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Abstract
The paper analyses select literary works of Ngugi wa Thiong’o (1938—), a widely acclaimed postcolonial, Marxist writer and ideologue from Kenya, with a special emphasis upon the indigenous elements that figure in his works. It argues that Ngugi evokes Gikuyu songs, rituals, and customs to develop a critique of (neo)colonial power structures. In Ngugi’s novel *The Petals of Blood* (1977), the Mau Mau oathing rituals are evoked in order to resist the hegemony of the elite in post-independence Kenya—a dominance that was spawned by colonial capitalism. Likewise, in the play *I Will Marry When I Want* (1982), Ngugi stages Gikuyu nuptial songs and customs to counter colonisation that continued to prevail in Kenya when the erstwhile colonial government was nonexistent. The paper intends to show that Ngugi politicises indigenous elements in accordance with the demands of his literature of resistance, and in so doing, he enables his readers/audience to understand (neo)colonialism with nuance.

Introduction

Ngugi wa Thiong’o (1938—) is a contemporary postcolonial writer and Marxist ideologue whose works are globally acclaimed for their subversive approach. His ‘renunciation of the English’ (both in terms of his Christian name ‘James Ngugi’ and the primary language of his literary works) and defence of ‘Afrocentrism’, placing African languages and cultures at the centre of literary and cultural productions about Africa, have been lauded as a testimony to his commitment to the cause of the politically and economically marginalised people of Africa. Through his works, thus, Ngugi discursively engages with issues of ethnicity that involve nationhood, language and indigeneity. This paper looks at the ways in which Ngugi textually evokes certain indigenous elements—Gikuyu rituals, customs and songs—through an analysis of his works. The central focus of the paper is Ngugi’s inclination to transform the indigenous to serve the purpose of his resistive politics.

Conceptualising ‘Indigeneity’

In anthropology, the term ‘indigeneity’ denotes a strong connection between a people and locality separating the ‘autochthones’ from the ‘foreigners’, and has been semantically expanded to define an international category which concerns itself with communities ‘who have great moral claims on nation-states and on international society, often because of inhumane, unequal, and exclusionary treatment’ (Merlan 2009: 304).
However, it must also be considered that ‘indigenous people’ have no essential feature because indigeneity, like other identity categories, ‘is a contingent, interactive, and historical product’ (319). To comprehend a specific identity, first, one needs to locate it within the discursive paradigm—the specific institutional and/or historical sites governed by certain ‘modalities of power’—in which it has been produced; and second, one has to look at it in relation to the differences that emerge between itself and its ‘Other’ (Hall and Gay 1996: 4). Therefore, the ‘indigenous’ is best understood as an identity which is ‘at once historically contingent and encompassing of the nonindigenous’: it has been derived from the French indigene and the Latin indigena meaning ‘natives’ and first came into use in the late 16th century to differentiate between the European colonisers and the colonised people of Latin America (Cadena and Starn 2007: 4). In the 1970s, the United Nations (UN) emphatically expressed an apprehension of the forces of modernity (vis-à-vis the politics of globalisation) and upheld the manifold crises faced by indigenous communities in the Americas (Neizen 2003: 2; Kingsbury 1998: 421). Since then it has been particularly crucial in the struggles of the communities which were marginalised by the majoritarian populaces of European ancestry in the erstwhile settler colonies.

