‘Malleable Minds’: Women of the Mau Mau

By Rachel Urovitz

In the mid-twentieth century, Britain experienced the beginnings of decolonization and heightened nationalistic movements in many of its colonial holdings and protectorate territories. Specifically, in 1952 the Mau Mau Uprising in Kenya highlighted colonial desires to be independent and exiled from the Empire.¹ Simultaneously, the case study of the Mau Mau shows the British government attempting to preserve the spirit of empire. Continuing to demonstrate their motivations and purpose as the leading global imperial power in Kenya, the British exhibited their self-imposed paternalistic ‘duty,’ as civilizing initiatives persisted. Critically analyzing the roles of female Mau Mau members in the rebellion demonstrates the cultural and ideological discrepancies between British and Kenyan conceptions of traditional gender roles. Furthermore, it demonstrates how British notions of gender provided an opportunity for Mau Mau women to exhibit significant political influence and agency that arguably contributed to the end of the rebellion (1956) and the eventual independence of Kenya (1963). Ultimately, women’s roles “were as multi-faceted as the revolt it-self”² as they held military, political, and domestic positions that challenged traditional British gender roles.

Studying Mau Mau women is pivotal in understanding the role of empire. The Mau Mau demonstrates the reality of colonial rule, investigating differing gender conceptions and treating mobilization of African peoples as a nationalist revolution that had grave influence on Kenya’s independence. However, there are serious limitations to studying the Mau Mau Uprising and, more so, women’s role in the rebellion. First, the major actors in this study are the Kikuyu people, who made up the majority of the Mau Mau, and the nature of their culture and approach to remembering history clashes with Western systems. The Mau Mau exercise oral history traditions of passing on stories through generations. Western discourse has prioritized written records of history, suggesting histories from oral societies are not valid. Thus, not only do western historians neglect oral histories, but there is also a lack of available sources that are not easily accessible. Additionally, the Mau Mau Rebellion is a violent example of the British Empire purposely exterminating thousands of people, and therefore Britain has held valuable files and archives pertaining to the Mau Mau in attempts to protect its global image. Lastly, many historians who do show interest in the Mau Mau do not prioritize women’s involvement in the crisis. However, recent scholarship from historians such as Cora Ann Presley (1988), Marina E Santou (1996), Caroline Elkins (2005) Amanda Elizabeth Lewis (2007), and Katherine Bruce-

Lockhart (2014) is attempting to fill the gaps and uncover the realities of the Mau Mau Rebellion. Especially notable is Elkins, who specialized in looking at the shifting roles of women under colonialism and travelled to Kenya, interviewing surviving Mau Mau members, as well as visiting the national archives in Nairobi.

Established as a colony in 1920, British colonial presence predates the proclamation claiming Kenya as a protectorate in 1895. Britain's interest in Kenya followed the general objective of empire building in expanding territorial holdings, but more specifically exploiting the potential of the land, as Kenya had quality soil for agricultural development.³ The Report of the East Africa Commission of 1925 stated "the high average fertility of the soil and the favorable elements of climate was an assurance of productivity" indicating the prospective value of the land.⁴ Colonists aimed to make Kenya a white settlement area and established European systems that clashed with how Africans had been living pre-contact. Africans already had techniques for aggregating labour forces and cultivating land using cooperative family labour projects.⁵ Losing land to white settlers, particularly the land they were cultivating, became an "agricultural proletariat for European farmers," who benefited from the uprooting of African people.⁶ Thus, with the establishment of colonial rule, native resistance emerged in the early years of British rule, creating bitter and hostile attitudes that would unfold in the Mau Mau Rebellion. Moreover, tension was fostered in early British-African relations due to economic necessity. The time in which British settlers arrived in the Kenyan highlands was a difficult time for the three inhabiting African peoples of the Massai, Kamba, and Kikuyu.⁷ A combination of cattle diseases, human epidemics and famines motivated people to convert to Christianity, as individuals took refuge and sought assistance from missionaries in order to survive.⁸ Though some natives willingly converted and others out of desperation, acceptance of British religion validated the civilizing mission of the empire. Demonstrating how initial British-African tensions focused on land loss and cultural assimilation sets up pivotal underlying issues that become apparent in the rebellion.

