Academic Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research

THE CONSENSUS TRAP: NEGOTIATED DEMOCRACY IN NORTHERN KENYA CLAN CONSENSUS, SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION, AND THE COUNTIES OF GARISSA, WAJIR, AND MANDERA

Abdiweli Mohamed Hussein and **Prof. Steve Ouma Akoth, PhD**

The Consensus Trap: Negotiated Democracy in Northern Kenya Clan Consensus, Social Transformation, And The Counties of Garissa, Wajir, And Mandera

Abdiweli Mohamed Hussein
Corresponding Author, Tangaza University, Nairobi, Kenya
https://orcid.org/0009-0009-7375-7294
Prof. Steven Ouma Akoth, PhD
Senior Lecturer, Tangaza University

Article History:
Published on: 09/07/2026
DOI:
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21279299
How to cite: Abdiweli, M. H., & Akoth, S. O. (2026). The Consensus Trap: Negotiated Democracy in Northern Kenya Clan Consensus, Social Transformation, And The Counties of Garissa, Wajir, And Mandera. *Academic Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research*, 3(2), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21279299

Abstract:

Purpose of Study: This study interrogates negotiated democracy in Kenya's northern frontier counties of Garissa, Wajir, and Mandera, examining how clan consensus mechanisms mediate electoral politics and governance outcomes. It evaluates whether this hybrid governance arrangement enables or obstructs social transformation in communities historically marginalised by the Kenyan state.

Methodology: The study employs a qualitative, interpretive desk-based methodology, drawing on secondary data from peer-reviewed scholarship, official statistics (KNBS, NCPD), oversight reports (CRA, ICPAK, OCOB), and legal instruments. The analysis is framed through five social transformation criteria—structural accountability, distributive justice, human agency, ethical leadership, and community resilience.

Findings: Negotiated democracy—defined as extra-constitutional electoral mediation through clan consensus—produces governance pathologies that systematically undermine social transformation. These include sycophantic leadership oriented toward elder networks rather than citizens; a wealth-legitimacy nexus that rewards financial muscle over competence; the merit-eroding capture of executive appointments by clan loyalty; uneven, clan-inflected development; tokenistic inclusion of allied minorities; and structural exclusion of women, youth, and minority clans. The system displaces citizens as the primary principals of governance, substituting elders as arbiters of political legitimacy, while perpetuating a perpetual campaign-governance cycle that prioritises short-term patronage over transformative investment.

Conclusion: The paper proposes a hybrid democratic model that honours indigenous deliberative traditions while restoring constitutional accountability and citizen agency. Reform requires anchoring clan deliberation in formal institutions—county assemblies, the Equalisation Fund, the Auditor-General, and the Frontier Counties Development Council—to transform governance from elite-serving to citizen-serving in northern Kenya.

Keywords: *Negotiated Democracy, Clan Consensus, Social Transformation, Northern Kenya, Devolution, Governance Ethics, Northern Kenya Counties, Elite Capture, Pastoralist Politics, Service Delivery*

1. INTRODUCTION: THE DEMOCRATIC PARADOX OF THE FRONTIER

The three counties of Garissa, Wajir, and Mandera — collectively constituting Kenya's North-Eastern region or what was historically designated the Northern Frontier District — present one of the most intellectually compelling governance paradoxes in contemporary African politics. These are regions where formal constitutional democracy coexists, often uneasily, with deeply entrenched clan-based political mediation systems that predate Kenyan statehood and that continue to exercise decisive influence over who governs, how they govern, and for whom they govern.

Kenya's 2010 Constitution introduced a devolution architecture premised on citizen sovereignty, participatory governance, and equitable service delivery. In theory, devolution promised a structural rupture with the historical marginalisation of northern Kenya — a region that had experienced systematic neglect, securitisation, and political exclusion since colonial times (Schlee, 2013; Anderson & McKnight, 2015). In practice, however, devolution in the northern Kenya counties has produced a distinctive form of political governance that scholars and practitioners have variously described as consensus democracy, negotiated politics, or clan democracy — a system in which electoral competition is mediated, filtered, and ultimately resolved not through the ballot box alone, but through intricate clan negotiations that precede, accompany, and sometimes override electoral outcomes.

This paper names this phenomenon negotiated democracy — a term that captures both its procedural character (democracy mediated through negotiation) and its normative ambiguity (a form of democratic practice that is neither purely liberal nor simply authoritarian, but something structurally distinct). The paper then subjects this phenomenon to analysis through the lens of social transformation theory, asking a foundational question: does negotiated democracy enable or obstruct the social transformation of northern Kenya's communities? The central argument developed across the paper is that clan consensus is a legitimate but flawed governance alternative — legitimate because it draws on genuine communal values and historically rational political adaptations, but flawed because its interaction with competitive electoral politics generates governance pathologies that systematically undermine accountability, ethical leadership, and transformative service delivery.

The social transformation lens is particularly apt for this analysis because it shifts the evaluative question from the formal procedural question — 'is this democratic?' — to the substantive outcome question — 'does this governance arrangement advance human dignity, distributive justice, citizen agency, ethical leadership, and community resilience?' These are the criteria by which northern

Kenya's communities themselves evaluate their governance, and they are the criteria by which negotiated democracy is found, in its current form, to fall short.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 provides a conceptual framework defining negotiated democracy and situating it within the broader literature on hybrid governance and electoral ethnicity. Section 3 develops the social transformation lens through which governance outcomes are evaluated. Section 4 provides a detailed contextual analysis of Garissa, Wajir, and Mandera, tracing the historical and political foundations of clan-based political mediation. Section 5 examines the specific governance pathologies that negotiated democracy produces. Section 6 identifies conditions under which clan consensus can enable social transformation. Section 7 proposes a hybrid democratic model. Section 8 concludes.

1.1 Research Questions, Methodology, and Scope

This study is guided by four research questions: (i) how does negotiated democracy operate as a system of clan-mediated electoral and governance practice in Garissa, Wajir, and Mandera; (ii) in what respects does it advance or undermine social transformation, judged against the criteria of human dignity, distributive justice, and community resilience; (iii) under what conditions can clan-based deliberation contribute to, rather than obstruct, transformative governance; and (iv) what institutional arrangements might reconcile the indigenous legitimacy of clan deliberation with constitutional accountability? Methodologically, the study is a qualitative, interpretive, desk-based inquiry that relies on secondary data rather than original fieldwork; its contribution is conceptual and analytical.

The evidence base comprises four categories of secondary source: peer-reviewed scholarship on devolution, clan politics, and hybrid governance; official statistics, notably the poverty estimates of the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS, 2024) and population and health data (NCPD, 2020); oversight and audit reports, including those of the Commission on Revenue Allocation (CRA, 2021) and the Institute of Certified Public Accountants of Kenya (ICPAK, 2019), and the World Bank's independent assessment of devolved service delivery (Muwonge et al., 2022); and the relevant legal-institutional instruments, principally the Constitution of Kenya (2010) and the County Governments Act (2012). These sources are read through the five social-transformation criteria developed in Section 3, which serve as the analytical framework, and are triangulated across source types to mitigate the limitations of any single body of evidence.

Three limitations should be stated at the outset. First, in relying on secondary data the study inherits the variable granularity and currency of those sources, and several of its propositions —

particularly concerning the micro-mechanics of elder endorsement and resource recovery — are advanced as analytically grounded inferences rather than verified observations. Second, while the three counties are treated as a comparative set, they are not interchangeable; the analysis is attentive to the within-case variation discussed in Section 4.4. Third, the findings are interpretive and analytically generalisable rather than statistically representative. Primary, county-disaggregated fieldwork — interviews with elders, county officials, women and youth leaders, and minority-clan representatives — would test, refine, and extend the propositions advanced here, and constitutes the natural next stage of this research.

