200,000 acres in the southern district of Kajiado. It is home to approximately 10,500 residents. Low altitudes, variable and little rainfall, and poor soils produce a semiarid climate with little agricultural potential. Consequently, traditional livestock husbandry is the primary economic activity in Enkop. Cattle, goats, sheep, and even a few camels are raised through a form of transhumant husbandry: during the wet season animals are grazed within the vicinity of a permanent homestead, and during the dry periods they are moved to distant pastures. There is little infrastructure in Enkop. Residents have access to water through scattered boreholes, seasonal streams, and hand-dug wells. There is no electricity and no paved roads. The closest paved road is 35 kilometers away from a small town center, which is comprised of a number of shops, an administrative office for the local chief, a health clinic, a primary school, a newly built secondary school, and a weekly livestock and goods market.

Rights discourses flow to Enkop residents through three main channels. Most notably, schooling provides a platform through which national perspectives are disseminated locally. Survey data on schooling I carried out in Enkop show a dramatic and relatively recent increase in school participation within the community, with gender parity in the youngest cohorts. According to the 2005 survey, two thirds (66 percent) of children ages 6–15 years old had attended

formal schooling for one year or more compared with less than half (47 percent) of the age-group above them (ages 16–25 years old). Among adults ages 46 and above, only 16 percent had ever attended school. With regard to female participation rates, the changes are even starker, with gender parity being reached in the youngest ages. In the cohort of children ages 6–10 at the time of the survey, the percentage of girls having attended one or more year of formal schooling was even higher than that of boys (64 percent of girls compared to 60 percent of boys). Among women ages 46 years and above, only nine percent had ever attended one or more years of schooling (Archambault 2007). The rise in primary-education participation in Enkop is linked to the perceived decreasing viability of pastoralism as a livelihood strategy for future generations, which I will further discuss below. School children read about human rights in their textbooks and hear rights proclamations from their teachers and school visitors. On special occasions (sports days or celebrations), they disseminate these messages through song and dance to their guests, parents, and fellow peers. Churches act as a second prominent channel with, according to the 2005 survey, approximately half of the adult population self-identifying as Christian (Archambault 2007). Early marriage is an issue raised during church sermons, prayer meetings, and other social religious gatherings. The church leadership quite actively promotes education of the girl child, the sanctity of love marriages, and free choice of life partners and condemns polygyny as well as both early and out-of-wedlock pregnancy. The third prominent channel is the growing local presence of the numerous NGOs servicing the Enkop community whose agendas focus on women and children’s rights. These organizations hold local meetings, visit churches and schools, and sometimes distribute posters or other reading materials to educate the public on the rights of the girl child and to issue warnings against the practice of early marriage.

How influential are the (trans)national discourses on the ways in which people in Enkop think about early marriage? Sally Engle Merry (2006a) provides a classificatory continuum for situating the degree of similarity between transnational rights discourses and local variations, distinguishing between replication, hybridization, and subversion. Although Esther’s case seemed to elicit reflections that spanned the spectrum, all of those interviewed seemed to retain the prevailing structural binaries found in popular narratives. They identified Esther as a victim and her father as a violator. They invoked early marriage as a traditional custom that was incongruous with modern times. They spoke of tension between individual rights and culture and collective practices. Some interviewees replicated the emotional charge of these binaries by angrily condemning Esther’s father for his patriarchal and malicious intentions to violate and oppress his daughter’s rights to an education. One young female respondent went as far as to accuse Esther’s father of marrying off Esther as a way to punish his least favorite wife (Esther’s mother). “He’s a bad man,” she insisted. “He does not like when girls go to school . . . and

he does not love Mama Esther” (interview, August 11, 2010). Some directed their blame, more generally, on Maasai men’s greed for livestock, as reflected in the words of a young pastor: “Most of the people give out their girls to be married just . . . to get cows. They are greedy” (interview, August 13, 2010). Such sentiments reflect the transnational narrative constructions depicted in the UNPF article or the slogan “Don’t sell your daughters for a cow” that adorns the walls of NGOs in Kajiado and Nairobi.

Most people interviewed, however, seemed to embrace a hybrid variation by retaining the binary structures while infusing them with local meaning, which significantly softened their antagonism. A less aggressive perspective seemed to arise not only from an intimate understanding of the people involved (and their intentions) but also from an experience and interpretation of “tradition” and “culture” as something that, while perhaps outdated, was nonetheless largely dignified. “He is not a bad man. He has just taken a wrong decision,” expressed an elderly mama (interview, August 13, 2010). “The guy is an innocent guy. It is the culture,” said an educated young man (interview, August 11, 2010). Much of the empathy shared in the case of Esther’s father was not only because of his outstanding record of educating his children and commitment to education but also to the fact that Esther had not originally been enrolled in school. “She was a girl of the home,” her father and others insisted. The educated young man explains: “It was the traditional agreement. So that is what you follow. . . . I don’t blame him. He had two [uneducated] girls and . . . they got married. . . . That is the criteria of the father. . . . It is not wrong. That is how it is for our culture” (interview, August 11, 2010).

The common distinction made by many interviewed between the marital rights of “local” or uneducated girls versus those of schooled girls could be considered subversive of the transnational discourse. Educated girls, several insisted, are given the right to decide on the timing of their marriage and choose their own partners, whereas the marital decisions for “girls of the home” are determined by their parents.