The Mau Mau fighters were composed mainly of the ethnic group Kikuyu, who were the dominant Kenyan culture, having more than a million members by the early 1950's. The Kikuyu were economically marginalized, as they had been losing their land to white settlers since colonization.⁹ Nationalistic movements had been developing prior to the uprising and notable nationalists such as Jomo Kenyatta of the Kenyan African Union (KAU) had been addressing the British government, advocating for political rights and reforms that sought to increase

independence and regain land in the Highlands. In 1952 Kikuyu fighters became more radical and began attacking political opposition, as well as ransacking white settler farms and slaughtering livestock.¹⁰ By October, events had escalated and the British declared a state of emergency and sent British troops to Kenya. Revolting against colonial rule, the uprising lasted until 1960, leading to Kenya's independence. An important aspect of the uprising that the British found extremely problematic was the ceremonial oaths in which Mau Mau members participated. The Kikuyu, often through intimidation and threats of death, implemented oath-taking to commit people to the Mau Mau cause. Mass oathing spread as means of organizing the people, gaining support from African politicians, Kikuyu schools and churches.¹¹

The scale of the oathing campaign, which began before the British declared a state of emergency, drew significant attention to the Mau Mau movement and furthermore contributed to colonial officials' perception that the Mau Mau were a unified force.¹² In reality, like other instances in history of rebellion or revolution, the Mau Mau had internal divides, which are reflected in the different oaths taken. Though oaths differed in the deepness of the pledge, particularly in the severity of violence the pledger was willing to commit, and often influenced by how radical the oath administrator was, common characteristics of the oath included denouncing the 'enemy' and the clear indication that disobedience of the oath should be punishable by death. Some of the most popular pledges were: "If I know of any enemy of our organization and fail to kill him, may this oath kill me" and "If I reveal this oath to any European, may this oath kill me,"¹³ demonstrating the severity and commitment of the oath. As the movement progressed, Mau Mau leaders created seven levels of oaths, each demonstrating a further commitment to the movement. The first level of oath, referred to as the oath of unity, was estimated to have been pledged by 1.5 million of the Kikuyu people, representing almost 90% of the population.¹⁴ The activity of oath-taking represented not only the commitment of the African people's fight against colonial power but also the form of this resistance, demonstrated by practice of this cultural tradition. Oathing became an indication of Kenyan nationalism. Alternatively, colonial government and settlers understood oathing as a backward practice, further playing into the savage conception of Mau Mau and providing the British with reason to civilize.¹⁵ Thus, at the root of the rebellion, the British realized the significance of Mau Mau oaths and their contribution to mobilization.

Women's relationship to oaths is debated because of limited sources and lack of focus on women as active participants in the uprising. District officials in the Central Province felt it was

Mau Mau men taking advantage of women's naivety and malleability, hoping they would not question the violent actions the oaths necessitated.¹⁶ This perception parallels British ideals of gender roles, as they negated the possibility that women, like men, could promote these oaths with intention. Furthermore, this suggests that women exercised political agency that contributed to commitment of the movement. The way in which women were connected to the practice of oath-taking is indicative of the depicted image women had in the rebellion.

