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Introduction

The question regarding whether a coherent tradition that is philosophically and politically discernible as “African feminism” exists, or whether what exists is a diverse and not necessarily amenable set of feminist trajectories among women (or more historically, gendered subjects) in Africa, continues to be definitive of the debates on feminism in Africa. This question itself suggests a conceptual conflation (between African feminism/feminism in Africa) that is both necessary and unavoidable, as both are represented along the spectrum of what has constituted the expanse of social and political praxis by African women across time. Both are historically situated in that they highlight a political concern with what movements resemble, what they do, why they take on particular issues and characteristics, what an African vantage point reveals, and the ways in which collective identification with them functions politically and socially. Over the course of history, the distinction between (African) feminism as tradition on the one hand, and as a political orientation (ideology) on the other, has been transgressed and blurred, depending on the political demands of the time. Furthermore, across our histories, women have formed many transformative movements when faced with particular political questions — movements which latter dissolved or sublated to other questions and in this sense may be understood in their historicity. Such periodic alliances also then form the cornucopia of African feminism/feminism in Africa. As such while conceding definitional pitfalls and conceptual tensions between the two, this chapter builds on the notion of “African feminism,” both as an assertion of a coherent historical political tradition, and methodologically as offering the possibility for critique in relation to feminisms politically located elsewhere, and against which African women have sought to distinguish our claims as historically contingent, situated, and structurally defined.

A number of debates and varying positions on African feminism provide insight into the contested nature of this terrain of thought and struggle. One current in the debates outrightly rejects identification with Western feminism and asserts a variant of maternal determinism disarticulated from difference and in Desree Lewis’s analysis, is celebratory of purely symbolic roles for women, or affirming gendered roles of service and nurturing. Mikell has for instance, written that African feminism “has largely been shaped by African women’s resistance to Western hegemony and its legacy within African culture … [and] does not
grow out of bourgeois individualism and the patriarchal control over women within capitalist industrializing societies.” As such, Mikell problematically asserts, “[the debates in many Western countries about essentialism, the female body, and radical feminism are not characteristic of new African feminism …] rather, the slowly emerging African feminism is distinctly heterosexual, pro-natal, and concerned with many ‘bread, butter, culture, and power’ issues.” Noting the “deeply conservative” thrust of this argument and arguing for a more robust critique of social, political, economic subjectivities, others insist that “essentialist evolutions of geographical, national or racial criteria as decisive grounds for defining African feminism are especially untenable in our current context of intensified globalization.”

Rather, acknowledging African diasporic, Pan Africanist, and continental interconnectivity, a more progressive current views the potency of African feminism as located within “a shared intellectual commitment to critiquing gender and imperialism coupled with a collective focus on a continental identity shaped by particular relations of subordination in the world economy and global social and cultural practices.” Furthermore, women’s entry and participation in economic and political life has broadened the scope of concepts such as “freedom,” “emancipation,” and “democracy,” such that it is impossible to think of them today outside of the co-constitutive meanings with which women’s actions have imbued them. As such, pitting African feminism against Western feminism misses the objective conditions and manifestations of domination, exploitation, subordination against which feminists everywhere articulate their claims, albeit in historically distinct/differentiated relation to the structuring power of race, ethnicity, sexuality, age, gender, class, and so on.