The way in which Esther escaped her marriage was raised on several occasions and elicited some sympathy for her father. Several people who I interviewed felt that Esther should not have waited until the day of her wedding to assert her rights. They believe she should have talked to her father or called a meeting with the local chiefs before the groom and his family arrived. Especially the men interviewed seemed to empathize with how shameful the turn of events must have been for Esther’s father and how disappointing and disruptive for the groom and his family.

Remarkably, no interviewee explicitly or fundamentally rejected the use of the dichotomous conceptual framework described above to explain practices of early marriage. Even if the meanings were softened and sympathies with the parties involved were expressed, Esther’s father was seen to be at fault and early marriage rendered as a cultural practice of the past. From the perspective of those interviewed, there seemed to be only one way to secure the well-being and

future of daughters in Enkop: through education. Only one age-mate of Esther's father came close to breaking out of the confines of this frame by suggesting that the path of early marriage could be a modern possibility and the result of love felt for a daughter: "He had other girls whom he sent to school and others to be married," suggested the man. "He loves a lot his children. And he is not a bad person. He chose a very good person [for her to marry]" (interview, August 18, 2010).

"ANOTHER" VERSION: PREDICAMENTS OF THE PATRIARCH

"Had I know she would have been this good of a student, I would have chosen her all along," Esther's father explained (interview, November 3, 2007). Admittedly, I first dismissed his statement as a simple justification. However, the more I learned about Esther's situation and situated it within the larger context of social change in Enkop, the more significant it became. Assuming that fathers love and want the best for their daughters—which I strongly believe holds true for most fathers in Enkop—I have come to appreciate the difficulties parents face in choosing the "best" path to secure the future well-being of their daughters.

Most parents in Enkop today question the viability of pastoralism as an exclusive livelihood strategy for all of their children. There is a pervasive sentiment throughout the region that pastoralism is becoming much more difficult because of the combined forces of land and resource fragmentation and dispossession, which have been accelerated by recent land-tenure reforms, increased climatic instability, continued state neglect, and increasing population pressure. Over the past few decades, per capita livestock holdings in Kajiado district have fallen well below subsistence survival levels (Anderson and Broch-Due 1999; Talle 1988). Residents of Enkop periodically suffer dramatic droughts that threaten to decimate their herds. The drought of 2000 killed an estimated 80 percent of cattle and 70 percent of small stock. Estimates of livestock losses from the most recent drought (2008–09) are still undetermined, but many people believe that droughts have become more frequent and more severe. In the 19th century, pastoralists faced great environmental calamities, outbreaks of disease, and severe drought, but many managed to recuperate their losses over time. Today, however, environmental adversity is compounded with a long history of political marginalization by the colonial and postcolonial states, which has resulted in an increase in economic marginalization (Anderson and Broch-Due 1999). Investments in the pastoral sector have been neglected by a long-standing view that pastoralism is an unproductive, inefficient, environmentally destructive, and archaic mode of production (Waller 1999). With little understanding of pastoral ecology and indigenous systems of resource management, many of the development initiatives aimed at "rationalizing" animal husbandry disrupted the livelihood and rendered pastoralism more precarious. The state has also long been implicated in pastoral land

dispossession, through colonial treatises of relocation, the allocation of pastoral lands for national parks and reserves or for other commercial interests, and the continued encouragement to privatize communally held grazing lands (Galaty 1992; Lesorogol 2008; Mwangi 2008). Although privatization has been pursued by many Maasai as a way to prevent further dispossession of their rangelands because of encroachments by the state and neighboring groups, it has made them vulnerable to territorial losses through land sales or exclusion from private property. Despite the fact that privatization is not yet complete in Enkop, many complain that it has already intensified the difficulties of pastoralism by considerably restricting livestock mobility. According to the 2008–09 land-tenure survey, 59 percent of men and 71 percent of women interviewed in Enkop reported that the subdivision of land made pastoralism more difficult, while only 10 percent of men and 2 percent of women reported that privatization made pastoralism easier.

Given these growing constraints on pastoralism, residents of Enkop must turn to their social networks for protection of and access to resources—arguably more than ever before. Maasai lineage, clanship, age-set, and marriage systems provide an institutional foundation for these networks. In this light, and at the risk of sounding reductionist, the continued (or even heightened) importance of "customary" marriage in connecting families to pastoral resources now under individual title and providing strong links of mutual support and reciprocity must be noted.

Although recognizing the diversity of marriage practices among the Maasai (Bledsoe and Pison 1994; Coast 2006; Hodgson 1996; Talle 1988; von Mitzlaff 1988), still there exists a strong set of cultural norms that define the "customary" system of Maasai marriage. This system is exogamous, in that both men and women should take their spouses from clans other than their paternal and maternal clans. Typically, customary marriages are arranged by the parents of both bride and groom when both girls and even boys are young and uncircumcised. They are often arranged through lengthy processes of negotiations and are characterized by a "protracted" form of marriage payment (Hakansson 1989). Compared to other East African patrilineal groups, Maasai pay a small initial bridewealth payment of a few animals, beer, blankets, and, more recently, cash, with the understanding and expectation that transactions of livestock and other forms of support will continue through the course of the marriage. This form of marriage is understood and valued as an alliance of families. Although parents look at the individual qualities of potential brides and grooms for their children, much consideration is given to the wider qualities and characteristics of the families that are being united. Marriage is understood as creating powerful linkages to new resources and obligations of mutual social and economic support. There is probably no greater gift, as viewed by the Maasai, than having been given a daughter. Affines share a special bond. Daughters do not disappear from their natal homes into their new families but remain central

nodes of sociality and security between these families. “The relationship will be very strong [between affines]. They will help each other throughout,” explains an elder man. “They have a very strong relationship because of the girl that was given to that family,” he continues (interview, August 18, 2010). An educated young mother who is a third wife to her husband adds: “[The two families] are now becoming like sisters and brothers” (interview, August 8, 2010).