In advancing this argument, the paper makes three contributions that distinguish it from the existing scholarship. Work on clan-based and hybrid governance in the Somali-inhabited Horn has established that negotiated, consensus-based politics is neither primitive nor illegitimate but a rational adaptation to weak state authority (Menkhaus, 2006, 2008; Elmi, 2010), while research on ethnicity and devolution in Kenya has shown how communal identity structures electoral competition and the distribution of the devolved dividend (Lynch, 2011; Hassan, 2020). This body of work, however, has tended either to describe negotiated democracy or to evaluate it against a liberal-procedural benchmark of competitive elections and formal accountability, and to oscillate between two verdicts — indigenous legitimacy on the one hand and elite pathology on the other. The present paper departs from both moves. First, it evaluates negotiated democracy not by proceduralist criteria but against a substantive, African-grounded standard of social transformation — human dignity, distributive justice, conscientisation, and Ubuntu solidarity — asking what such governance does to, and for, the people it claims to represent. Second, it moves beyond the legitimacy-versus-pathology binary by specifying the conditions under which clan deliberation becomes transformative rather than extractive, treating a single institution as capable of both. Third, it translates this diagnosis into a constructive hybrid model, grounded in comparative county-level fiscal and audit evidence from Garissa, Wajir, and Mandera, rather than resting at critique. The paper thus reframes the guiding question from whether negotiated democracy is authentically democratic to whether it is genuinely transformative.

2. NEGOTIATED DEMOCRACY: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND THEORETICAL LOCATION

2.1 Defining Negotiated Democracy

The concept of negotiated democracy, as used in this paper, refers to a form of political governance in which the formal mechanisms of liberal democracy — elections, campaigns, representation, accountability — are systematically mediated through extra-constitutional consensus-building processes rooted in communal identity structures, particularly clan and lineage groupings.

Negotiated democracy is neither a deviation from democracy nor its antithesis; rather, it is a hybrid political arrangement in which the procedural forms of democratic governance are filtered through substantive communal deliberation that determines acceptable candidates, power-sharing arrangements, and political loyalty structures before, during, and after electoral competition.

This definition builds on but departs from related concepts in the comparative politics literature. Electoral ethnicity (Posner, 2005) describes the tendency of voters to support co-ethnic candidates, but does not capture the structured, pre-electoral negotiation dimension that is central to negotiated democracy. Consociationalism (Lijphart, 1977) describes elite-level power-sharing arrangements designed to manage deep social cleavages, but is premised on formal constitutional recognition. Negotiated democracy, as practised in northern Kenya, is distinct in that it operates largely outside formal constitutional frameworks, is driven by cultural authority rather than legal mandate, and produces power-sharing arrangements that are enforced through social sanction rather than legal mechanism.

The closest theoretical analogue is what Helmke and Levitsky (2004) term informal institutions — defined as socially shared rules, usually unwritten, that are created, communicated, and enforced outside officially sanctioned channels. Negotiated democracy can be understood as an informal institution that has achieved such deep structural salience in northern Kenya that it effectively constitutes a parallel governance system — one that operates alongside, and frequently overrides, the formal constitutional architecture.

2.2 The Mechanics of Clan Consensus in Electoral Politics

In practice, negotiated democracy in Garissa, Wajir, and Mandera operates through several interrelated mechanisms. First, clan elders and lineage heads convene formal and informal deliberative assemblies — known variously as shir among Somali communities, or baraza za ukoo in Swahili contexts — in which the political claims of competing candidates are evaluated against criteria of clan balance, seniority, turn-taking norms, and historical grievances. These assemblies may precede formal party nominations and are often more determinative of electoral outcomes than the official ballot.

Second, financial resources play a critical intermediary role. Candidates who wish to secure elder endorsement are typically expected to demonstrate financial capacity — through the funding of community events, contribution to clan welfare funds, payment of bride wealth disputes, or direct cash transfers to influential elders. This creates a structural filter that systematically favours candidates with access to capital, embedding wealth as a prerequisite of political legitimacy in ways that distort both representation and post-election governance incentives. The financial dimension of elder engagement is not incidental to negotiated democracy; it is one of its defining structural features.

Third, the political loyalty structure produced by this system is fundamentally bifurcated. The elected leader owes primary political debt not to the voters who cast ballots, but to the elders whose consensus secured his candidacy. This bifurcation of political loyalty — between the constitutional principal (the citizen) and the informal principal (the elder network) — is the central structural source of the governance pathologies examined in Section 5 of this paper.

Fourth, negotiated democracy creates what might be termed a clan political market — a competitive arena in which different clan groupings bargain for political representation, appointments, and resource allocation through a complex system of endorsements, counter-endorsements, and shifting alliances. This market operates with its own rules, currencies, and enforcement mechanisms that are largely invisible to formal governance institutions but that are deeply consequential for governance outcomes.

2.3 Theoretical Location: Between Legitimacy and Pathology

Situating negotiated democracy theoretically requires navigating between two poles of interpretation that each capture partial truths. The first pole — the communitarian defence — argues that clan-based political mediation represents an authentic expression of African political philosophy, specifically the Ubuntu principle of collective decision-making and the Somali tradition of shir as a consensual, egalitarian deliberative institution (Menkhaus, 2006; Lewis, 2008). On this reading, negotiated democracy is not a pathology but a culturally rational adaptation to social conditions characterised by fragile state authority, high inter-clan competition, and the absence of reliable formal institutional guarantees.

The second pole — the liberal democratic critique — argues that clan-based mediation fundamentally subverts the individual rights basis of democratic governance by substituting group identity for individual political agency, enabling elite capture by elder networks, and producing accountability gaps that harm service delivery and democratic development (Cheeseman, 2015; Branch, 2011). On this reading, negotiated democracy is simply a form of political clientelism dressed in cultural garb, no more deserving of scholarly deference than any other form of patronage politics.

This paper argues that the most productive analytical move is to subject negotiated democracy to a social transformation lens, which provides normative criteria grounded neither in cultural relativism nor liberal universalism, but in the concrete outcomes for human dignity, justice, and community wellbeing — criteria that the communities of northern Kenya themselves articulate as the purpose of governance. This move enables the paper to acknowledge the legitimate foundations of clan consensus while exposing its structural governance failures without dismissing its social significance.

3. SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION AS AN EVALUATIVE LENS

3.1 Social Transformation Theory

Social transformation, as a theoretical framework in political science and development studies, refers to systemic, structural changes in social arrangements that enhance human dignity, reduce inequality, advance justice, and build community resilience (Peet & Hartwick, 2009; Swilling & Annecke, 2012). Social transformation theory is distinct from both liberal modernisation theory — which posits a single linear trajectory from tradition to modernity — and Marxist revolutionary theory — which posits class conflict as the singular engine of social change — in that it emphasises the importance of locally grounded, participatory, and ethically driven processes of change that respond to the specific material and cultural conditions of communities.

For the purposes of this paper, social transformation is operationalised through five core criteria contextualised for northern Kenya. First, structural accountability — the degree to which governance systems create enforceable accountability relationships between leaders and the governed, ensuring that power is exercised in the public interest. Second, distributive justice — the degree to which public resources and services reach the most marginalised members of society, addressing historical inequalities rather than reinforcing them. Third, human agency — the degree to which ordinary citizens, including women, youth, and minority communities, exercise meaningful voice in political decisions that affect their lives. Fourth, ethical leadership — the degree to which those in power are motivated by public good rather than private gain, and hold themselves accountable to the communities they serve. Fifth, community resilience — the degree to which governance systems strengthen communities' capacity to manage shocks, including climate, conflict, and economic stress.