The term gained currency in the African context from the 1990s, when the global indigenous peoples’ movement incorporated few African movements thanks to the efforts of the leaders of certain marginalised communities in Africa (Hodgson 2009: 2; Ignoe 2006: 402). The definition of ‘indigenous people’ expanded to include the subjugation of few African communities when the UN Working Group showed its willingness to address the claim that those African communities tend to share common histories and struggles within their nation-states with the ‘first peoples’ from settler colonies in the Americas, Australia, New Zealand and elsewhere (Hodgson 2009: 2). However, this apparently inclusionist move spawned new struggles for ‘indigeneity’; struggles for financial aid from the international NGOs: in Africa, small portions of marginalised people came to be known as ‘indigenous’ in the UN-supported global fora, while the plight of others could not get such recognition, and this happened because of the varying degrees of accessibility of such communities to the global fora (Ignoe 2006: 403-404). Besides, this expansion of the definition of indigeneity elided a major difference between African nation-states and the settler colonies in the Americas, New Zealand, Australia and elsewhere. In most African nation-states, the elite minorities rule over the economically and politically marginal groups constituting majority citizenries; whereas in settler colonies, indigenous groups have not only been politically and economically marginalised but also constitute minority citizenries (404). On the other hand, when the leaders of few African communities such as Massai, Kung Sang, Batwa drew special attention of the UN and became a part of the international indigenous people’s movement, those communities faced hostility from most nation-states in Africa (Hodgson 2009: 3). The reason for this hostility can be linked with the claim of such states that all of their citizens were indigenous, and hence selective recognition of indigeneity would leverage political tribalism running counter to the unifying and modernising spirits of the nation-states (3). On the other hand, certain communities like Masaaai have strategically employed their autochthony to gain the necessary symbolic capital in the global platforms, and thus have been considerably successful in obtaining political leverage in Tanzania (Ignoe 2006: 410). It is, therefore, evident that inclusion of certain oppressed communities in the UN-recognised category called ‘indigenous peoples’ does not adequately address the issues of economic and political marginalisations of people in Africa. In some cases, it leads to ethnological antagonisms.
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as well. Nevertheless, one must acknowledge that indigeneity gains power in the identity politics that involves ethnicity, class as well as political positions in African nation-states. This particular potential of ‘indigeneity’ is explored by Ngugi wa Thiong’o in order to construct a subversive literary discourse that takes issue with (neo) colonial power structures in Kenya.

**Locating Subversive Indigeneity in Ngugi**

It can be argued that Ngugi wa Thiong’o, who belongs to a majority ethnic group in Kenya, namely Gikuyu or Kikuyu, has creatively responded to the politics of indigeneity. In one of his early novels, *Weep Not, Child* (1964), the protagonist Njoroge seeks for an ‘alternate’ (feminine) site of resistance to colonisation when he realises that the ‘main’ (masculine) paradigm of resistance has been destroyed by colonial government (Chakraborty 2016a: 87-88). The events in the narrative take place in that part of the colonial period which is marked by extreme violence. This violence was engendered by the indigenous peasant uprising (Mau Mau) and the ruthless policies implemented by the government. Armed resistance to colonial rule is embodied by Njoroge’s brother Boro, a member of the Kenya Land and Freedom Army, while his father Ngotho is a Gikuyu patriarch—a native squatter working under the British landowner Mr. Howlands—whose relation to the native land is an index of his identity and manhood (76, 84). The Kenya Land and Freedom Army, also known as ‘Mau Mau’, was a Gikuyu-majority group that revolted against the colonial government primarily on the issue of land rights for the natives (Branch 2007: 292; Green 1990: 72). From the end of the 19th century, the cornerstone of Gikuyu male-adulthood and patriarchy—be it *gethaka* (individual) or *mbari* (family or clan) systems of ownership—began to be predicated upon the man’s regular access to his ancestral land—be it as a tenant or as an owner (Branch 2007: 294-295; Kilson 1955: 106-108). The customary land tenures in Gikuyu-dominated areas were never rigidly defined; they were always modified time to time (Dewees 1993: 19-22).¹ The colonial administration, without adequate understanding of the indigenous land tenures, implemented policies that led to land disputes in Gikuyu areas. Concurrently, the British law barred the Gikuyus from private ownership of lands (Green 1990: 75-76). Evidently, on the one hand, the subaltern Gikuyus suffered because they lost their tenancy; on the other hand, the sub-elite Gikuyus suffered because they never achieved private ownership of lands. The widespread indigenous anticolonial resistance that emerged due to land disputes during the mid 20th century was not unified; but it was strongly inclined towards the issue of land. The sub-elite section of the indigenous population—spearheaded by Jomo Kenyatta (1891-1978), the most famous anticolonial, English-educated Gikuyu leader and the first prime minister of independent Kenya—were opposing British rule primarily because they wanted to construct a ‘Gikuyu’ nation, and hence they were committed to