Given increasing pressure on pastoral practices and the role that customary marriage plays in providing extended family support, it is perhaps less surprising to note that, in contrast to the general trends in Kenya and elsewhere in East and sub-Saharan Africa (Mensch et al. 2006), age at first marriage among the Maasai seems to be actually decreasing rather than increasing. In the not-so-distant past, explains one young man, “the girls waited until they knew how to milk a cow and to carry a container of water and carry firewood and also to know how to feed the small kids” (interview, August 11, 2010). An elder mother adds: “Men took a very long time [to marry]. They even grew beards. They stayed for a long time before they were circumcised. Not like now” (interview, August 13, 2010). Survey data from Enkop supports the common assertion that the age of marriage for both girls and boys has been decreasing over time because the age of female circumcision, which is commonly performed immediately prior to marriage, shows a steady decrease. Women ages 60–69 years old at the time of the survey were circumcised on average at 19.7 years old, whereas women ages 20–29 were circumcised at 16.6 years old.

Ernestina Coast (2001, 2006) finds a similar trend in several other Maasai communities in Kenya and Tanzania. She attributes this change to “modernizing” influences, as young men step out of the livelihood and out of the control of their fathers. They no longer have to wait to amass livestock wealth or wait for the ritual sanctions to be married. In Enkop, several explanations circulate. Similar to Coast, many point to the attrition of cultural practices, whereby young boys and girls forego or expedite rites of passage and are circumcised at increasingly younger ages. A young, educated man, himself circumcised at the age of 15 because of the social pressure of other circumcised boys at his school, reflects: “I think it is the community culture which is changing slowly. They circumcise both boys and girls at a very young age . . . and then girls are let out for marriage” (interview, August 14, 2010). Education is identified as a powerful force in expediting adulthood, as students want to attain adulthood before reaching the final grades of primary school. Many also attribute the decreasing age of marriage to increases in early pregnancy, discussed in more detail below.

Finally, people claim that early marriage is a product of insecurity and poverty, exacerbated by the heightened challenges to pastoral livelihoods. “Sometimes the children are so many at home that you cannot educate them, you cannot provide food for them, so the only alternative is to marry them,” explains an elderly mother (interview, August 13, 2010). Several residents explained that under circumstances

in which families struggled to provide for their children, marrying out a daughter to a good family would better secure the daughter’s future and would relieve some of the pressure of providing for the remaining members of the family. As one elder explains: “You can not just give your daughter to be married by anyone. You must choose for someone who you know will care for your daughter. And they do that by marrying their daughters to see that they have a good future” (interview, August 18, 2010). Logos on T-shirts chastise fathers for selling their daughters for cows. Although their blame may be arguably misdirected, the link between early marriage and poverty is probably quite salient as marriage remains one of the important mechanisms through which families can draw on support and security and ensure that daughters are well protected in good homes.

As elsewhere in Maasailand, people in Enkop have responded to the insecurities of pastoralism by finding ways to diversify their sources of income (Hodgson 2001; Homewood et al. 2009; Thompson and Homewood 2003). The options for diversification and small-enterprise development are limited in Enkop by the lack of electricity, poor infrastructure, low levels of education among the adult population, and a difficult climate for agricultural endeavors. For this reason, pastoralism and the marketing of livestock is still one of the most important sources of income and security for families in the region. However, for the younger generation, parents are investing in formal schooling in the hopes that this will provide their children with the skills and opportunities to enhance opportunities for livelihood diversification. “Education is the key to life” is a common saying today in Enkop. Schooling and the employment that it promises are seen as new options by which Maasai families protect themselves against the vulnerabilities of pastoralism (Archambault 2007).

Schooling is by no means, however, the panacea that many (esp. young) enthusiasts in Enkop suggest. Parents, mothers especially, have taken on increased herding and domestic responsibilities to compensate for the loss of their children’s labor while they attend school. Schools in Enkop are few and dispersed over a wide area. According to my 2005 survey, on average children live 57 minutes’ walk away from the nearest primary school, with many children having to walk for upward of two hours through wild shrub land to reach school. Consequently, parents wait for children to be “big” enough to make it to school, sit through the day and learn productively, and return home safely. The practice of sending children to live with family or friends living closer to schools is common in Enkop and demonstrates the level of dedication both children and parents have toward schooling (Archambault 2010).