Historical expressions and debates

Feminist commitments to writing women, and in particular, African women back into history have critiqued women’s deliberate silencing in colonial historiography and highlight various practices of agency and resistances to colonial domination as producing a discernible concept of what might be termed as the “political” for those women. “Discernible” because women’s political activities and activism have to be read in relation to their positionality against the structures of domination pertaining at any historical conjuncture. So for instance, while justice emerges in more contemporary feminist discourses as a specific claim in relation to the state, it does not accurately account for the imperatives that drove anticolonial resistance and struggles. Those struggles were more accurately articulating questions of power and liberation. To speak of “justice” is misleading because there is no actual basis for reading the colonial state as a “just” state; the colonized natives exist fundamentally outside of the state’s notion of citizenship and rights claims, yet at the same time are incorporated into the colonial state’s raison d’etre as “Captive Maternals” – “those most vulnerable to violence, war, poverty, police, and captivity; those whose very existence enables the possessive empire that claims and dispossesses them” [and who] “can either be biological females or those feminized into caretaking and consumption” – a notion of social reproduction to which I shall return in the critical assessment of contemporary African feminist debates. To James, “off-continuum politics that resist … rebellion through boycott, protest, or even riot becomes an act of the uncivil.” The “uncivility” of African women’s struggles of the past is at present claimed as a necessary weapon of feminist struggles on the continent, again denoting epistemological lineages.

Just as well, given that colonialists neither had women as their focus, nor initiated any possibility of extending the realm of “civil society” to African women as was a possibility available to a small number of male African elites. African women’s ‘riots’ in the colonial
period, while dangerous and impactful, could not in the strictest sense be considered as transgressive as they did not violate any formal codes to which their control had been ascribed. African women existed outside of the formal coding of natives – partly as a strategy of their pacification. Rather their control was assured by forcefully disrupting and redirecting women’s productive and reproductive labours towards the colonial empire and enterprise of accumulation. In this endeavour, I have shown elsewhere that the control of women’s sexuality was central both to the ways in which male resistance to colonialism became publicly articulated, and to the ways in which women developed a sense of political agency. In addition, the gendered division of labour and control especially of women’s labour by colonial authorities provoked women’s mobilization and organizing. Many instances abound from the historical epoch of colonialism which illustrate the contradictory ways in which colonial powers perceived, reconstructed, and reacted to women’s political agency.

This was illustrated in the context of the Mau Mau rebellion in Kenya, where colonialists did eventually recognize the threat that women as a group distinct from men posed to the colonial project. The British administration sought to implement a differentiation strategy that led them to a triple dichotomy of women as spouses of Mau Mau, women as domestic workers, and single women based in the city – categories which sought to minimize women’s militancy. Such definitions were also an attempt to find an inclusive definition of the female component in Mau Mau in the hope of resolving the basic contradictions thrown up by colonialist policies towards women. The basic view that prevailed was on the one hand, of women as “victimized” and “instrumentalised” by Mau Mau, and on the other hand, a recognition of women’s activism as fundamental to the movement’s operations – an acknowledgment of women as a threat in their own right – which ultimately served to legitimise the ways in which colonialists responded to women. Yet colonialists were never fully able to grasp how they themselves defined the threat that women posed to them, despite the force they exerted upon women. The general belief among colonialists, of women as a much more subversive force, became more entrenched in the Emergency period, as increasingly it was women, way more than men, who were seen as sustaining the movement. The implications of this underrating of women’s resistance roles was twofold: first, colonialists assumed that “protecting” women would resolve their perceived ambivalence – a solution for which the colonial administration mandated detention and rehabilitation programs. Second, by denying any contribution of women in the nationalist project, colonial thought on women’s involvement in the Mau Mau also denied women’s agency.

In another widely cited context of the Aba Women’s War in Nigeria – a historical event variously referred to as the “Aba Women’s Riot of 1929” and “the Women’s Revolt of 1929,” scholars have also pointed out the attempts at subversion: that terming this event a “riot” by the British was a deliberate attempt to downplay its impact on future history, and by extension, a denial of women’s agency. The British refused to acknowledge that the war was in fact, a systematically organized socioeconomic protest movement (that cut across six ethnic groups – Ibibio, Andoni, Ogoni, Bonny, Opobo and Igbo women) of southeastern Nigeria comprising women motivated by specific grievances, directed at achieving certain clear-cut social, economic and political goals. The women’s demands were radical: that the government exclude women from taxation; to stop [government] counting personal property and arresting of prostitutes; cancellation of rent payments for women’s market sheds; abolish fees for licenses to stage women’s dances; dismissal of the warrant chief; and that men too, should no longer be taxed. To simply surmise the end of the war as “tragic” is again, to minimise the profound effect it had in consolidating women’s struggles against colonial institutionalisation of their exploitation. Although they did not win their
final battle, the women broke with taboo, exposed the absurdity of the colonial project, and “succeeded in shaking the foundations of colonial rule” through a plethora of reforms to which the colonial government acquiesced, marking the first steps of colonial disengagement in Nigeria.\footnote{16}