These five criteria provide the evaluative framework through which the governance outcomes of negotiated democracy are assessed in this paper. They are not external impositions on northern Kenya's communities but reflect values that community members themselves articulate when asked about the kind of governance they want and that they have historically been denied.

3.2 Social Transformation and the African Context

Social transformation theory has particular resonance in the African context because it takes seriously the structural legacies of colonialism, the ongoing dynamics of state weakness and elite capture, and the rich resources of indigenous knowledge and communal organisation that exist alongside and often in tension with formal state institutions. In the African governance literature, social transformation has been linked to the concept of developmental states (Mkandawire, 2001), to feminist political economy approaches that centre women's agency (Mama, 2011), to Ubuntu-based governance frameworks that emphasise communal solidarity and relational accountability, and to Freirean critical pedagogy traditions that emphasise conscientisation — the development of critical political awareness among marginalised communities.

The application of social transformation theory to northern Kenya is particularly appropriate because the region's social challenges — extreme poverty, maternal and infant mortality, girls' educational exclusion, climate vulnerability, inter-clan violence, and food insecurity — are precisely the structural conditions that social transformation theory is designed to address. The question is whether the governance arrangements of negotiated democracy are capable of producing the sustained, structural, justice-oriented interventions that these challenges demand. The scale of these challenges is stark: in 2022 the overall poverty rate stood at 72.9 per cent in Mandera, 67.8 per cent in Garissa, and 64.7 per cent in Wajir, against a national rate of 39.8 per cent and a Nairobi rate of 16.5 per cent (KNBS, 2024).

3.3 The Freirean Dimension: Conscientisation and Political Exclusion

Paulo Freire's concept of conscientisation — the process by which oppressed communities develop critical awareness of their social condition and capacity for transformative action — provides an important supplementary lens for understanding the political exclusion produced by negotiated democracy (Freire, 1970). For Freire, authentic democratic participation requires that ordinary people become active subjects of political life rather than passive objects of elite decisions. The distinction between the active subject and the passive object of governance is central to the social transformation critique of negotiated democracy developed in this paper.

Freire's concept of assistentialism — the distribution of charity or patronage that satisfies immediate material needs while reproducing political dependency — is particularly applicable to the utilitarian governance patterns of the northern Kenya counties. Pre-election distributions of food, building materials, and cash that are characteristic of the campaign-governance cycle in Garissa, Wajir, and Mandera represent the governance equivalent of assistentialism: they meet immediate needs while reinforcing the political passivity of communities and their dependence on the patronage decisions of clan political elites.

Social transformation, in Freirean terms, requires not just better services but a democratisation of deliberative processes themselves — a transformation of the relationship between governors and governed from patron-client dependency to civic accountability. This is the most fundamental challenge that negotiated democracy poses for social transformation in northern Kenya.

3.4 Ubuntu, Social Solidarity, and Governance

The Ubuntu philosophical tradition — encapsulated in the Nguni aphorism 'umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu' (I am because we are) — provides an important African philosophical resource for the social transformation analysis of negotiated democracy. Ubuntu emphasises the relational constitution of human identity and the moral priority of communal wellbeing over individual interest (Shutte, 2001). These values are not foreign to the deliberative traditions of northern Kenya's Somali communities; they find resonance in the shir tradition's emphasis on collective decision-making and communal responsibility.

The critical insight of Ubuntu philosophy for this paper is that genuine communal solidarity — the Ubuntu ideal — is not the same as clan partisan solidarity. Ubuntu calls for care for all members of the human community; clan consensus, in its current political manifestation, generates solidarity within the clan at the expense of inter-clan equity and broader community transformation. A social transformation reading of Ubuntu suggests that the clan consensus tradition needs to be expanded — from clan solidarity to county-wide civic solidarity — if it is to serve as a genuine resource for social transformation rather than a mechanism of elite capture and inter-clan competition.

4. NORTHERN KENYA'S FRONTIER COUNTIES: HISTORICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL, AND POLITICAL CONTEXT

4.1 The Historical Foundation of Clan Politics

Understanding negotiated democracy in Garissa, Wajir, and Mandera requires engaging seriously with the historical conditions that produced clan-based political organisation as the dominant social institution of the region. The northern Kenya's incorporation into colonial Kenya was deeply contested — the region's predominantly Somali population was governed under a separate administrative regime, subjected to emergency laws that remained in force until 1991, and excluded from mainstream Kenyan political and economic development for most of the post-independence period (Carrier & Lochery, 2013; Anderson & McKnight, 2015).

In the context of weak or absent state services, persistent inter-clan competition over scarce pastoral resources — water, pasture, and land — and the absence of reliable judicial and security institutions, clan structures emerged as the primary mechanism of social organisation, conflict resolution, resource allocation, and collective action. The shir — the Somali clan deliberative assembly — was not merely a cultural artefact but a functional institution that performed governance tasks that the state was unable or unwilling to perform (Menkhaus, 2006). This historical context is essential for understanding why clan consensus commands genuine social legitimacy in northern Kenya: it earned that legitimacy by actually governing when the formal state could not or would not.

The Shifta War (1963–1967), in which the region's communities mobilised for secession and union with Somalia, further deepened the region's political alienation from the Kenyan state and reinforced the primacy of clan identity as the foundational political loyalty. Decades of security operations, cattle rustling conflicts, and state violence produced a political culture in which trust in formal institutions was minimal and clan networks were the primary source of security, justice, and welfare. This is the historical substrate from which negotiated democracy grows.

This historical alienation is compounded by a contemporary security emergency that fundamentally shapes governance across the region. Garissa, Wajir, and Mandera form the frontline of Kenya's confrontation with al-Shabaab, whose cross-border incursions from Somalia have produced recurrent attacks on security personnel, civil servants, teachers, and infrastructure — most devastatingly the 2015 assault on Garissa University College. Because this is a profoundly elder-centred society, the state's security response works through, rather than around, clan authority: county security committees, peace committees, community policing, and early-warning arrangements routinely enlist elders as community interlocutors — conduits for intelligence, dispute resolution, and the brokering of local order. This is the logic of the mediated state (Menkhaus, 2008), in which the formal apparatus governs through customary intermediaries rather than through direct citizen-state accountability. Its effect, however, is to deepen the structural centrality of the very elders on whom negotiated democracy already depends: the authority that brokers security also brokers votes, consolidating elder power across both domains. Any realistic account of negotiated democracy in northern Kenya must therefore treat insecurity not as background but as a structural determinant of how authority is sought, exercised, and legitimated.

4.2 Devolution and the Democratisation of Clan Competition

Kenya's 2010 Constitution and the subsequent devolution of significant political and fiscal authority to county governments transformed the political economy of clan competition in northern Kenya in ways that were both enabling and distorting. On the enabling side, devolution brought substantial public resources to regions that had historically been starved of public investment.

County governments in Garissa, Wajir, and Mandera receive equitable share allocations running into billions of shillings annually, complemented by conditional grants for health, agriculture, and infrastructure. This created genuine opportunities for transformative investment in social services.

On the distorting side, devolution dramatically raised the stakes of clan political competition. When the governorship of Mandera County controls a multi-billion-shilling budget, the clan that captures that office gains access to patronage resources of an order of magnitude greater than anything previously available through traditional clan political competition. This transformation significantly altered the character of negotiated democracy: from a relatively low-stakes mechanism for managing inter-clan relations into a high-stakes competition for fiscal resources in which the financial dimensions of elder engagement have become correspondingly more elaborate, expensive, and corruption-prone (Hassan, 2020).