¹ In pre-colonial times, land was used for hunting, cattle-breeding and cultivation by Gikuyus, and one’s access to land was not rigidly defined. Land tenure in areas dominated by Gikuyus was modified time to time depending upon the economic situations and customary practices. The origin of land holding can be traced back to acquisition of land on the basis of first use: the one who first started hunting or trapping animals at a particular place came to be accepted as the owner of the land that he had occupied (Dewees 1993). Later, it would be inherited by his sons. Portions of that land could be lent to friends for cultivation, sometimes, in exchange of gifts. This tenancy arrangement in turn could be passed from one generation to another. However, when population increased and land became scarce, often these oral tenancy contracts were arbitrarily cancelled.
‗constitutional nationalism‘ (Green 1990: 73, 83-84). For them the ownership of land was important; but they were advocates of Gikuyu private ownership (84). However, the subaltern Gikuyu were opposing the British government—many of them joined the Mau Mau—because they thought that land was to be accessed freely and collectively and the colonists were impeding their free and collective access to land (84). Eventually, it ushered in indigenous peasant revolt (Mau Mau) in the 1940s and the state of Emergency in 1952.

Though there was a faction within the resistance, ‗land‘ was important for all the Gikuyus. Thus in Ngugi‘s novel the loss of land becomes significant. Evicted from his ancestral land due to colonial intervention into customary (indigenous) land tenure, Ngotho faces existential as well as spiritual crisis: ‘And yet he felt the loss of the land even more keenly than Boro, for to him it was a spiritual loss. When a man was severed from the land of his ancestors where would he sacrifice to the Creator?‘ (Thiong‘o 1967: 84). This loss gradually leads to Njoroge‘s suicidal despair. Their plight is a critique of repressive measures taken by the colonial government to curb land disputes in the 1930s. Boro, Ngotho and Njoroge represent the indigenous resistance to colonial power structure, and through their characters and suffering, Ngugi exposes the colonial policies that were myopic, relentless and repressive.

However, it would not be amiss to argue that a critical awareness of the class-laden factionalism in the indigenous population is yet to gain prominence in the writings of Ngugi. This awareness takes the centre stage in one of his later works, the novel titled *Petals of Blood* (1976). If *Weep Not, Child* covers the violence of Emergency, *Petals of Blood* deals with neocolonialism (Chakraborty 2016b: 276-277). The novel offers Ngugi‘s Marxist interpretation of the ways in which the subaltern majority is exploited by an elite minority in post-colonial Kenya (Ogude 42; Chakraborty 2016b: 276-281). Extending the sub-elite claims over the resources of the hitherto colonised nation-state, the post-colonial leaders called for total ‗indigenisation‘ of ownership; that is to say, the elite African indigenous minority would own the land and factories in Kenya after independence. Thus political independence achieved in 1963 did not lead to amelioration of the marginalised majority but somewhat exacerbated their lives. *Petals of Blood* underscores this post-colonial condition through the characters of Chui, Kimeria and Mzigo, the revered leaders of the state who ruin a rural habitat named Ilmorog in the name of modernising it. As a major step towards this ‗modernisation‘, they industrialise the traditional Theng‘eta brewing—an indigenous practice in which an alcoholic beverage is produced and consumed ceremoniously. The tradition of Theng-eta brewing dates back to precolonial times. Banned by the colonial administration for its alleged connection to the indigenous initiation rites (for instance, the indigenous ceremony of circumcision that became a symbol of protest against colonialism), Theng-eta gained significance in post-colonial Ilmorog. On the one hand, it evokes memories of historical indigenous resistance to colonialism, and draws upon indigenous spiritual belief system. Evoking its connection with indigenous circumcision ceremonies, Theng-eta brewing rejuvenates the collective memories of the circumcision controversy of 1930s that discursively transformed the Gikuyu practice of circumcision into an organised revolt against the colonial church and the government in Kenya (Chakraborty 2018: 108-109; Nicholls 2010: 34-35).² Besides, it also has a strong spiritual overtone which draws upon