In scholarship, women have been seen as either victims of the Mau Mau or as activists who consciously contributed to the success of the Mau Mau. While, as mentioned, women are hardly included in official colonial documents, brief appearances present them as victims of physical and psychological abuse. Instances recorded in two different commissioner reports in 1952 describe women being forced to partake in oath ceremonies when they were physically beaten, stripped naked and forced to drink blood.¹⁷ Further, colonial administrators had difficulty defining the female enemy because of their notions that women were weak and passive.¹⁸ Colonial documents, although beneficial in working towards gaining a complete understanding of altering perceptions of the oaths, must be read with caution as they are produced by colonial officials for a British audience. As Presley argues, "while the rebellion was in progress, a popular British tactic was to portray women as Mau Mau victims,"¹⁹ projecting their passiveness and fitting into British gendered stereotypes. Thus, there are examples of females falling victim to physical and sexual abuse, but generalizing that women as a whole were passive in the movement as naïve Mau Mau members would overlook their desire to be politically active in Kenya. Although initially it was believed that men were administering the oaths, the Kiambu District Commissioner (1950) observed women had taken over oath-giving, signifying a shift in Kikuyu tradition.²⁰ Women's involvement in oath-giving campaigns not only signaled their acceptance of the movement, but also a significant evolution in Kikuyu culture, as it was the first time men and women were taking the same oaths.²¹ In addition, the *African Affairs Report in 1953* indicates that women participated in oath giving, demonstrating that via nationalistic ideology of the Mau Mau movement, women were defying British gender roles. The report specified "The part played by women to aid the terrorists was considerable" suggesting women's involvement was recognizable.²² In 1954, in another report to the Colonial Office from Thomas Askwith, who was the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of African Affairs, similar conclusions were indicated. Askwith stated, "There is evidence that wives have in many cases persuaded their husbands to take the oath,"²³ further exemplifying the shifting British

perceptions of Mau Mau women. Though it was initially believed that men persuaded women to take the oath, as the Mau Mau crisis continued more evidence emerged that debunked the British colonial stereotype that women were politically passive.

In addition to having roles in oath-taking, Kikuyu women also were active members of nationalistic associations in Kenya before and during the rebellion. Muthoni wa Gachie and Wagara Wainana, who identify as Mau Mau leaders, described voluntarily taking oaths and joining to become politicians,²⁴ demonstrating the Mau Mau Uprising featured women in political roles. Gachie was a part of the Kikuyu Central Association (KCA) and Kenyan African Union (KAU) in the 1940's,²⁵ exemplifying how women were active in politics before the rebellion; therefore nationalistic organizations did not emerge from the Mau Mau but rather the rebellion drew more attention to female political participation.

As suggested, the actual oath and actions of the oathing campaign were central to the Mau Mau movement and once the British realized this they devised a plan to rectify the damage of the oath. Taking a closer look at British detention programs, the system that came to be known as the pipeline, demonstrates that the British believed the appropriate response to the Mau Mau crisis was rehabilitation. Central to the program was classifying detainees as white, grey, or black, which represented the respective level of severity. Moving through the pipeline reflected how cooperative the detainee was and their willingness to confess the Mau Mau oath. By deporting every African bearing any connection to the Mau Mau, almost the entire Kikuyu population was detained by the British, amounting to approximately 1.5 million people. Specifically focusing on the Kamiti Detention Camp, which was the main location for female incarceration, and Gitamayu, which was created closer to end of the rebellion (1958) explicitly to handle hardcore female detainees, reveals how the British understood female deviancy and how they justified treatment of Mau Mau women.

Women's punishment in these detention camps proved to be similar to that of male detainees. Punishment and treatment, like that of males, were increasingly severe depending on the person's position on the pipeline. Though women shared the aspects of violence and inhumane treatment that men experienced, due to British ideas of gender, it was believed women could be more easily rehabilitated. Gendered stereotypes influenced the treatment of female detainees, in that the colonial government's idea that women were malleable meant rehabilitation could be achieved, discouraging them from participating in the Mau Mau movement.²⁶ Kamiti was distinctive in that it operated as a self-contained pipeline, encompassing women of all