4.3 Clan Structures and Political Dynamics in the Northern Kenya Counties

Each of the three northern Kenya counties has a distinct clan composition that shapes the specific character of negotiated democracy in that context. Garissa County is dominated by the Ogaden clan but contains significant sub-clan divisions and minority clan populations. The political history of Garissa is characterised by strong Ogaden dominance in the governorship and parliamentary positions, with sub-clan rotation and financial negotiation determining intra-Ogaden succession. This produces a political dynamic in which the primary axis of negotiated democracy operates within the dominant clan rather than between clans.

Wajir County presents a more complex multi-clan landscape, dominated by the Ajuran, Degodia, and Ogaden clans in roughly competitive proportions. The political history of Wajir has been marked by periods of intense inter-clan violence, most notably the Wajir Massacre of 1984 and recurrent cycles of electoral violence in the 1990s and 2000s. The Women's Association for Peace in Wajir — later the Wajir Peace and Development Committee — pioneered grassroots peace-building that drew explicitly on reformed clan mediation processes, providing an important precedent for constructive engagement with indigenous deliberative institutions (Menkhaus, 2008). Wajir's experience thus encapsulates both the destructive potential of unreformed clan competition and the constructive potential of transformed clan deliberation.

Mandera County, bordering both Ethiopia and Somalia, has the most complex clan topology, with the Garre, Degodia, and Murulle clans as major political actors and multiple sub-clan groupings. Mandera has experienced some of the most acute post-devolution political tensions, including gubernatorial elections characterised by clan mobilisation, elder endorsement competitions, and post-election inter-clan tension over perceived imbalances in county appointments and contracts. Mandera's experience illustrates the particularly acute governance challenges that arise when negotiated democracy operates in a context of competitive multi-clan equilibrium.

4.4 Comparative Dynamics Across the Three Counties

Although the three counties share a common logic of negotiated democracy, the way that logic unfolds is shaped decisively by clan topology — the number, relative balance, and spatial concentration of clans within each county. Garissa, dominated by a single major clan, the Ogaden, tends toward a relatively hegemonic and stable consensus in which the principal competition is displaced inward, among Ogaden sub-clans; the system is comparatively orderly but entrenches the marginalisation of non-Ogaden minorities. Wajir, by contrast, is a balanced multi-clan county in which the Ajuran, Degodia, and Ogaden compete in roughly comparable proportions; here negotiated democracy operates through intensive inter-clan bargaining and rotational or coalition pacts, and it is precisely from Wajir's experience of managing this competition that the model of the mediated state was first theorised (Menkhaus, 2008).

Mandera presents the most volatile configuration. Its fragmented topology — the Garre, Degodia, and Murulle as major actors — combined with its position on the borders of both Somalia and Ethiopia, produces the highest-stakes and at times the most violent electoral competition of the three, in which clan rivalry has periodically escalated into open insecurity (Hassan, 2020). These differences matter analytically: they indicate that negotiated democracy is not a single, uniform phenomenon but a family of arrangements ranging from single-dominant hegemony, through balanced-competitive bargaining, to fragmented-volatile contestation — each generating a distinct profile of governance pathologies and a distinct set of reform challenges.

5. GOVERNANCE PATHOLOGIES OF NEGOTIATED DEMOCRACY: A SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION CRITIQUE

The critique developed in this section synthesises the documented record — the scholarly literature on devolution and clan politics in northern Kenya, official and oversight-body reports, and reported accounts of county governance — rather than original fieldwork. The pathologies it identifies are accordingly presented as structural tendencies evidenced in that record, not as findings of primary observation.

5.1 Sycophantic Leadership: The Elder-Loyalty Trap

The most immediate and structurally significant governance pathology produced by negotiated democracy is what this paper terms sycophantic leadership — a leadership orientation in which the elected official's primary strategic objective is satisfying elder networks and clan power brokers rather than delivering transformative services to the wider citizenry. This is not, it must be emphasised, a matter of personal character or individual moral failure. It is a structural outcome of the incentive architecture that negotiated democracy creates.

When a gubernatorial candidate in Wajir must secure the blessing of dominant clan elders before mounting a credible campaign, and when that blessing is contingent on financial contributions, the articulation of clan-specific patronage promises, and implicit commitments to appoint clan members to key county positions, the post-election governance logic follows inescapably. The governor owes his position to the elders. His political survival at the next election depends on maintaining elder loyalty. His resource allocation decisions — appointment of county executives, award of tenders, location of public infrastructure, hiring of public servants — are therefore filtered through elder satisfaction rather than citizen need.

On the documented record, this sycophancy expresses itself most fundamentally as an inversion of the direction of accountability. At the individual level, governors are described as cultivating their relationships with key elders through regular consultations, material gifts, and preferential treatment, investing political energy upward rather than in the citizenry. The institutional and spatial expressions of the same orientation — the capture of senior appointments by clan loyalty, examined in Section 5.6, and the concentration of development in the governing coalition's strongholds, examined in Section 5.7 — follow from this single underlying logic. Its cumulative effect is a governance system structurally oriented toward upward political accountability, to elder networks, rather than downward democratic accountability, to citizens.

The social transformation cost of sycophantic leadership is severe and well documented. Citizens who are not members of the governor's clan coalition — minority clans, sub-clans out of political favour, women and youth without elder political standing, nomadic communities in peripheral areas — experience systematic exclusion from the benefits of county governance. Service delivery becomes a form of clan patronage rather than a constitutional right, and the transformative potential of devolution is captured by elite clan networks rather than realised by marginalised communities.

5.2 Utilitarian Governance and the Marginalisation of Voters

Closely related to sycophantic leadership is utilitarian governance — a governance mode in which public resources are instrumentalised to serve the political survival calculus of the governing elite rather than the constitutional mandate of equitable service delivery. In the social transformation framework, utilitarian governance is the antithesis of distributive justice: it systematically diverts public resources from the marginalised toward the politically connected.

Utilitarian governance in the northern Kenya counties is characterised by persistent patterns of over-allocation to administrative and personnel costs — which serve clan patronage functions through employment — and under-allocation to development projects in health, education, water, and pastoralist support services that would produce transformative social outcomes (ICPAK, 2019; CRA, 2021). This pattern reflects not incompetence but rational clan political utility maximisation: every county job is a clan political resource; every development project is a potential source of tender-based rent extraction.

Reports of the Office of the Controller of Budget bear out the scale of this imbalance at the system level: in the 2024/25 financial year, county governments spent roughly 74 per cent of their funds on recurrent items and only about 26 per cent on development — well short of the statutory minimum of 30 per cent for development set by the Public Finance Management Act (2012) — with the Controller repeatedly flagging unsustainable personnel and wage-bill costs (OCOB, 2025). Where public employment is, in effect, distributed as clan patronage and renewed with each electoral cycle, the county government comes to function less as a provider of development services than as an employment bureau for the governing coalition, hiring kin and clients of the dominant clan rather than building the technical and physical infrastructure that social transformation requires. The first major independent assessment of Kenyan devolution reaches a convergent conclusion, identifying human-resource management and the county wage bill among the binding constraints on devolved service delivery (Muwonge et al., 2022).

The electoral cycle shapes service delivery in ways that are antithetical to social transformation. In the years approaching elections — particularly the third and fourth years of a county government's term — the documented pattern is a surge in visible but shallow public works: road grading, construction of incomplete buildings, distribution of foodstuffs and agricultural inputs. These pre-election interventions are designed not to produce durable developmental outcomes but to generate sufficient voter gratitude and elder satisfaction to secure re-election or succession. They represent the governance equivalent of Freire's assistentialism — the distribution of charity that reproduces dependency rather than building human agency.

Utilitarian governance inverts the proper principal-agent relationship of democratic governance. In a constitutional democracy, the elected official is the agent of the citizen-principal. In negotiated democracy, the effective principal is the elder network, and the citizen is reduced to a marginal figure — relevant only as a voter every five years, and even then often mobilised through clan directives rather than individual political agency.