² In the 1930s, Kenyan socio-political milieu was fraught with circumcision controversy. Circumcision, especially clitoridectomy, was an index of babarism in colonial discourse. However, it was glorified by many anticolonial Gikuyu nationalists as a mark of ‘authentic’ Gikuyu identity. These leaders protested
indigenous religious practices. In Gikuyu spiritual discourses, the *Theng’eta* brew provides access to the divine powers of the ancestors (Mukundi 2010: 169). On the other hand, its production could have brought money directly to the rural population, and thus uplifted their livelihood. Significantly, it is revived by Wanja, one of the protagonists of the novel, and by her grandmother Nyakinyua, the most respected person in the village who knows all the indigenous ceremonies (Johnson 1988: 12; Thiong’o 1977: 204). This revival, thus, finds its relevance in both material and spiritual terms. Unfortunately, when the ownership of the brewery goes into the hands of the capitalists, the people of Ilmorog get relegated to the status of wage-labourers, or even worse. This capitalist hijacking of the indigenous practice is a microcosmic representation of the ways in which the indigenous moneyed class impoverishes the indigenous subaltern majority in post-independence period (Chakraborty 2016b: 281; Gikandi 2002: 137). In addition, this capitalist commandeering also signifies a spiritual loss for the common people of Ilmorog: the ancestral powers and the memories of indigenous resistance would no longer be accessible to them.

Likewise, as Ngugi shows in *Petals of Blood*, the Mau Mau oathing rituals, which strengthened the indigenous peasant protest against the colonial policies in the 1940s, become a means to consolidate the power of the indigenous elite after independence (Chakraborty 2018: 109; Thiong’o 1977: 151). The rituals, considered bestial and perverted in the colonial discourse, were performed by the new members of the Land and Freedom Army under the aegis of the seniors (Green 1990: 76-77). The primary aim of the rituals was to create unity among the Gikuyus. However, the origin of these rituals was not ‘purely’ Gikuyu: Gikuyu, Masaai as well as Christian religious traditions were selectively drawn upon by the Gikuyu elders to create the ‘Gikuyu’ oathing rituals (78). Nevertheless, these constructed Gikuyu rituals consolidated the ideology of a unified Gikuyu identity, an ideology which was needed for a strong indigenous anticolonial resistance (84). Ngugi’s *Petals of Blood* shows another transformation that happens to these rituals. One of the central characters of the novel, Munira, observes in despair that in mysterious ways ‘ordinary working people were being given an oath to protect’ the interests of the elites (Thiong’o 1977: 92, 151). He also notices that in high-class parties, both Swahili and English men and women are seen to enjoy ‘the juicy sections of songs normally sung at circumcision’ (150). Munira’s observation is significant because it exposes the neocolonial objectification of indigenous rites and protests: the apparently erotic dimension of circumcision songs is evoked out of context for cheap entertainment. The oathing rituals which had an aim to bolster anticolonial protests in the colonial period, thus dwindle into means to provide entertainment and perpetuate the dominance of the elite in the post-colonial period (Chakraborty 2018: 107). Thus the novel shows a way in which indigenous elements are robbed of their subversive potential and reduced to the tools of neocolonisation by the economically and politically powerful groups in Kenya.

However, Karega, another protagonist of the novel, proclaims, ‘we must not preserve our past as a museum: rather, we must study it critically, without illusions, and see what lessons we can draw from it in today’s battlefield of the future and the present’ (Thiong’o 1977: 323). This statement has a profound significance in the context of Ngugi’s representation of indigenous elements. Nyakinyua’s ‘opera of eros’, the

__________________________

against British administration and missionary practices through songs and dances which were closely associated with circumcision ceremonies in popular imagination (Nicholls 2010: 34).
indigenous song and dance performance accompanying Theng-eta brewing, fuses the past with the present:

They listened to Nyakinyua as she sang Gitiro. At first, it was good-humoured, light-hearted, as she commented on those present to a chorus of laughter.