As a consequence of difficulties in accessing school, Maasai children—girls especially—often begin their education at a relatively late age. Consequently, girls often reach reproductive age while still in primary school. The school environment affords considerably more exposure and unsupervised interaction between boys and girls, and according

to many this has resulted in a surge of early pregnancies. In Kenya, not just in Maasailand, pregnant girls are discouraged from remaining in school because they are often perceived as a bad influence on their peers. Among the Maasai, an early and unexpected pregnancy will commonly trigger circumcision followed by marriage. "It is a taboo for a Maasai girl to be pregnant when she's not circumcised," an elder man explains. "Fifty years ago there were no girls who just got pregnant [so young]. . . . But nowadays it is very common. They circumcise quickly . . . so that she is not pregnant when she is a girl," he continues (interview, August 18, 2010). Over the years, I have witnessed more and more cases where young schoolgoing mothers leave their newborns in the care of their family and return to their studies after giving birth. Whether pregnancy should preclude further education and mark a young girl's transition to customary family life is contested in Enkop. In fact, the two other cases of "rescued girls" in Enkop that I have heard about concerned situations of school pregnancies. The risk of early pregnancy weighs heavily on the minds of parents as a real risk of formal schooling.

Parents are also concerned that their children will not be able to translate their education into livelihood security. Formal-sector salaried jobs in Kenya seem to demand increasingly higher levels of education, and the Kenyan school system is highly competitive, with positions in secondary school available for only just over half (55 percent) of primary graduates (Nyerere 2009). Young women in Enkop who manage to avoid pregnancy or other situations resulting in their dropping out nevertheless have to obtain high enough marks on the national primary leaving exam to secure a spot in the competitive secondary system. Low-quality educational provision in Enkop—because of large class sizes, understaffing, lack of learning resources, and a nonconductive study environment, among other factors—make this a real challenge, especially for girls. Those who manage to obtain high enough marks often find the secondary school fees and associated costs prohibitive. According to the 2005 survey data, a little over one quarter (28 percent) of girls between the ages of 26 and 35 who attended primary school entered secondary school, with only ten percent pursuing some form of tertiary education (Archambault 2007).

With high levels of dropping out inevitable in the current competitive system, there is great pressure to offer good quality basic and primary education. Yet parents in Enkop complain that even primary school graduates have substandard levels of literacy and numeracy and observe that secondary-school graduates often come home jobless but unwilling to herd livestock, a job they associate with the uneducated. Inadequate access to vocational and technical training, pedagogical approaches focused on rote learning and the acquisition of exam-based knowledge, and a biased curriculum that presents pastoralism as an archaic mode of production are all aspects of the current school system that render even primary graduates, in the opinion of many parents and in the words of a primary school teacher, as "half-baked cakes." Furthermore, school children often want

to arrange their own marriages, leading many parents to fear the implications this will have on their security and well-being. They question whether such alliances will provide as strong protection for their children and whether they themselves will be in the position to mediate marital disputes if they are not responsible for having formed the union.

So although sending girls to school is the path that most parents in Enkop are choosing to secure the future well-being of their daughters (recall that in the 2005 survey, the percentage of girls with at least one year of schooling was higher than that of boys), the risks of dropping out and uncertainties related to whether or not formal education will lead to livelihood security make it less of an obvious choice than the human rights discourse suggests. In this light, choosing early marriage may be understood as a decision taken by parents who have lost confidence in the education system or in the economy or who do not trust their daughters' future to the hands of the state. So, contrary to popular belief, early marriage may be more effectively understood as a modern adaptation—a decision made not out of a "deeply rooted custom" and "patriarchy" but, rather, out of love, concern, and insecurity.

IMPLICATIONS OF AN ETHNOGRAPHIC VERSION

The ethnographic version I have provided above, which breathes social life into Esther's story and situates her father's decision in a wider context of profound socioeconomic and ecological change, threatens to dismantle the prevailing dichotomies that are often used to frame the issue of early marriage among the Maasai. Such an approach debunks the powerful dualism of victim and violator that is pervasive in (trans)national and local accounts of early marriage. In light of the circumstances in which Esther's father's decision was made and his intentions, he shifts from a symbol of patriarchal oppression to a persona of a concerned father. No longer simply a violator of his daughter's rights to an education, he can be understood as a victim himself of economic, ecological, and political forces beyond his control that render the path that would attain security for Esther (and other young women like her) more uncertain. Other anthropologists engaging in human rights issues have, similarly, found the lens of victim versus violator limiting in its neglect of the range of subjectivities and historically situated positions people embody (Ross 2003; Wilson 1997; Wilson and Mitchell 2003). The binary framework also deflects attention from human rights abuses that are not perpetrated by individuals but, rather, by economic, political, or social forces at large.

An ethnographic perspective on Esther's case challenges the tradition-modernity dichotomy. Early marriage is historicized and is situated not as a relic of an age-old tradition among conservative pastoralists but, to the contrary, as a modern phenomenon: a shift downward in the age of marriage in response to cultural change and increasing poverty and marginalization. Anthropologists have heavily scrutinized the culture-tradition concept, moving away from a static and bounded interpretation only to find its essentialized

forms clung to by informants and fuelled by “rights talk” (Cowan 2006; Cowan et al. 2001; Eriksen 2001; Merry 2006b; Preis 1996). Esther’s uneducated father, an exclusive pastoralist and polygynist who is simultaneously an educational leader and advocate, sits precariously on both sides of the tradition–modern binary. And Esther, who rejected her status as a “traditional” girl of the home in favor of the status of a “modern” school girl (even at a late age), illustrates the agency people possess to move themselves in and out of such symbolic categories. Her case serves as a warning to human rights theorists and practitioners to avoid essentialized, nonpoliticized, and nonagentive notions of culture and tradition in human rights theory.