Another area where women’s movements were particularly important in anticolonial activity was southwestern Nigeria. There, women possessed a long and rich history of collective organization through which they articulated and protected their interests from precolonial times onward.\footnote{17} As Johnson (1982) has also argued, colonialism altered women’s position in their societies, particularly affecting their economic roles and ability to participate in local government. Southwestern Nigerian women quickly perceived the nature of the threat to their interests and regrouped their forces in order to preserve their interests. Usually this centered on organizing market women along new lines, utilizing both traditional skills and concepts of leadership as well as western protest actions. Like the Fante and Ga Confederacies in the Gold Coast or the Egba Board of Management in Abeokuta, the new organizations represented the uniting of the western educated elite leadership and traditional Yoruba leadership and institutions in order to promote the welfare of Yoruba women within the changed circumstances of the colonial situation.\footnote{18} Two particularly significant movements in this regard were the Lagos Market Women’s Association (LMWA) led by Madam Alimotu Pelewura, and the Abeokuta Women’s Union (AWU) led by Mrs. Funmilayo Anikulapo-Kuti (formerly Ransome-Kuti) (ibid.). As with their Igboland counterparts, the most important grievance of the LMWA had been taxation and food price controls; the AWU also protested taxation without representation,\footnote{19} and demanded the abdication of the Alake (traditional ruler), and abolition of the Sole Native Authority system (SNA)\footnote{20} and its replacement by a more representative form of government which would include women representatives.\footnote{21} The women were vigilant of colonial attempts to undermine their productive and reproductive economies, and sustained militant protests expressing economic and political grievances, which also influenced the rise of militant mass anticolonial movements.

What these historical recorded instances of the militancy of women highlight is an earlier point regarding the fact that African women under colonial rule stood beyond the pale of the law, and their recourse to (uncivil) disobedience ought to be understood in this regard. As Johnson (1982) writes of the AWU in Abeokuta, “[w]hen it became abundantly clear that going through the proper channels – petitions, test cases in court, and publicity in the press – produced no results, the AWU adopted more radical methods – sit-ins, mass protest, demonstrations, and outright refusal to pay taxes. The new militant approach began early in 1947 when Kuti refused to pay her taxes.”\footnote{22} There is an immanence here in the fact that the particular conditions faced by women at those different historical junctures and to which they variously responded, also dialectically produced within them the modes of resistance and thus, possibility of social and political change: stated differently, the (political) form of society also produced within it the modes of protest and resistance. These were, of course, historically specific and would inevitably take on different form in the post-independence period as African women gained greater access to civic spaces, and as their nominal claims to citizenship modified the modes of social protest and resistance available to them – albeit retaining a complex relationship with the weapons of the past.

It is necessary though to also point out the contradictory nature of women’s participation in the anticolonial movement. I have, for instance shown in the case of Kenya, that despite having extended their political responsibilities, women were largely circumscribed from developing a political discourse centered on the women-related issues which in the early
years of colonialism had characterized their experiences of nationalism. The idea of women’s weakness and corruptibility became strengthened as colonial tactics of forced rule became more desperate and as colonial authorities sought to grapple with their own contradictory perceptions of women. The colonialists’ redefinition of gender roles and attempts to devalue women’s productive and reproductive roles in the subsistence and colonial economies had far-reaching consequences on the process of imagining and constructing a women’s movement with nationwide significance in the postindependence period. Characteristic of colonial rule, the bifurcated state became stabilized along the social, ethno-political, and economic crevices engendered through the violent control and manipulation of natives’ labour, mobility, kinship networks, and gender solidarities.