classifications.²⁷ The rehabilitation program set up for Kamiti was heavily influenced by British conceptions that women had gendered domestic roles.²⁸ Rather than considering the possibility that women's involvement could be self-motivated, colonizers continued to believe that women were malleable. Therefore plans for rehabilitation centred on restoring women's roles as mothers and wives.²⁹ This British notion that emphasized women's role as mothers transferred from the metropole to its colonies. Continuing to protect and promote ideas of empire, the British government attempted to gender metropolitan and colonial women in similar fashions, emphasizing a woman's role or duty to the empire should be as a mother above anything else.³⁰ Suggesting motherhood and childbearing as the priority of Kikuyu women would thus deter them from possessing political positions. Rehabilitation programs claimed to focus on domestic training that included instruction and practice relating to "hygiene, embroidery, gardening, cooking, and child welfare"³¹ that would assist with becoming good mothers. However, the initiatives of this program were paradoxical due to the conditions of the camp. Many women who were detained brought their children with them to the camp, or if pregnant, gave birth to children in the camps. Based on the camp official's estimates in 1955, about 600 hundred children were in Kamiti.

Ideally, if it was Britain's aim to rehabilitate female detainees as effective mothers, having a considerable amount of infants and children living in the camps would have provided opportunity for experiential training and education. However, the realities of living in these camps with children were often dire, as survival and providing basic needs were extremely difficult for mothers to achieve; not only were the women and children exposed to infectious and nutritional diseases, but lack of clothing and food made for low survival rates. Mothers themselves were so malnourished their bodies could not produce breast milk, which directly resulted in their infants' poor health.³² In addition, having to work long hours in different work details left children abandoned in the camps or susceptible to unsafe environments. Kimiti in particular had four jobs: digging murram (clay-like material), cleaning toilet buckets, maintaining the grass and vegetable garden, and transporting and burying dead bodies.³³ Colonial officials claimed the high amount of child deaths were due to neglect.³⁴ By placing blame on the Kikuyu women, it further emphasized the British notion that African women needed rehabilitation to be good mothers. However, it was the colonial exercise of power and punishment that left African women unable to provide for their children.

The conditions and treatment of women in the camps transformed their physical appearances. Subjected to violence, sexual abuse, and the aforementioned health issues affected their appearance so drastically that they personified the undomesticated Mau Mau savages that colonial administrators such as Evelyn Baring were propagating in Britain and the international community.³⁵ Britain used photographs of the female detainees to purposely show them as savages which arguably allowed them to justify the use of these detention camps for rehabilitation, validating the British paternalistic duty of civilizing. Though the British used propaganda to export ideas about an inferior people that needed civilizing, it was in fact the colonial programs and policy that produced the images that people around the world perceived as realities of the Kikuyu culture. Since many Kikuyu women realized the realities of both the survival of their children and themselves in the detention camps, many denounced their Mau Mau oaths to escape. Kimiti had regular visits from missionaries attempting to spread the Christian faith, contributing to the civilizing mission of the empire.³⁶ Though the true reasons for conversion and denouncing their oaths were not unified, Elkin's accounts reveal that many women expressed that they tolerated preachers because it relieved them from work and even aided with their release. The aforementioned motivations for women embracing Christianity, whether genuine in embracing religion or a sacrifice for survival, provided the desired example that the British rehabilitation was producing success stories.

Particularly, press reports of Katherine Warren-Gash, the screening officer at Kamiti, indicated that female detainees were entering the camp "sullen" and "unpleasant" but leaving "really pretty" and "rehabilitated."³⁷ Warren-Gash's role as an officer presents an interesting parallel that it was not just Kikuyu women who assumed different roles during the rebellion. Though Warren-Gash was a female British settler, not a Mau Mau woman, she too symbolized how females outside the British metropole assumed a different position that fell outside the projected primary role of a woman as a mother of the empire. Warren-Gash's reports, among other stories, were featured in British press during the state of emergency. Furthermore, the role of official propaganda and censorship was heightened during World War II. Thus, the portrayal of the Mau Mau to British audiences was controlled and effectively influenced the narrative of violent savages. The Mau Mau were well known in the metropole. Parents would threaten children with ideas of the savage Mau Mau coming to get them if they misbehaved and even some MPs compared their disorderly behaviour in the Commons to the incivility of the Mau Mau.³⁸ Racist images and savagery were perpetuated into popular beliefs by the British public