Further, this ethnographic approach challenges the perceived irreconcilable conflict between individual and collective rights (Berting et al. 1990). It reveals a redundancy, argued by Jack Donnelly (1990), wherein the rights of individuals acting as members of social groups become disaggregated into separate forms of entitlements: “There is no necessary logical incompatibility between the idea of human rights and peoples’ rights (or other group rights)—so long as we see peoples’ rights as the rights of individuals acting as members of a collective group, and not rights of the group against the individual” (Donnelly 1990:48). When put into context, the “collective right” of arranging marriages appears to be an expression of individual rights to integrity and security. Father and daughter can be understood as sharing similar fundamental goals (security of well-being) while disagreeing on the means through which to achieve them. The reverse also holds true in Enkop. What gets classified as an individual right, in this case the right to education, is also perceived locally as a collective right and a responsibility. Many people in Enkop think about formal education as a means of empowering the community at large. “The pen is the spear of today” is a common saying meant to instill in the young a commitment to defend and protect their community with the knowledge, networks, and resources afforded by education. So although the binary frame obscures the conceptual overlap of individual and collective rights, it also ignores the plurality of collectivities of which individuals are a part. For example, Esther’s father is part of a collectivity of elders who continue to practice pastoralism and who perceive it as an enduring and important form of security for some. Esther is a part of a growing collectivity of young women who are striving to attain security and status through schooling. Different collectivities may very well perceive different pathways by which to achieve shared goals or rights.

In this light, Esther’s case also speaks to another powerful dichotomy structuring children’s rights discourse: how to reconcile the will of parents with the will of (underage) children. Interestingly, this issue was never raised in discussions locally about the practice of early marriage. Several people made mention that Esther had a very strong will to go to school, as she had enrolled herself very late and was willing to start at a grade typically well below her age. This showed great determination and promise that she would do well in

school. However, those who reprimanded Esther’s father’s decision to marry her did so not because they believed parents should listen to the will of their children but, rather, because they strongly believed that education was the right path to a better future for young girls. For every young girl or boy who pleads to their parents to be sent to school, there is likely one who pleads against being sent or who wishes to discontinue. Children drop out from school for many reasons, but some do so to the great disapproval of their parents because they simply lose interest or would rather be doing something else with their time. Maasai parents strongly hold on to the responsibility and the authority to make decisions for their children. There is a strong belief that the young lack the hindsight or experience necessary to make informed decisions about their future. This belief is held not just about young children. Age-based seniority is central to Maasai social organization and sociocultural life. Throughout one’s life, one always remains under the authority and decision-making power of a group of elders, who are perceived as parents of a generation. Although parental authority is highly valued and institutionalized in Maasai society, it is important to note that young people find ways to exercise their will. Esther is an obvious reminder of such agency.

Although the discursive binaries distort a proper understanding of the practice of early marriage, the situation of early marriage, nevertheless, reveals a real injustice in gender inequality. It is unjust that the “modern” path of a good education followed by job opportunities and free partner choice is so insecure for both young girls and boys—but especially for young girls. In the current context in Enkop, young boys can have an earlier start at schooling because they are believed to better withstand the difficulties and risks associated with long travel to and from school. Unlike girls, boys do not bear the responsibilities of out-of-wedlock parenthood and consequent withdrawal from school if their sexual relations result in an early pregnancy. According to many, boys have less demanding responsibilities in the home after school and thus have more time to study. They generally have higher test scores than girls in Enkop and are encouraged by better job prospects. The discourses present this injustice and inequality as a product of a state of mind (of culture, tradition, and patriarchy), and thus policy measures focus on the punishment of fathers and the need to educate men on the rights of the girl child. When Enkop residents were asked how to solve the problem of early marriage, the reply of a young pastor was indicative of most opinions:

The only way they can solve this problem is to discipline these people who force their children to be married early [and take] them out from school . . . so that it is an example for other people . . . They will have that fear: “I will not do it because the government does not like it.” [interview, August 13, 2010]

Without dismissing such approaches, which may be necessary in the short term for safeguarding young girls’ opportunities to pursue formal education, Esther’s situation reveals how the focus on culture and patriarchy obscures important

underlying forces that perpetuate such inequalities. Dorothy Hodgson (1999) wrote of patriarchy among the Maasai as a “consequence of history” rather than a situation inherent to the culture and temperament of pastoralists. She situates the gradual political and economic disempowerment of women in relation to men as a product of colonial and postcolonial interventions in political life and the commoditization and monetization of the pastoral economy. Similarly, there are real historical and structural factors underlying the practice and injustice of early marriage that deserve serious policy attention and hold the promise of being more effective in the long term.

Esther’s case identifies the root cause of early marriage as economic insecurity and lack of confidence in the ability of the educational system to provide for the well-being of Maasai children. In this light, policy initiatives aimed at eliminating the practice of early marriage should focus on securing better livelihoods for Maasai by addressing the challenges that impinge on arid land livelihoods and in particular on extensive animal husbandry. More economic security would allow parents to hire labor for domestic and herding needs, allowing children to attend school and focus on their education. Parents could then afford education and could nondiscriminately send their children to primary school and support them through the high costs of secondary and onward. Greater economic security would reduce the pressure on the institution of marriage as a means of enhanced security and preclude the need to marry daughters into more supportive homes. To enhance economic security among families in Enkop, the government should recognize the continued centrality and economic importance of pastoralism—not only to the Maasai and other communities inhabiting the semi-arid and arid lands of Kenya but also to the country as a whole. Investments should be made in improved infrastructure (e.g., transport and communication technology) that would allow pastoralists greater mobility and access to markets. Pastoralists need much more assistance preparing for, coping with, and recovering from dramatic income shocks brought about by drought. Arguably, most pressingly, careful attention needs to be paid to the ongoing process of land privatization, which in Enkop and many other localities is rife with corruption in terms of the allocation of parcels, undermining effective forms of land use and further marginalizing the poor.