As a result, in the postindependence transition period political participation for many African women literally found new expression – as highly urbanized and subordinated movements, alienated from their long histories of organic modes of political organizing that had been articulated to their struggles for survival and livelihood – struggles over land, food, and freedom. New regimes of control reconfigured the economic as well as political insertion of women into the independent state. In countries such as Kenya, where transition to independence had been negotiated between the colonial authorities and largely moderate African nationalists, the latter sought assurance not only in the stabilization of existing class configurations, but also reaffirmed a gender order which would not threaten the patrimonial hegemony through which the colonialists had perfected their exploitative and accumulative onslaught on the country. The “place” of women was clearly defined under such arrangements as the country transitioned into the postindependence period, the legacies of which would extend well into the era of democratization.

Yet women’s historically distinct forms of organizing had not yet been shed. Rather what was lost in the longue durée of colonial, patriarchal reconstitution of feminist agency and women’s power had been the social, cultural, and political resources, which had steadily shifted to exclude women, and at independence, consolidated around narrow masculinist nationalist politics that albeit deracialized, did not manage to detribalize – thus setting the stage for identitarian forms of violence that mark the terrain of African feminist struggles at present. The anachronism of postindependence African states burdened with ethnic identitarianism was deeply intertwined with the colonial imperative of indirect rule. From independence onwards, we see the deliberate appropriation and commodification of women’s associational practices and labor by the state, through the very organs of the women’s movement through which women had sought to build autonomy and self-sufficiency as their traditional networks began to drastically shift under late colonial capitalism. In the era of neoliberalization that also ushered in multiparty politics, the women’s movement’s retreat from class analysis and the submerging of women’s postcolonial concerns under the liberal rubric of human rights and women’s rights thus bore little apparent logic of women’s particular structural positions and oppression under neoliberalism. The enterprise of (both structural and embodied) violence against women – a profound preoccupation of our contemporary feminist struggles in Africa – ought then to be understood in relation to this long history of dispossession.

Major contemporary debates in African feminism

Contemporary movements of African women have precipitated a more deliberate turn towards a political identification with “African feminism” as positionality, existential praxis and political/philosophical vantage point, yet this shift has also been marked by a disarticulation between elite,
urban-based feminist movements and rural-based women’s movements, which although retaining an ideological commitment to the emancipation of African women as a whole, renders it more tenuous to speak collectively of “African feminism” as a coherent whole. Rather, what contemporary struggles shore up are multiple locations of struggle and resistance that are at times contradictory, though not inimical.

Beginning in the late 1980s when structural adjustment took hold on the continent, disguising neo-imperialist interests, the accompanying political and economic liberalisation shifted struggles towards an intensified period of constitutionalism, which has fundamentally structured and redirected feminist claims towards questions of human/women’s rights, political participation, representation, and to a politics of recognition. Furthermore, the professionalization of the women’s movement – the gradual shift from grassroots feminism in the colonial period, towards state feminism in the early postindependence nationalist period, to the neoliberal “shrinking” of the state in direct provisioning of welfare which paved way for nongovernmental organization – what some have termed as “NGOization” – has gradually (ironically) redirected feminist claims in a more structured manner through identification with the state. The scholarship has also shown the effects of deepening authoritarianism and conservative public politics that have accompanied neoliberalization.

The “neoliberal squeeze” has been experienced at the level of the family, household, community, in institutions of higher learning, and the state, with the outcome that the articulation within the women’s movement of either progressive or conservative politics have largely been defined through various state regime politics. As spaces for feminist activism increasingly retreated from (increasingly conservative and militaristic) university spaces, the proliferation of nongovernmental organizations did afford alternative frameworks within which feminist organizing could proceed. Yet as Khatak (2014) notes, while this created room for women, it also engendered a reactionary position in relation to the family, causatively linked to the fact that some donors were keen to strengthen the family.