that led to continued support of colonial presence and control in Kenya. The *Daily Mail* newspaper, from October 21, 1952 included headings such as “Navy Joins Mau Mau Fight” and “Mau Mau Terrorist is charged.”³⁹ Accompanied by photos that emulated British wartime heroism, the press in Britain endorsed the barbaric society of the Mau Mau, suggesting British political and military presence was needed to tame the savage. Therefore popular press like the *Daily Mail* supported the emergency policies issued by the government and sympathized with the settlers and colonial officers, rather than the Mau Mau.⁴⁰ This evidence suggests the press was able to manipulate the public’s perception of Mau Mau Crisis and more broadly, the actions of colonial rule that affected the treatment and ideological basis for rehabilitation of Mau Mau women in the detention camps. Similarly, positive rhetoric that celebrated rehabilitation was seen in official colonial documents. In the recovered files from the East African Department, such as a document on the “Advancement of African Women in Kenya” from 1954-1956 “the impressive work of rehabilitation of Mau Mau adherents” is acknowledged.⁴¹ Further, the document states that progress is notable in the conversion of women, praising the work camp programs.⁴² Both metropolitan British newspapers and exported colonial documents from Africa demonstrate the dominating narrative of the early Mau Mau Rebellion, in that colonial presence and programs in Kenya were presented as beneficial.

Metropolitan views of incarcerated Mau Mau women therefore influenced how they were treated and disciplined within the camps. Kamiti contained female detainees who the British felt could progress through the pipeline system and whose association with the Mau Mau were understood as passive and therefore likely reversible. Women who were classified as ‘Hard Core’ were isolated and sent to Gitamayu. Treatment of women detainees was more severe and violent in this facility but also demonstrated shifting perceptions of how the British defined Mau Mau women. As highlighted in examples of detainees and the rehabilitation program at Kamiti, the British saw Mau Mau women as malleable but policies enforced at Gitamayu suggested a changing discourse that categorized females as mad or mentally insane.⁴³ Gendered assumptions showed that the British were uneasy about how to punish resistant women, and although hardcore women were deterring views of malleability, they were still seen as more redeemable than male detainees.⁴⁴ Influential in this shift in thinking was Warren-Gash’s work at Kamiti, in which she commented hardcore women “were not in a reasonable state of mind.”⁴⁵ Gitamayu, in its isolation of hardcore women, approached detainment differently, signifying the British acceptance that not all female detainees were redeemable.⁴⁶ Also significant was that Gitamayu

detainees were no longer required to denounce their Mau Mau oath, as the British realized it would most likely not be genuine but rather in hopes of being released.⁴⁷ By labeling deviant women insane, the British again attempted to justify the violent treatment of the Mau Mau. Colonial stereotypes of gender suggested women were nonviolent by nature. Thus, in order to rationalize women who did demonstrate extreme violence, the British argued they must be mentally unstable. Designating women detainees as mad further exhibits the colonial power relationship at play, demonstrating that white males had the authority to define women and that the colonial response in itself was gendered. Deeming a Mau Mau woman insane reduced her to be less human which allowed the repressive structure colonialism depended on.⁴⁸ By understanding how ideas of gender roles influenced the treatment of women in Kamiti and Gitamayu it becomes clear “the discourses of ‘otherness’ separating the Mau Mau women from the British were variously expressed along the fault lines of race, gender, power, ‘sanity,’ and freedom.”⁴⁹ By looking at some of the women who were detained in detention camps it becomes evident that the notion of British gender roles impacted their treatment.