Alongside investments aimed at improving pastoralism and raising economic security, numerous educational improvements would render the path of schooling for young girls more secure. Investments in building and staffing more schools would decrease the average distance to and from school, thus allowing young girls to start school at competitive ages. This in itself would contribute to reducing the risk of early pregnancy, which should also be a focus of policy attention. Early pregnancy prevention and management efforts (in the form of, e.g., educational awareness programs and support for child care) should not only focus on young women but also young men, ensuring

that girls are not alone, as they often are, in shouldering the responsibilities and implications of an early pregnancy. Furthermore, numerous educational interventions could help address the poor quality of primary education in Enkop. More schools and more teachers would reduce class sizes, which are currently reaching over 100 pupils per class in the early grades of some primary schools in Enkop. With smaller class sizes, teachers could give each student more instruction and attention. They would be able to spend more time grading and giving feedback and could more easily employ child-centered pedagogical approaches for classroom learning. Primary schools in Enkop are also very underresourced. Teachers in Enkop complain that their students perform poorly on the national placement exams for secondary school because they do not have the resources to purchase practice exams or to give students their own textbooks for home study. Addressing school access, early pregnancy, and educational quality could all productively contribute to reducing the practice of early marriage by securing the path to higher education for young women.

If livelihood and educational insecurity for the people of Enkop could be better addressed, fathers could then make the choice to keep their daughters in school not in “fear of the government” but in confidence that the decision is a good investment toward their daughters’ and their families’ futures.

CONCLUSION

In this article, I have examined the limitations of (trans)national and local discourses in understanding and addressing the practice of early marriage among the Maasai. These discourses depict early marriage as a violation of a girl’s right to education by fathers who are motivated by tradition, culture, patriarchy, and greed. From this perspective, solutions to early marriage target fathers and focus on enforcing the law through fines and jail time.

Through an ethnographic exploration of Esther’s particular case, this article has contextualized the practice of early marriage and situated it as a recent phenomenon brought about by cultural change and growing poverty and marginalization. Land and resource fragmentation and dispossession, increasing climactic instability, continued state neglect, and rising population pressure have weakened the viability of pastoralism as an exclusive livelihood practice for the majority of young people. Members of Enkop have sought multiple avenues of diversification, including dramatically increasing the participation of children (and girls especially) in primary school. Parents in Enkop hold education in high esteem but, nevertheless, express a lack of confidence in the system. They make great investments in educating their children, but many obstacles—including access to school, high dropout rates, poor quality learning, curriculum bias, and low achievement—stand in the way of translating education into livelihood security, especially for girls.

In this context, some parents continue to turn to the social institution of marriage as a means of securing

their children’s future. Placing daughters in trusted and well-connected families is meant to provide children (and their parents) with economic and social security. Affines share strong mutual obligations of support. They expand networks of reciprocity and facilitate access to resources, which are increasingly harder to obtain under land-privatization reforms.

From this perspective, early marriage could be significantly addressed through policies aimed at improving the viability of pastoralism, resulting in more economic security and less reliance on social institutions such as marriage for family protection. In conjunction, policy interventions should focus on improving education access and quality, particularly for girls, so that schooling for young daughters becomes a more reliable path to livelihood security.

The local and national discourses on early marriage confine and stabilize complex and dynamic subjectivities. The pervasive human rights dualisms of violator–victim, tradition–modernity, and collective rights–individual rights limit our understanding of social phenomena that are intrinsically unbounded, fluid, and permeable. Debunking this binary framework and recognizing the ambiguities and contingencies of social life need not result in “sloppy relativism”; rather, it can lead to productive insights. The binaries structuring popular discourses of early marriage obscure structural processes that give rise to early marriage and demand important policy attention (Cowan 2006; Englund 2006; Goodale 2009b).

Caroline S. Archambault *Faculty of Geosciences, International Development Studies, and University College Utrecht, 3584 CS Utrecht, The Netherlands; C.S.Archambault@uu.nl*

NOTES

Acknowledgments. This research was supported by a doctoral fellowship from the Population Council and a postdoctoral fellowship from the Social Science and Humanities Research Council pursued at the Department of Anthropology at McGill University. The writing of this research was further supported by a VENI research grant from the Dutch Academy of Sciences (NWO). I would like to acknowledge my appreciation to my many research assistants in Enkop, to Lucia Vasquez Quesada, and to the many members of the Enkop community who supported this research. I am also grateful for the very helpful comments from the anonymous reviewers of *AA* and Editor-in-Chief Tom Boellstorff as well as Joost de Laat, Professor John Galaty, Andrea Gourgy, and the members of the McGill Writers Group.