5.3 The Wealth-Legitimacy Nexus and Elite Capture

The relationship between financial resources and political legitimacy in clan consensus systems constitutes what this paper terms the wealth-legitimacy nexus: a structural condition in which access to financial capital is a prerequisite of political legitimacy, which in turn shapes the character of post-election governance in profound ways. As documented accounts of the region's electoral politics describe, securing elder endorsement in Garissa, Wajir, and Mandera is reported to involve significant financial obligations — funding of deliberative gatherings, contributions to clan welfare, and transfers to influential elders.

At the heart of this nexus lies a corrupted criterion of selection. In principle, elder endorsement is meant to identify the candidate best able to serve the community; in practice, the single most decisive qualification has become the financial muscle to campaign effectively across an entire county — to fund gatherings, mobilise sub-clans, and meet the expectations of elders and brokers. Wealth thereby comes to stand in for leadership merit, displacing competence, integrity, and ethical standing as the measure of fitness for office. The corruption is twofold. It is normative, in that affluence is treated as itself a leadership value, so that the richest aspirant is presumed the most deserving. And it is transactional: where elder endorsement can be purchased, elders have reportedly been induced to bless the heaviest-pocketed contender even over more popular, more competent, or more ethical alternatives. The result is a selection mechanism that can elevate the least suitable candidate precisely because he is the wealthiest, entrenching at the very threshold of office the inversion of values that the social-transformation lens identifies as fatal to accountable governance.

The wealth-legitimacy nexus operates as a filter that systematically excludes capable but resource-poor candidates from the political arena — including educated women, reform-oriented youth leaders, and community activists who may have the vision and capacity for transformative governance but lack the financial resources to engage the elder endorsement market. It produces a candidate pool skewed toward individuals with prior access to capital: business people, former politicians with accumulated resources, and individuals with access to diaspora financial networks.

More perniciously, the wealth-legitimacy nexus creates post-election governance incentives structurally oriented toward resource recovery and wealth accumulation rather than service delivery. When a candidate has spent significant personal or borrowed resources to secure elder endorsement and fund an election campaign, the post-election period becomes, from the candidate's rational perspective, a period of necessary resource recovery. This creates structural incentives for corruption, rent extraction from public contracts, and the private appropriation of public resources — behaviours that are individually rational given the investment logic of negotiated democracy but collectively catastrophic for social transformation.

Elite capture — the appropriation of public resources and governance institutions by narrow elite networks — is the systemic outcome of the wealth-legitimacy nexus operating at scale across county governance in the northern Kenya counties. County development funds, procurement processes, public employment, and donor resources are all subject to elite capture through mechanisms that are deeply embedded in the logic of negotiated democracy and therefore resistant to conventional anti-corruption interventions that target symptoms rather than structural causes.

5.4 The Exclusion of Women, Youth, and Minority Voices

Negotiated democracy in the northern Kenya counties produces systematic political exclusion of specific social categories whose inclusion is essential for social transformation. Women, youth, and minority clan members are the most structurally disadvantaged by clan consensus politics, and their exclusion represents both a justice deficit in its own right and a profound obstacle to the transformative governance that northern Kenya's social challenges demand.

Women's political exclusion operates at multiple levels. At the deliberative level, shir and clan consultative assemblies are typically male-dominated spaces from which women are excluded as decision-makers, even where they participate as informal influencers. At the electoral level, clan consensus rarely produces female gubernatorial or parliamentary candidates — women are typically expected to compete only for the constitutionally reserved women's representative seat, which is itself subject to clan mediation. This exclusion is a social transformation catastrophe: northern Kenya's most urgent human development challenges — maternal and infant mortality, female genital mutilation prevalence, early marriage, and girls' school dropout rates — require governance responses informed by women's leadership and responsive to women's priorities. The magnitude of the deficit is illustrated by maternal mortality: Mandera's ratio of 3,795 deaths per 100,000 live births is the highest in Kenya — exceeding that of many active conflict zones — and Wajir's stands at 1,683, several times the national average (NCPD, 2020).

Youth exclusion operates through equally damaging mechanisms. Young people in Garissa, Wajir, and Mandera are politically active and constitute a demographic majority, but their political influence is systematically subordinated to elder authority in clan consensus processes. Youth political mobilisation is frequently co-opted by elder networks and deployed instrumentally —

youth are useful for campaign logistics and voter mobilisation, but are rarely afforded genuine political agency in the negotiation of governance outcomes. The result is a political system that systematically frustrates the ambitions and excludes the perspectives of the very demographic cohort on whose shoulders northern Kenya's social transformation depends.

The exclusion of minority clans from effective governance participation creates additional social transformation costs. When county governance is captured by dominant clan coalitions, minority clan communities in all three northern Kenya counties experience systematic under-investment in their areas, exclusion from public employment, and the absence of political voice in decisions that affect their lives. This not only violates constitutional equity principles but creates persistent grievances that fuel inter-clan tension and undermine the community resilience that social transformation requires.

5.5 The Campaign-Governance Cycle: Perpetual Election Mode

A final and underappreciated governance pathology of negotiated democracy is the campaign-governance cycle — a pattern in which the logic of the next electoral campaign begins to dominate governance decision-making from the early stages of a sitting term, effectively eliminating the space for the long-term, structural investments that social transformation requires. Because negotiated democracy makes political survival contingent on continuous elder satisfaction and financial capacity maintenance, the sitting governor is never fully in governance mode; he is always simultaneously in campaign mode.

This manifests in several documented patterns. Resource accumulation is reported to begin immediately after election — through procurement manipulation, appointment of revenue-generating officials, and positioning in external financial networks — in preparation for the financial demands of the next elder consensus process. Governance decisions are continuously evaluated for their electoral utility rather than their developmental impact. Long-term capital investments with diffuse beneficiaries — which would score well on social transformation criteria — are systematically undervalued relative to visible, short-cycle patronage distributions that maintain elder loyalty.

The campaign-governance cycle is perhaps the most insidious obstacle to social transformation because it operates through entirely legal means. The governor who perpetually campaigns is not necessarily corrupt in any prosecutable sense; he is simply behaving rationally within the incentive structure that negotiated democracy creates. This is precisely why addressing the governance pathologies of negotiated democracy requires structural institutional reform rather than merely individual accountability measures.

5.6 The Competence Paradox: Elder Control of Executive Appointments

If Section 5.2 traced the aggregate fiscal bias toward employment over development, a further and more paradoxical pathology operates specifically at the apex of the county bureaucracy, in the appointment of its most senior officers. It concerns the fate of the young and educated elites who ought to be at the forefront of these counties' development. Garissa, Wajir, and Mandera now produce a growing cohort of graduates, professionals, and diaspora-educated returnees who, judged on competence alone, would be natural candidates for County Executive Committee and senior bureaucratic appointments. Yet this cohort is itself bound by clan consensus and the deeply socialised norm of loyalty to elder decisions; even its most capable members are constrained to operate within elder-sanctioned channels rather than as autonomous reform agents. The clash surfaces most sharply in executive appointments. Because the governor owes his mandate to the elders who brokered it, those elders are able to press — and frequently to manipulate — the governor into appointing their own kin to executive and chief-officer positions. The merit and fair-competition principles that the Constitution of Kenya (2010, Article 232) and the competitive-recruitment provisions of the County Governments Act (2012) require are thereby subordinated to clan and kinship loyalty.