Neoliberalisation’s enduring “gift” to feminist organizing in Africa has then been the necessity to innovate, reimagine, and reclaim a rebellious tradition of struggle that once again exceeds the “civil,” “liberal,” constitutionalism that has largely been a conversation between the liberal state and elite women.

If the historical present is one that has again shored up questions of neocolonialism, monopoly finance capitalism, imperialism, patriarchy, exploitation, and the carceral state (against which emancipation, freedom, desubjectivation and decolonization emerge as primary demands), then we must of necessity locate feminist activism in Africa within these questions and demands. Firstly, there has in the course of the past few years, been a profound generational reckoning with the limits of appealing to the very structures and institutions that disenfranchise women and necessitate justice claims. In more intensified ways than ever before, injury marks the space of struggle for a younger generation of feminist activists on the continent at present. As so aptly put by a recent collective conference statement

“decolonisation” in “our” contexts inevitably began with the gendered and sexualized violence of colonial/Apartheid legacies and of the newly independent state-nation. In other words, sexual violence has been the defining experience of gendered, sexualized, caste-d, and racialised bodies in the postcolony, and unsurprisingly, an issue that has been at the heart of feminist struggles in these locales.

Weary from seemingly insurmountable struggles for the implementation of gender violence laws and policies, and recognizing the limits of institutionalized responses to everyday forms...
of sexual and gendered violence, the articulated position of African women (and more broadly, women of the global south) seeking an end to violence is that this cannot be accomplished if not also conditioned upon anti-racist, anti-capitalist, decolonial struggles, and struggles against gender inequality.

Among others, this has meant engaging thematically with labour questions, including taking radical positions in relation to the recognition of sex work, domestic labour remuneration, informal economy, migrant labour and “free” labour performed for the reproduction of families and households. The stand taken by African feminists is distinctly different from the liberal feminist mantra of inclusion, recognition, equality, citizenship. In the emerging African feminist discourse and struggles around rape and gendered violence – embodied by student movements (FMF/RMF, #menaretrash) – the modes of activism are deeply articulated to a critique of the ways in which black women have been reconstituted in the post-colonial state as both already violated and as violable, the ways in which we experience the state as violent, and the ways in which the neoliberal state has tended to redirect injury through recourse to the criminalization of women’s labour, dress, speech, and sexuality. As the Intimacy and Injury statement further observes: the #MeToo intervention [has] positioned itself as a direct challenge to the limits of the law and one of challenging “due process” through the tactics of public shaming and shifting the burden of proof from the accuser to the accused. In generationally inflected narratives of feminism’s evolution, the time had come, it was said, to move feminist politics “beyond the law.”

Alongside the strategic significance that violence takes in the contemporary subjective positioning of African women are debates on sexuality and heteronormativity which expose some contradictions inherent to the African feminist project. Queer African feminists provide an important lens into these contradictions, noting the religious and cultural underpinnings of homophobia, and exposing the conventions that link traditional institutions of marriage, rites of passage, childbearing/rearing etc. to normative sex and gender roles. Furthermore, claiming queery positionalities within African feminism has also opened up the possibility of challenging racist, anti-black-women, homophobic, homonationalist, and colorist rhetoric that have nominally been concealed/marginalized by the universalizing rhetoric of a “shared” social orientation among African women. This radical queer commitment towards critiquing African feminism from “within” responds in part to the following question: how can African feminism, to paraphrase Dhawan (2014) “be taken beyond [its heteropatriarchal] confines … and be made to work for [its] ‘Other’?” Furthermore,

\[\text{does it suffice to critique Western operations of racist and imperialist violence or must not the postcolony confront its own failures? And…how does one safeguard that this auto-critique is not instrumentalized to disqualify postcolonial-queer-feminist-perspectives?}\]