1. Given the sensitive nature of the research topic, pseudonyms have been used for all proper names of people and places.
2. The total number of rescued girls and rescue centers currently in Kenya is unknown. Research has identified at least five formal centers in Kajiado and Narok districts serving the Maasai community. A number of boarding schools across the region also accept and accommodate young students escaping marriage.

3. The research for this article spans seven years of work in Enkop on issues related to human rights, specifically focused on education, social change, gender, and land-tenure reform. Much of the initial research was conducted during a two-year period of doctoral dissertation work from 2003–05. During the beginning of this fieldwork in October of 2003, I volunteered at the rescue center and was given the opportunity to formally interview eight of the “rescued girls.” In June of 2007, I returned to the school and conducted interviews with five more girls, including Esther. In between these two visits, I undertook doctoral research in Enkop using a combination of participant-observation, semistructured and structured interviews, and survey work. During this period, I came to know Esther’s family and engaged her father, mother, and brother in numerous discussions about their situation. In 2005, I administered a survey in the three contiguous localities that comprise the field site of Enkop, randomly sampling 15 percent of the population. The survey was undertaken by local Maasai assistants, who collected demographic and socioeconomic information as well as specific educational data on all members of the sample households. In 2007, as part of my postdoctoral research at McGill University, I became part of an interdisciplinary team responsible for investigating the causes and consequences of land-tenure reform in nine Maasai communities in Southern Kenya. Enkop is part of this study so I have been able to return to the area on a regular basis to conduct research. This project permitted me to undertake a second round of survey work in Enkop in 2008–09 on the same sample studied in 2005. Throughout my postdoctoral fieldwork (2005–present), I have returned to Enkop two or three times a year to undertake fieldwork on various topics. The most recent period of fieldwork specifically focusing on early marriage, including Esther’s case, was conducted in July of 2010, when another eight interviews were conducted with men and women of diverse ages and backgrounds. My long-term engagement with research in this community, the strong social relationships I have forged with different kinds of people in the community (old, young, men, women, educated, and not educated), and the diversity of my research agenda over the years have all been critical in providing me access to the perspectives of family, friends, and community members on the sensitive topic of early marriage. The survey data has also been important as a way to check against interview bias.

REFERENCES CITED

- Anderson, David M., and Vigdis Broch-Due, eds.
1999 *The Poor Are Not Us: Poverty and Pastoralism*. Oxford: James Currey.
- Archambault, Caroline S.
2007 “School Is the Song of the Day”: Education and Social Change in Maasai Society. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, Brown University.
- 2010 *Fixing Families of Mobile Children: Recreating Kinship and Belonging among Maasai Adoptees in Kenya*. *Childhood* 17(2):229–242.
- Berting, Jan, Peter R. Baehr, J. Herman Burgers, Cees Flinterman, Barbara de Klerk, Rob Kroes, Cornelis A. van Minnen, and Koo VanderWal

- 1990 Human Rights in a Pluralist World: Individuals and Collectivities. Westport, CT: Meckler.
- Bledsoe, Caroline, and Gilles Pison, eds.
1994 Nuptiality in Sub-Saharan Africa: Contemporary Anthropological and Demographic Perspectives. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Coast, Ernestina
2001 Maasai Demography. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University College London.
- 2006 Maasai Marriage: A Comparative Study of Kenya and Tanzania. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 37(3):399–419.
- Cowan, Jane K.
2006 Culture and Rights after *Culture and Rights*. *American Anthropologist* 108(1):9–24.
- Cowan, Jane K., Marie-Benedicte Dembour, and Richard A. Wilson, eds.
2001 Culture and Rights: Anthropological Perspectives. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Donnelly, Jack
1990 Human Rights, Individual Rights and Collective Rights. *In* Human Rights in a Pluralist World: Individuals and Collectivities. Jan Berting, Peter R. Baehr, J. Herman Burgers, Cees Flinterman, Barbara de Klerk, Rob Kroes, Cornelis A. van Minnen, and Koo VanderWal, eds. Pp. 39–62. Westport, CT: Meckler.
- Englund, Harri
2006 Prisoners of Freedom: Human Rights and the African Poor. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Eriksen, Thomas H.
2001 Between Universalism and Relativism: A Critique of the UNESCO Concept of Culture. *In* Culture and Rights: Anthropological Perspectives. Jane K. Cowan, Marie-Benedicte Dembour, and Richard A. Wilson, eds. Pp. 127–148. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Galaty, John
1992 “The Land Is Yours”: Social and Economic Factors in the Privatization, Sub-Division and Sale of Maasai Ranches. *Nomadic Peoples* 30:26–40.
- Gasper, Des, and Raymond Apthorpe
1996 Introduction: Discourse Analysis and Policy Discourse. *European Journal of Development Research* 8(1):1–15.
- Goodale, Mark
2006 Introduction to Anthropology and Human Rights in a New Key. *American Anthropologist* 108(1):1–8.
- 2007 Introduction: Locating Rights, Envisioning Law between the Global and the Local. *In* The Practice of Human Rights: Tracking Law between the Global and the Local. Mark Goodale and Sally Engle Merry, eds. Pp. 1–38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 2009a Surrendering to Utopia: An Anthropology of Human Rights. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- 2009b Introduction: Human Rights and Anthropology. *In* Human Rights: An Anthropological Reader. Mark Goodale, editor. Pp. 1–19. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Government of Kenya (GOK)
2001 Laws of Kenya: The Children Act. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Hakansson, Thomas
1989 Family Structure, Bridewealth, and Environment in Eastern Africa: A Comparative Study of House-Property Systems. *Ethnology* 28:117–134.
- Hodgson, Dorothy
1996 “My Daughter . . . Belongs to the Government Now”: Marriage, Maasai and the Tanzanian State. *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 30(1):106–123.
- 1999 Pastoralism, Patriarchy, and History: Changing Gender Relations among Maasai in Tanganyika 1890–1940. *Journal of African History* 40:41–65.
- 2001 Once Intrepid Warriors: Gender, Ethnicity, and the Cultural Politics of Maasai Development. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Homewood, Katherine, Pippa Chenevix Trench, and Patti Kristjanson
2009 Staying Maasai? Livelihoods, Conservation and Development in East African Rangelands. New York: Springer.
- Lesorogol, Carolyn K.
2008 Contesting the Commons: Privatizing Pastoral Lands in Kenya. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Mensch, Barbara S., Monica J. Grant, and Ann K. Banc
2006 The Changing Context of Sexual Initiation in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Population and Development Review* 32(4):699–727.
- Merry, Sally Engle
2006a Transnational Human Rights and Local Activism: Mapping the Middle. *American Anthropologist* 108(1):38–51.
- 2006b Human Rights and Gender Violence: Translating International Law into Local Justice. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mwangi, Esther
2008 Socioeconomic Change and Land Use in Africa: The Transformation of Property Rights in Maasailand. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nyerere, John
2009 Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) Sector Mapping in Kenya. Report Draft: Edukans Foundation.
- Preis, Ann-Belinda
1996 Human Rights as Cultural Practice: An Anthropological Critique. *Human Rights Quarterly* 18(2):286–315.
- Roe, Emery
1994 Narrative Policy Analysis: Theory and Practice. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Ross, Fiona C.
2003 Using Rights to Measure Wrongs: A Case Study of Method and Moral in the Work of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission. *In* Human Rights in Global Perspective: Anthropological Studies of Rights, Claims and Entitlements. Richard A. Wilson and Jon P. Mitchell, eds. Pp. 163–182. London: Routledge.
- Shell-Duncan, Bettina, and Owuor Olungah
2009 Between Crime, Faith, and Culture: Contesting Female Genital Cutting and the “Best Interest” of the Child. Paper