The consequences are corrosive. The county executive comes to reflect clan arithmetic rather than technical capacity, eroding administrative competence at precisely the level responsible for delivering health, water, and education services. Minority clans, lacking the elder leverage to extract appointments, are doubly marginalised — absent both from the executive and from the decisions that allocate public resources — while educated would-be reformers are either co-opted into the clan calculus or shut out of it altogether. Because the governor's survival depends on renewing elder endorsement at each electoral calendar, the pattern reproduces itself cycle after cycle, entrenching a permanent mismatch between the skills county government needs and the loyalties on which appointments are actually made. The cumulative effect is that these counties chronically under-provide the very services their citizens most need, and the social-transformation outcomes set out in Section 3 remain perpetually out of reach — not for want of capable people, but because the competence those people could offer is structurally overridden by the imperatives of clan consensus.

5.7 Spatial Favouritism, Alliance Tokenism, and the Fracturing of Cohesion

Closely related is the uneven, clan-inflected geography of development. A governor elected through clan consensus tends to concentrate development projects — and public recruitment — in the areas from which he hails or from which he drew his decisive votes, while sub-counties associated with rival clans are comparatively starved of both investment and employment. Because each successive administration repeats this pattern in favour of its own base, development becomes a function of electoral geography rather than need, and the same areas are advantaged or neglected cycle after cycle. The cost is not merely distributional. Visible favouritism toward the governor's clan, and the corresponding marginalisation of others, corrodes social cohesion and the sense of a shared county community; the resulting grievances simmer between elections and not infrequently harden into open tension or clashes around the electoral calendar, when competition for the county's resources is at its most acute (McCrone, 2023) — a dynamic that interacts directly with the regional insecurity discussed in Section 4.

A final mechanism concerns the hollowness of the alliances on which negotiated democracy depends. To assemble a winning numerical majority, a dominant clan will typically forge electoral alliances with smaller, non-dominant clans. Once the election is won, however, the substantive value of that inclusion is frequently withdrawn. The allied minority clans — their executive appointments notwithstanding — are commonly assigned low-status, non-essential dockets; and where they are given a weightier portfolio, its budget is quietly slimmed or its decisions micro-managed from the dominant-clan centre. The appearance of power-sharing thus masks a reality of continued dominant-clan control, so that formal inclusion in the executive coexists with substantive exclusion from authority and resources. On this reading, negotiated democracy does not so much share power across clans as ratify the pre-eminence of the strongest, reproducing minority marginalisation within the very executive that was meant to embody the alliance.

5.8 Alternative Explanations: Capacity, Insecurity, and the Limits of Rival Accounts

It would be one-sided to attribute the governance deficits of Garissa, Wajir, and Mandera solely to negotiated democracy. Three rival explanations deserve consideration. The first is capacity: these are relatively young county administrations in a region with thin professional labour markets, limited technical expertise, and weak absorptive capacity, such that funds allocated are not always funds effectively spent (Muwonge et al., 2022). The second is insecurity: the al-Shabaab frontier and recurrent inter-clan conflict raise the cost of service delivery, deter qualified staff, and divert administrative attention from development to security. The third is structural marginalisation: decades of colonial and post-colonial neglect left an infrastructure and human-development deficit so deep that even competent, well-resourced government would struggle to close it quickly. Each of these factors is real, and each compounds the others.

These accounts are, however, insufficient on their own, for three reasons. First, the problem is not simply a shortage of money: under devolution these counties receive substantial equitable-share allocations and, on paper, meet or exceed the statutory development threshold — Wajir’s 2024/25 budget, for instance, allocated some 38.6 per cent of expenditure to development (Wajir County

Government, 2024) — yet human-development outcomes remain among the worst in Kenya, which directs attention to how resources are distributed, and to whom, rather than merely to how much is available. Second, the capacity and insecurity accounts cannot explain the patterned character of the failures: that benefits cluster in the governor's clan strongholds (Section 5.7), that senior posts go to elder-favoured kin over qualified outsiders (Section 5.6), and that allied minorities are included nominally but starved substantively are facts about clan-political logic, not about absorptive capacity or terrorism. Third, insecurity is in part endogenous to the system described here, since the favouritism and exclusion that negotiated democracy produces themselves generate the grievances that fuel inter-clan tension (McCrone, 2023). Capacity constraints and insecurity are therefore best understood not as alternatives to the clan-consensus explanation but as conditions with which negotiated democracy interacts and which it frequently aggravates; the incentive architecture of clan consensus remains the more complete account of why resources, and even capable people, are systematically turned to ends other than social transformation.

6. RECLAIMING CLAN CONSENSUS: WHEN INDIGENOUS DELIBERATION ENABLES SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION

6.1 The Legitimate Foundations of Clan Consensus

Having subjected negotiated democracy to sustained critical analysis, the paper turns to the question that distinguishes its argument from a simple liberal democratic critique: under what conditions does clan consensus represent a legitimate and potentially transformative governance resource? This question matters both analytically and practically — sustainable governance reform in northern Kenya must engage with rather than simply dismiss indigenous deliberative institutions.

The shir tradition in Somali political culture, at its historical and normative core, represents a sophisticated model of participatory deliberation rooted in values of collective responsibility, restorative justice, and communal solidarity (Lewis, 2008). The shir's deliberative principles — the requirement that affected parties have voice, the search for consensus over winner-take-all outcomes, the role of respected elders as facilitators of agreement — embody genuine democratic values that are not reducible to Western liberal models and that carry significant social capital in the region's communities. Historical evidence further supports the social transformation capacity of reformed clan consensus: The Wajir Women's Peace initiative of the 1990s demonstrated that shir mechanisms can be reconfigured to serve transformative, cross-clan peace-building rather than clan-partisan ends (Menkhaus, 2008).

6.2 Conditions for Transformative Clan Deliberation

This paper identifies four conditions under which clan consensus can enable rather than obstruct social transformation in northern Kenya. The first condition is inclusive deliberation — the systematic inclusion of women, youth, minority clans, and other marginalised voices in clan consultative processes. Evidence from the Wajir peace-building experience and from comparative cases in Somaliland, where reformed shir processes have included women as deliberative participants, suggests that inclusion can be achieved without destroying the social legitimacy of the institution (Ingiriis & Hoehne, 2013).

The second condition is constitutional anchoring — the formal connection of clan deliberative processes to constitutional accountability frameworks. When clan consensus produces a political leader, that leader's accountability to citizens must be enforceable through constitutional mechanisms — audit institutions, parliamentary oversight, judicial review — that operate independently of clan political loyalty. Constitutional anchoring preserves the social legitimacy of clan deliberation while subjecting its governance outcomes to public accountability.

The third condition is transparency of resources — the public disclosure of financial flows associated with political candidacy and elder engagement. The opacity of the wealth-legitimacy nexus is one of its most distorting features. Transparency requirements would not eliminate the financial dimension of negotiated democracy but would subject it to public scrutiny and social accountability, enabling citizens and civil society to evaluate the financial relationships between political candidates and elder networks.

The fourth condition is outcome accountability — the systematic evaluation of governance against social transformation criteria and the public reporting of these evaluations to both elder networks and citizen constituencies. If elders are to retain political influence, they must also bear reputational accountability for the governance performance of the leaders they endorse. Community scorecards, social audits, and citizen report cards that connect elder endorsement to governance outcomes would gradually shift elder incentives from rent-maximisation toward transformation-oriented governance.

7. TOWARD A HYBRID DEMOCRATIC MODEL FOR NORTHERN KENYA

7.1 The Conceptual Case for Hybridity

The governance challenge confronting northern Kenya's frontier counties is not simply one of implementation failure — a matter of applying constitutional governance frameworks more rigorously. It is a deeper challenge of institutional alignment: how to build governance systems that honour the social legitimacy of indigenous deliberative traditions while delivering the structural accountability, distributive justice, and citizen agency that social transformation demands. The answer lies in a hybrid democratic model — one that neither transplants liberal democratic forms onto unreceptive social terrain nor accepts the governance pathologies of unreformed negotiated democracy, but constructs a new synthesis appropriate to northern Kenya's specific social, cultural, and constitutional context.