Shifra Wametumi and Helen Macharia were two Mau Mau women classified as hardcore. Arrested together, among 12 other men, their stories exemplify how British gender conceptions dictated their treatment. Though Wametumi and Macharia were detained with men for similar suspicion that they were significant, organizing members of the grassroots movement in the Fort Hall District, their punishment was very different.⁵⁰ All detained at the Kahuro camp, the British officer ordered the men to be gathered together, shot, and buried in a pit, exhibiting typical protocol for their level of commitment to the Mau Mau movement. Conversely, the two women known to have similar, if not stronger ties to the Mau Mau were spared and instead detained for five years. Wametumi was the leader of a local African independent church and, because of the location, was central to Mau Mau activities in the area. As Elkins conducted her own interviews with former Mau Mau members, in her conversation with Wametumi she confirmed that she “directed the oathing, collected funds, and prepared ourselves for war.”⁵¹ Wametumi’s treatment demonstrates that gender was a critical factor in British colonial decisions for the severity of punishment. Though the British considered what Wametumi did punishable by death, as demonstrated by the execution of the 12 men convicted of similar crimes, since she was female, her punishment was less severe. Wametumi, among several thousand other Mau Mau women classified as hardcore and subjected to harsh treatment and exploitation by colonial power, ultimately survived because of her gender.

Women also demonstrated examples of direct military involvement, which contradicted traditional British gender roles. The presence of women in military camps differed from Britain, who for the most part in the twentieth century saw women's place in war as on the home front or in supporting roles. Though even in Kikuyu culture women had not traditionally had active roles in warfare, the Mau Mau Rebellion demonstrated that a substantial amount of women emerged in the military sphere. Records show that many military camps had women, as many as 450.⁵² While some women continued their traditional domestic roles of cooking, cleaning, and caring for the men, others transcended the demands of domesticity and wanted to have what the British understood as male roles. Kikuyu women instead joined their men in military training and participated in combat proving to be warriors, not just wives.⁵³ For example, Wamuyu Gakurur, who joined the Mau Mau movement in 1951, became a full-fledged female Mau Mau freedom fighter. Gakurur served in the "Nyandarua and Mount Kenya battalion under the command of General China"⁵⁴ indicating she physically devoted herself to the Mau Mau nationalistic movement, voluntarily placing herself in dangerous situations. More commonly, women's presence in the forests and military camps was outside combat.⁵⁵ One of the most significant roles women provided to the Mau Mau movement was linking fighters in the forest to the 'passive wing.' The passive wing was the support and contributions from people outside the forest to the militant wing.⁵⁶ The most crucial activities carried out by women within the passive wing were farming crops to secure a steady food supply and then delivering the supply to the camps.⁵⁷ In addition, females of the passive wing provided intelligence, weapons, clothing and other supplies forest fighters required.⁵⁸ Whether passive or active participants in the military effort of the freedom fighters, the importance of women's roles surprised the British, as they again challenged gendered stereotypes that characterized women as secondary support subjected to male commands. Mau Mau women in combat and domestic positions showed they were active members of the movement, able to express agency and direction for the cause.

In conclusion, the Mau Mau Rebellion was an event that marked the weakening control of the British Empire, as the colony of Kenya demonstrated its direct condemning of empire, fighting to become an independent nation. The case of the Mau Mau further illustrates strategies to preserve the essence of empire. The British government's motivations were clear, indicating it was crucial to maintain their colonial holdings in order to remain an imperialistic global power. By inflicting paternalistic ideologies, executed through the civilizing rehabilitation mission, the British attempted to continue their superior, governing role. Though the rebellion was multi-

faceted and can be analyzed for a plethora of historical narratives, focusing specifically on the roles of female Mau Mau members in the rebellion demonstrates clashing British and Kikuyu conceptions of gender. British conventions of traditional gender roles depicted women as passive and malleable, thus when the state of emergency was declared, British colonial officers did not consider that the Mau Mau women would play active roles in the rebellion. Mau Mau women demonstrated that they had significant political influence that contributed to the success of the rebellion, were pivotal in the execution of the oath-taking process and showed their aspirations to be politically active. Women also showed they were willing to fight in combat and support military camps, as well as proving themselves to be conscious and active in the nationalist movement. Studying the Mau Mau women emphasizes the importance of considering women's roles in history as they factor into broader ideologies of race, politics, and culture, while also showing the shift in western historical approaches that are validating oral histories.

NOTES

¹ HIST 3P01, Brock University, Lecture 12.