These questions have larger political implications than merely constructing an identitarian position within African feminist thought. The “anti-homosexuality” debates and criminalization of same-sex relations in Africa have remained marginal to dominant African feminist debates and emerge (perhaps positively?) as a terrain of struggle within the feminist movements(s). Yet attention to the ways in which these discourses have been manipulated and instrumentalised by African governments do in my view, center them as important
analytical tools in our relation to the imperialist West. Brown’s words in this regard ring true, that there are powers that possess discernible logics, but lack political form or organization, let alone subjective and coordinated intentionality. Such powers inadvertently (re)produce themselves through discernible spaces of power like democracy, which is then subjected to its machinations. As such, the incubation of an LGBTQI discursive space in many African countries (e.g. South Africa, Kenya, Uganda) must be read in tandem with the objectives of the deeply rooted neocolonial links they retain with the US and the West. What is lost is much more than a genuine space for making rights claims by those individuals or groups disenfranchised by a greedy, corrupt, repressive, and inequitable state. It is also the case that out of the artificial binary imposed by human rights between “legitimate” and “illegitimate” claims, those assumed as more deserving of protection – the “hungry masses” – are also the ones most penuriously injured by this falsehood. The deception being that homosexuality becomes the totality of “that” which ails society. The choice offered between one set of (morally corrupting) rights and another set of transcendental human rights is also the application of liberal “choice” as an instrument of capitalist domination.

The question of capitalist domination remains a central one in African feminist debates, with land as one of its most compelling thematic questions. Across many African countries especially in settler colonies, the land question remains unresolved and a source of much contemporary debate, contestation and violence. From Zimbabwe – where “the most important land reform after the Cold War” took place – to Kenya, South Africa, and Uganda, land retains significance not only as a means of production, but significantly for the land poor and effectively landless peasantry that predominates in much of Africa, as a means of survival and for social reproduction. The continuities between the peasant and land articulations of the agrarian question in the anticolonial period, and the present demands arising in the back of large scale land dispossession (termed by some as renewed primitive accumulation), have also shored up contemporary agrarian questions, among which of particular concern for African feminist agrarian scholars has been the agrarian question of gendered labour. That is, the reliance of capitalism on exploitative relations of production, the base of which is supported by the unremunerated/under-remunerated, casualized gendered labour that reproduces and sustains the massive numbers of surplus labourers that are daily being expended from manufacturing and industry in ongoing processes of semi-proletarianization.

The effects of this “pyramid” is felt most acutely in countries of the global south. In Africa, where more than 70% of the population remains agrarianised, the insistence by feminist political economists on posing these exploitative gender relations as a contemporary agrarian question is meant to write African women back into the continent’s narrative of dispossession and development, and to expose the contradictions entailed in resolving the land and/or peasant questions without commensurate attention to women. Furthermore, in highlighting the extent to which social reproduction in Africa depends to a great extent on access to private lands, common lands and nature, we are asserting a fundamentally different approach to a question (the crisis of social reproduction) that is common to capitalism everywhere. In this regard, an approach grounded in African feminism must take seriously the structural implications of uneven development, accumulation by dispossession, renewed forms of primitive accumulation, and the role of gender as a condition of possibility for these processes. For feminists writing from Africa, the significance of land is therefore much
more than a “resource” and the basis of “development.” Land retains significance as the basis of survival, as a symbol of connectivity, of ritual, ancestry, and as a historical claim against the distortions imposed upon African people by colonial plundering.