Hybrid institutional design has important precedents in comparative politics. Somaliland's post-civil war constitutional settlement combined a formal elected parliament with a house of traditional elders (Guurti) whose role is formally constitutionalised, creating a hybrid legislature that draws on both democratic and traditional authority (Walls, 2009). Rwanda's Gacaca courts hybridised traditional community justice with transitional justice frameworks to address post-genocide accountability at scale. These cases demonstrate that institutional hybridity is not simply a compromise between tradition and modernity but a creative synthesis capable of producing governance outcomes superior to either pure alternative.

7.2 Proposed Elements of a Hybrid Democratic Model for Northern Kenya Counties

The hybrid model proposed here is not an abstract template but a set of reforms each designed to answer a specific pathology diagnosed in Section 5, and each anchored in institutions and instruments that already exist within Kenya's devolved system. Six elements form its core. First, the informal authority of elders should be given a formal, inclusive, and rule-bound channel through statutory Elder Advisory Councils established by county legislation under the County Governments Act (2012). Constituted with defined membership that includes women and youth representatives, confined to a clearly advisory function, and kept constitutionally distinct from executive decision-making, such councils would bring the elder–governance relationship into public view: their deliberations and any candidate-screening role would be governed by published rules, conflict-of-interest provisions, and a code of conduct, with advisory opinions tabled before the county assembly as public record. Transparency of this kind is the first practical step toward disarming the wealth-for-endorsement transaction described in Section 5.3, in which endorsement is quietly purchased and financial muscle substitutes for competence.

Second, the appointment of County Executive Committee members and chief officers should be lifted out of elder-brokered clan bargaining and placed on a competitive, merit-based footing. Positions would be publicly advertised and filled through the County Public Service Board against published qualification criteria and transparent panel scoring, with candidates vetted for integrity under Chapter Six and appointed on the fair-competition and merit principles of Article 232 of the Constitution of Kenya (2010). This directly counters the competence paradox of Section 5.6 — the appointment of kin over capability — and opens a legitimate, non-clan route into county leadership for the educated young professionals whom the present system sidelines.

Third, the use of public employment as clan patronage must be checked by fiscal discipline. County personnel costs should be held within the ceilings set by the Public Finance Management (County Governments) Regulations and monitored by the Office of the Controller of Budget, while expenditure is rebalanced progressively toward the thirty-per-cent development floor required by the Public Finance Management Act (2012). Curbing the recurrent wage bill that the Controller of Budget repeatedly flags (OCOB, 2025) is the practical precondition for a county to cease operating as an employment bureau for the governing coalition and to resume functioning as a provider of development services.

Fourth, development spending should be insulated from clan and electoral geography. Each County Integrated Development Plan would embed a transparent intra-county allocation formula keyed to population, poverty, and service-gap indicators — mirroring the marginalisation logic the Commission on Revenue Allocation already applies between counties — with ward-disaggregated budgeting and reporting, so that resources follow need rather than the governor's home area or decisive voting blocs. The same principle requires that the mandates and budgets of dockets held by allied minority clans be protected against the hollowing-out described in Section 5.7, so that inclusion in the executive carries genuine authority rather than a slimmed or micro-managed portfolio.

Fifth, governance should be made answerable to social outcomes, not merely to procedure. Each County Integrated Development Plan would report publicly and annually, to the county assembly and the Office of the Auditor-General, against measurable transformation indicators — maternal mortality, girls' school completion, water-access coverage, and the incidence of inter-clan violence — chosen because they capture the deficits the region's own data lay bare (KNBS, 2024; NCPD, 2020). Tying a portion of the Equalisation Fund, of which these counties are principal beneficiaries under Article 204 of the Constitution of Kenya (2010), to performance against these indicators would attach a tangible fiscal cost to capture and a tangible reward to delivery.

Sixth, reform must be carried by those with an interest in it and backed by institutions able to enforce it. Targeted women and youth political-development programmes — building capacity, financing, and deliberative networks — should be anchored in the county public service and supported through the Frontier Counties Development Council and development partners, with ring-fenced and audited budget lines. These efforts would be framed by a Northern Kenya Democratic Charter, convened and stewarded by the Frontier Counties Development Council together with the National Cohesion and Integration Commission, setting shared regional norms against corrupt elder engagement, for inclusion in deliberation, and for the separation of clan loyalty from public service. Underpinning all of this, the independence of the county assembly and its public accounts and investments committees must be strengthened — through competitive recruitment of technical staff and national support for oversight capacity — and the reach of the

Auditor-General, the Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission, and Senate oversight under the Commission on Revenue Allocation framework extended into counties where these bodies are presently weak.

7.3 The Political Economy of Reform

A candid account of these proposals must confront an obvious objection: the actors best placed to implement them — incumbent governors, county elites, and the elder networks that sustain them — are the very beneficiaries of the consensus trap, and have little incentive to dismantle the system that delivered them power. Reform therefore cannot rest on the goodwill of those it would constrain; its prospects depend instead on shifting the incentive structure from beyond the captured core. Several levers are available. National institutions that sit outside the reach of county clan networks — the Senate, the Commission on Revenue Allocation, the Office of the Auditor-General, the Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission, and the courts — can impose accountability and conditionality that county actors cannot. Tying fiscal transfers, and the Equalisation Fund in particular, to measurable social-transformation outcomes would attach a material cost to capture.

Equally important are the constituencies with an interest in change: an organised women's and youth movement, an assertive civil society and media, and a politically engaged diaspora can raise the reputational and electoral cost of the wealth-legitimacy nexus. Demographic change pulls in the same direction, as a youthful majority increasingly chafes against gerontocratic control. Finally, reform is more likely to succeed where it is framed not as an assault on clan authority but as a means of protecting the genuine legitimacy of clan deliberation from the corrosive corruption that discredits it — thereby aligning at least some elder interests with change. None of this amounts to a technocratic fix; dismantling the consensus trap is a long, contested, and fundamentally political process. But locating the agents and incentives of reform realistically, rather than presuming a benevolent reformer, is itself a precondition of any credible transformation agenda.

8. CONCLUSION

This paper has argued that negotiated democracy, as practised in the northern Kenya counties of Garissa, Wajir, and Mandera, represents a legitimate but profoundly flawed governance alternative to liberal constitutional democracy. Its legitimacy derives from its rootedness in genuine communal values, its historical rationality as an adaptation to weak state authority, and its demonstrated capacity — in reformed iterations like the Wajir peace process — to serve social goods including peace, cohesion, and inclusive deliberation. Its flaws are structural rather than incidental: the incentive architecture of clan consensus politics systematically produces sycophantic leadership; a wealth-driven selection that rewards financial muscle over competence and integrity; the capture of executive appointments by clan and kinship loyalty at the expense of merit; utilitarian, employment-bureau governance; uneven, clan-inflected development; the tokenistic inclusion of allied minority clans; elite capture; voter exclusion; and a perpetual campaign-governance cycle that together constitute a formidable obstacle to social transformation.

The social transformation lens developed in Section 3 provides the normative framework most appropriate for evaluating these governance arrangements. By the criteria of structural accountability, distributive justice, human agency, ethical leadership, and community resilience, negotiated democracy in its current form fails the communities of northern Kenya — not because it is African, indigenous, or communal, but because it systematically prioritises elite interests over community wellbeing and substitutes patronage for transformation. The Freirean critique sharpens this judgement: negotiated democracy reduces citizens to passive objects of elite political decisions rather than active subjects of democratic self-governance. That judgement, moreover, survives the most serious rival explanations: as Section 5.8 argues, the capacity constraints, insecurity, and historical marginalisation that also afflict these counties are real and compounding, but they cannot by themselves account for the patterned, clan-inflected character of the failures, which tracks the incentive logic of negotiated democracy itself.