² Cora Ann Presley, "The Mau Mau Rebellion, Kikuyu Women, and Social Change," *Canadian Journal of African Studies / Revue Canadienne des Études Africaines* (1988): 177.

³ Robert B. Edgerton, *Mau Mau: an African crucible* (New York: Free Press, 1989), 5.

⁴ Report of the East Africa Commission Presented to the British Parliament, 12, http://www.waado.org/colonial_rule/east_africa/east_africa_commission_1925.pdf

⁵ Robert L. Tignor, *The Colonial Transformation of Kenya: the Kamba, Kikuyu, and Maasai from 1900-1939* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1976), 4.

⁶ Ibid., 4.

⁷ Ibid., 7.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Tignor, 5.

¹⁰ Ibid., 11.

¹¹ Caroline Elkins, *Imperial Reckoning: the untold story of Britain's gulag in Kenya* (New York: H. Holt, 2005), 25.

¹² Elkins, 25.

¹³ Ibid., 26.

¹⁴ Ibid., 27.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Amanda Elizabeth Lewis, "A Kenyan Revolution: Mau Mau, Land, Women, and Nation," (2007), *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 2134. <http://dc.etsu.edu/etd/2134>. 50.

¹⁷ Presley, 505.

¹⁸ Marina E. Santoru, "The Colonial Idea of Women and Direct Intervention: The Mau Mau Case," *African Affairs* 95, no. 379 (April 1996): 259.

¹⁹ Presley, 505.

²⁰ F.D. Corfield, *The Origins and Growth of Mau Mau: an historical survey* (Nairobi: Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, 1960), 90.

²¹ Santoru, 256.

²² Presley, 507.

²³ Elkins, 222.

²⁴ Presley, 510.

²⁵ Ibid.

-
- ²⁶ Katherine Bruce-Lockhart, "'Unsound' Minds and Broken Bodies: the Detention of 'Hardcore' Mau Mau Women at Kamiti and Gitamayu Detention Camps in Kenya, 1954–1960," *Journal Of Eastern African Studies* 8, no. 4 (November 2014): 592.
- ²⁷ Elkins, 220.
- ²⁸ Bruce-Lockhart, 594.
- ²⁹ Bruce-Lockhart, 594.
- ³⁰ Anna Davin. "Imperialism and Motherhood," *History Workshop* 5 (Spring 1978): 13.
- ³¹ Bruce-Lockhart, 594.
- ³² Elkins, 225.
- ³³ Ibid., 224.
- ³⁴ Ibid., 227.
- ³⁵ Ibid., 221.
- ³⁶ Elkins, 229.
- ³⁷ Ibid., 228-229.
- ³⁸ E.S. Atieno Odhiambo and John Lonsdale, *Mau Mau & Nationhood: Arms, Authority & Narration* (Oxford: James Currey; Nairobi : EAEP ; Athens : Ohio University Press, 2003), 227.
- ³⁹ Ibid., 234.
- ⁴⁰ Ibid., 246.
- ⁴¹ East African Department, 9.
- ⁴² *Advancement of African Women in Kenya. 1954-1955.* 9.
- ⁴³ Bruce-Lockhart, 597.
- ⁴⁴ Bruce-Lockhart, 596.
- ⁴⁵ Ibid., 597.
- ⁴⁶ Bruce-Lockhart, 597.
- ⁴⁷ Ibid.
- ⁴⁸ Bruce-Lockhart, 603.
- ⁴⁹ Ibid.
- ⁵⁰ Elkins, 219.
- ⁵¹ Elkins, 219.
- ⁵² Edgerton, 118.
- ⁵³ Ibid.
- ⁵⁴ Gachihi, 173.
- ⁵⁵ Wunyabari O. Maloba, *Mau Mau and Kenya: an analysis of a peasant revolt* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998), 177.
- ⁵⁶ Santoru, 256.
- ⁵⁷ Marshall S. Clough, *Mau Mau Memoirs: history, memory, and politics* (Boulder: L. Rienner, 1998), 147.
- ⁵⁸ Elkins, 38 and 219.