The thematic areas covered here are by no means exhaustive of the breadth of intellectual and activist questions being posed by African feminists. My point rather has been to avoid the obvious pitfalls of attempting to “speak/think for,” but rather to “speak/think within” a tradition of feminism grounded in African realities. That is to say, if part of the difficulty in defining what African feminism is relates to the multiplicity of its projects/commitments, then the methodological and conceptual building blocks through which these multiple sites of struggle have been constituted must be clarified on an ongoing basis, and as part of our theorization and praxis. It helps to think of this in relation to standpoint theory which holds that there are some perspectives on society from which, however well-intentioned one may be, the real relations of humans with each other and with the natural world are not visible.38 There are a number of epistemological and political claims tied to this contention: i) that material life (class position) not only structures but sets limits on the understanding of social relations; ii) that the vision of the rulers, the powerful, is bound to be dominant, and is therefore partial; iii) that the fact that this vision, and also gender, structures the material relations in which we are forced to participate cannot be dismissed as false; iv) and as such, the vision available to the oppressed group must be struggled for; v) that adoption of a standpoint exposes the real relations among human beings as inhuman, points beyond the present, and carries a historically liberatory role.39 Standpoint draws from an assumption that all epistemology develops in a complex and contradictory way from material life, and as such has epistemological and ontological significance to human activity. That it is possible, out of this, to develop tools with which to understand the particular ways in which (African) women experience oppression.

Conclusion

If there is one thing that our collective African feminists histories have assured us of, it is that any politics, especially of a feminist variant, structured around a critique of coloniality, and which in its external bearings threatens to resurrect not just a history of “indisciplined” rebellious women such as those highlighted earlier, is likely to be met with massive resistance, both from the conservative forces within it, but also, and especially, from those who have historically denied female agency and power as transformative forces in society. It is in tracing the crevices of both these (re)emerging feminist spaces and claims in Africa, and the forms of resistance that are being deployed both for and against them, that we might arrive at a more concrete notion of a tradition that might be termed as African feminism.

Furthermore, to insist on African feminism as primarily representing a vantage point – an ideological commitment to understanding the world (history) of women from a political and philosophical position that is counter-hegemonic and grounded in African realities and that is sympathetic to subaltern, enslaved, colonised voices – is necessarily to reject a vulgar mutation that privileges geographical positioning as ontological. It is to say that the cornucopia of debates that are seeking to express and represent the condition of women in Africa gain coherence as “African feminist,” not because of who is authorised to speak with or on behalf of African women, but rather because what is articulated centres African women as protagonists of their actual lived realities – an understanding that our histories have also bequeathed to us the tools with which to fight for and imagine a more emancipated feminist existence. African feminism is then, the necessary condition for our political subjectivation as women in Africa: “political” because we are always faced with the question of power and liberation.
Notes

5 Ibid, 5.
7 Ibid, 258.
11 The British colonial government issued Emergency Orders in October 1952. The orders gave the government martial law powers. The situation was declared to be an emergency because of the massive oathing ceremonies held by the Kikuyu, the spread of the Land and Freedom army (the Mau Mau) from the urban areas into the rural districts, and rise of violence against Loyalist Kikuyu. In Kiambu district, Senior Chief Waruhiu, a prominent pro-government spokesman, was assassinated. His murder was the event which precipitated the announcement of the state of emergency and the British declaration of war against the Land and Freedom army (see Cora Ann Presley, *Kikuyu Women, the Mau Mau Rebellion, and Social Change in Kenya* (Baltimore: Inprint Editions, Presley 2003), 127.
14 Ibid, 110.
16 Ibid, 67.
19 Ever since 1918 when taxes were instituted, women were required to pay income tax upon reaching the age of 15 and continued to do so when married, whereas men did not have to pay until the age of 17. Women thus provided as much as one-half of district revenues, yet had no direct representation on SNA councils (Johnson 1982: 150).
20 The SNA system constituted indirect rule in Abeokuta and invested the Alake with his powers of office. Its unpopularity stemmed from the powers though which it authorized the alake in the misappropriation of land and wrongful leasing to Europeans and their agents, and his overenthusiastic interpretation of the colonial government’s orders regarding requisitioning of food. The AWU forced his abdication in 1948 (Johnson 1982: 150).
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