The path forward requires neither the abolition of clan deliberative institutions nor their uncritical acceptance, but a creative institutional synthesis — a hybrid democratic model — that channels the social legitimacy and deliberative wisdom of clan consensus into governance arrangements that are constitutionally accountable, socially inclusive, and transformation-oriented. Such a model requires political will from national and county governments, intellectual courage from scholars and civil society, and most fundamentally, the organised political agency of the women, youth, minority clans, and ordinary citizens of Garissa, Wajir, and Mandera who bear the highest costs of negotiated democracy's governance pathologies. These proposals are deliberately built on institutions that already exist — among them the County Public Service Board, the Commission on Revenue Allocation, the Equalisation Fund, the offices of the Controller of Budget and the Auditor-General, and the Frontier Counties Development Council — but, as Section 7.3 argues, their adoption turns less on technical design than on shifting the incentives of those who currently benefit from the consensus trap.
The deeper theoretical contribution of this paper is the argument that the test of any democratic arrangement — negotiated or otherwise — must ultimately be whether it serves the social transformation of the communities it governs. Democratic legitimacy, on this view, is not merely procedural — it is not enough that leaders are chosen through recognisably democratic or consensual processes — but substantive: legitimate governance must produce outcomes that advance human dignity, justice, and community flourishing. By this substantive test, negotiated democracy in northern Kenya falls short. But by this same test, the communities own deliberative

traditions, reformed and constitutionally anchored, contain genuine resources for the governance innovation that social transformation demands. The scholarly and political task is to build the bridge between those resources and that demand — and in so doing, to contribute to the transformation of northern Kenya's governance from a system that serves elders and campaigns to one that serves citizens and communities.

9. REFERENCES

Anderson, D., & McKnight, J. (2015). Kenya at war: Al-Shabaab and its enemies in Eastern Africa. *African Affairs, 114*(454), 1–27. https://www.prio.org/publications/10705

Branch, D. (2011). *Kenya: Between hope and despair, 1963–2011*. Yale University Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43904828

Carrier, N., & Lochery, E. (2013). Missing states? Somali trade networks and the Eastleighwood economy. *Journal of Eastern African Studies, 7*(3), 334–352. https://ideas.repec.org/a/taf/rjeaxx/v7y2013i2p334-352.html

Cheeseman, N. (2015). *Democracy in Africa: Successes, failures, and the struggle for political reform*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1086/695292

Commission on Revenue Allocation (CRA). (2021). *County budget implementation review report: 2019/2020 financial year*. Republic of Kenya. https://cra.go.ke/downloads/

Constitution of Kenya. (2010). National Council for Law Reporting. https://www.parliament.go.ke/sites/default/files/2017-05/The_Constitution_of_Kenya_2010.pdf

County Governments Act, No. 17 of 2012. (2012). National Council for Law Reporting. https://new.kenyalaw.org/akn/ke/act/2012/17/eng@2022-12-31

Elmi, A. A. (2010). Understanding the Somalia conflagration: Identity, political Islam and peacebuilding. Pluto Press. https://www.plutobooks.com/product/understanding-the-somalia-conflagration/

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum. https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=2059960

Helmke, G., & Levitsky, S. (2004). Informal institutions and comparative politics: A research agenda. *Perspectives on Politics, 2*(4), 725–740. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/perspectives-on-politics/article/informal-institutions-and-comparative-politics-a-research-agenda/11A6AA9DCAF579F5B72DA250728AA513

ICPAK. (2019). *Public finance management status report: Northern Kenya counties*. Institute of Certified Public Accountants of Kenya. https://www.icpak.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Journal-July-August-2019-.pdf

Ingiriis, M. H., & Hoehne, M. V. (2013). The impact of civil war and state collapse on the roles of Somali women and the contributions they are making to peace building and state reconstruction. *Journal of Eastern African Studies, 7*(2), 250–269. https://doi.org/10.1080/17531055.2013.776281

Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS). (2024). *The Kenya poverty report 2022*. Republic of Kenya. https://www.knbs.or.ke/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/The-Kenya-Poverty-Report-2022.pdf

Lewis, I. M. (2008). *Understanding Somalia and Somaliland: Culture, history, society*. Hurst & Company. https://doi.org/10.2307/25703047

Lijphart, A. (1977). *Democracy in plural societies: A comparative exploration*. Yale University Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1dszvhq

Lynch, G. (2011). I say to you: Ethnic politics and the Kalenjin in Kenya. University of Chicago Press. https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/I/bo11913256.html

Mama, A. (2011). What does it mean to do feminist research in African contexts? *Feminist Review, 98*(1), e4–e20. https://doi.org/10.1057/fr.2011.22

McCrone, F. (2023). ‘I have opened the land for you’: Pastoralist politics and election-related violence in Kenya’s arid north. *Journal of Eastern African Studies, 17*(1–2), 121–140. https://ideas.repec.org/a/taf/rjeaxx/v17y2023i1-2p121-140.html

Menkhaus, K. (2006). Governance without government in Somalia: Spoilers, state building, and the politics of coping. *International Security*, *31*(3), 74–106. https://www.almendron.com/tribuna/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Governance-without-Government-in-Somalia.pdf

Menkhaus, K. (2008). The rise of a mediated state in northern Kenya: The Wajir story and its implications for state-building. *Afrika Focus, 21*(2), 23–38. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/26569619_The_Rise_of_a_Mediated_State_in_Northern_Kenya_The_Wajir_Story_and_its_Implications_for_State-Building

Mkandawire, T. (2001). Thinking about developmental states in Africa. *Cambridge Journal of Economics, 25*(3), 289–313. https://doi.org/10.1093/cje/25.3.289

Muwonge, A., Williamson, T. S., Owuor, C., & Kinuthia, M. (2022). *Making devolution work for service delivery in Kenya*. World Bank. https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/520481645582955062

National Council for Population and Development (NCPD). (2020). *Maternal deaths in Kenya* [Policy brief]. Republic of Kenya. https://ncpd.go.ke/policy-briefs/

Office of the Controller of Budget (OCOB). (2025). *County governments budget implementation review report, FY 2024/25*. Republic of Kenya. https://cob.go.ke/reports/consolidated-county-budget-implementation-review-reports/

Peet, R., & Hartwick, E. (2009). *Theories of development: Contentions, arguments, alternatives* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press. https://www.academia.edu/61632117/Peet_R_Hartwick_E_Theories_of_development_Contentions_Arguments_Alternatives

Posner, D. N. (2005). *Institutions and ethnic politics in Africa*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/S153759270656027X

Public Finance Management Act, No. 18 of 2012. (2012). National Council for Law Reporting. https://new.kenyalaw.org/akn/ke/act/2012/18

Schlee, G. (2013). Customary law and the joys of statelessness: Idealised traditions versus Somali realities. *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, *7*(2), 258–271. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271672901_Customary_law_and_the_joys_of_statelessness_Idealised_traditions_versus_Somali_realities

Shutte, A. (2001). *Ubuntu: An ethic for a new South Africa*. Cluster Publications. https://philpapers.org/rec/SHUUAE

Swilling, M., & Annecke, E. (2012). *Just transitions: Explorations of sustainability in an unfair world*. UCT Press. https://i.unu.edu/media/unu.edu/publication/16234/just-transitions-sample-chapter.pdf

Wajir County Government. (2024). *Programme-based budget estimates, FY 2024/25*. https://wajir.go.ke/download/programme-based-budget-fy-2024-25-approved/

Walls, M. (2009). The emergence of a Somali state: Building peace from civil war in Somaliland. *African Affairs*, *108*(432), 371–389. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1437476