

Pyokyeong Son

Submitted 26 Sept. 2022

Mackie thinks there are lessons we can extract from the abolition of foot binding in China to foster the abolition of infibulation and FGM in sub-Saharan Africa. What differences between foot binding and FGM might make the recipe from China not work so well for FGM in east Africa?

Mackie's process of exposing a superior equilibrium and making pledge societies, as in China, are likely not enough to abolish FGM, due to its two characteristics absent from footbinding: its importance in the marriage market, and visibility.

Mackie's quote of "Abdalla's survey in 1980 of [...] Somali [...] university students" reveal that incentives in the marriage market are the prevailing factor in practicing FGM. Honor and fidelity—incentives maintaining the inferior equilibrium—are directly linked to FGM, unlike footbinding. While footbinding was "associated with higher status love and sex, and so carried strong *connotations* of both modesty and lasciviousness,"—a weak correlation to the paternity confidence and a nonexistent belief trap, the fact that in practicing societies FGM is "*required* for marriage and honor; [...] it is *proof* of virginity and secures fidelity," indicates that in the marriage market FGM is not only a luxury (or normal good) but a necessity. Thus in the current inferior equilibrium the utility lost (risk of inability to marry) due to not practicing is much higher, and pledge groups are less likely to form the initial k members in Figure 2., since the vertical distance between R and L at $N=0$ is higher than in footbinding. Adding to this, FGM is not visible, thus the people are "less sure of where they are on the Schelling diagram." Therefore even after pledge groups enter the self-reinforcing recruitment phase those still practicing (on L) will not easily realize their incentives, possibly even past the tipping point t .

(249 words)