- presented at the 108th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Philadelphia, PA, December 2–6.
- Stirrat, R. L.
2000 Cultures of Consultancy. *Critique of Anthropology* 20(1):31–46.
- Talle, Aud
1988 Women at a Loss: Changes in Maasai Pastoralism and Their Effects on Gender Relations. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Stockholm.
- Thompson, Michael, and Katherine Homewood
2003 Entrepreneurs, Elites, and Exclusion in Maasailand: Trends in Wildlife Conservation and Pastoralist Development. *Human Ecology* 30(1):107–138.
- UN Population Fund
2005 A Safe Haven for Girls Escaping Harm in Kenya. <http://www.unfpa.org/public/op/edit/News/pid/2202>, accessed on July 1, 2011.
- von Mitzlaff, Ulrike
1988 Maasai Women: Life in a Patriarchal Society. Dar Es Saalam, Tanzania: Tanzania Publishing House.
- Waller, Richard D.
1999 Pastoral Poverty in Historical Perspective. In *The Poor Are Not Us: Poverty and Pastoralism*. David M. Anderson and Vigdis Broch-Due, eds. Pp. 20–49. Oxford: James Currey.
- Wilson, Richard A.
1997 Representing Human Rights Violations: Social Contexts and Subjectivities. In *Human Rights, Culture, and Context: Anthropological Perspectives*. Richard A. Wilson, ed. Pp. 134–160. Chicago: Pluto.
- Wilson, Richard Ashby, and Jon P. Mitchell
2003 Human Rights in Global Perspective: Anthropological Studies of Rights, Claims, and Entitlements. London: Routledge.
- FOR FURTHER READING**
(These selections were made by the American Anthropologist editorial interns as examples of research related in some way to this article. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the author.)
- Goodale, Mark
2006 Ethical Theory as Social Practice. *American Anthropologist* 108(1):25–37.
- Greenough, Karen Marie
2007 Development Agents and Nomadic Agency: Four Perspectives in the Development “Market.” *National Association for the Practice of Anthropology Bulletin* 27(1):110–128.
- Hodgson, Dorothy L.
2002 Precarious Alliances: The Cultural Politics and Structural Predicaments of the Indigenous Rights Movement in Tanzania. *American Anthropologist* 104(4):1086–1097.
- Kontopodis, Michalis
2011 Transforming the Power of Education for Young Minority Women: Narrations, Metareflection, and Societal Change. *Ethos* 39(1):76–97.
- Lesorogol, Carolyn K.
2003 Transforming Institutions among Pastoralists: Inequality and Land Privatization. *American Anthropologist* 105(3):531–541.
- McCarty, Teresa L., Tamara Borgoiakova, Perry Gilmore, K. Tsianina Lomawaima, and Mary Eunice Romero
2005 Indigenous Epistemologies and Education: Self-Determination, Anthropology, and Human Rights. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 36(1):1–7.
- Ngo, Bic
2002 Contesting “Culture”: The Perspectives of Hmong American Female Students on Early Marriage. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 33(2):163–188.