But suddenly they were caught up by the slight tremor in her voice. She was singing their recent history. She sang of two years of failing rains; of the arrival of daughters and teachers; of the exodus to the city. She talked of how she had earlier imagined the city as containing only wealth. But she found poverty; she found crippled beggars; she found men, many men, sons of women, vomited out of a smoking tunnel—a big big house—and she was afraid. Who had swallowed all the wealth of the land? Who? (207-209).

The traditional performance (gitiro) thus turns into an oral commentary on the neocolonial present. It then upholds the significance of the youth who joined the Land and Freedom Army through initiation rites: ‘Yes, it was always the duty of youth to fight all the Marimus, all the two-mouthed Ogres, and that was the meaning of the blood shed at circumcision’ (209). This evocation of the indigenous cultural elements is a contrast to what Munira observes in urban social gatherings. Therefore, Nyakinyua’s performance can be considered as an enactment of Karega’s remarks on the critical engagement with the past. Her performance incorporates the past—both imaginary and real—and fuses it with the present. In so doing, it foregrounds the dynamism of indigenous elements. Instead of unthinking and/or derogatory repetition of the past, what one finds in her performance is a reworking of the indigenous elements to critique the present condition. In addition, through her song, Ngugi tries to fuse orature with literature in the way in which Mau Mau oathing rituals fused the Gikuyu and the non-Gikuyu. As the oathing rituals in the colonial period fused Gikuyu, Masai and Christian customs to unify Gikuyus against the colonial government, Ngugi blends the mythic Marimus and traditional gitiro with the form of the English novel in an aim to critique neocolonialism.

In his literary works in Gikuyu language, Ngugi amplifies this mode of critique. Indigenous lores, songs and dances get increasingly enmeshed with biblical narratives and contemporary urban stories in his post-1970s writings (Gikandi 2002: 211-213). His engagement with community theatre at Kamiriithu enables Ngugi to politicise indigenous aesthetics all the more. The production of the Gikuyu play Ngaahika Ndeenda (I Will Marry When I Want), first staged in 1977 at the Kamiriithu Community Educational and Cultural Centre, was a combined effort of Ngugi wa Thiong’o, Ngugi wa Mirii—a Kenyan-Zimbabwean playwright and social worker—and the peasants, workers and students of Kamiriithu. This theatrical pursuit particularly enabled Ngugi to rework indigenous elements in order to voice a collective dissatisfaction which emerged among the marginalised people of Kenya in post-independence period. For instance, the play constitutes traditional songs of indigenous marriage ceremonies which have a strong anticlonal Marxist overtone:

The AAGACIKU clan trill the four ululations for a girl. The AAMBUI trill the five ululations for a boy.

AAGACIKU:

Now you have seen

We have given away the hand of Njooki

To the Mbu clan
So famous in war and peace.
Let’s now go back to cultivate our fields
While seeking ways of getting back
Lands stolen from us by the whites.

AAMBUI:
Yes, we join our two hands
To see if we can defeat the enemy
Of this, our land,

Our beautiful land of Mount Kenya. (Thiong’o and Mirii 1982: 66)

This reminds the audience of Nyakinyua’s Gitiro in *Petals of Blood* as it imbues a Gikuyu wedding song with a critique of economic exploitation of indigenous people under colonial rule. Thus the play presents indigenous nuptial ceremonies as acts of subversion. The songs do not appear as apolitical embellishments. Nor do they remind one of a pristine past of peace and prosperity. Instead, they become inherently anticolonial, and conjure up an image of the past that is fraught with subaltern struggles against colonisation. The purpose of this overt politicisation of indigenous songs was to instigate the contemporary audience, primarily the villagers in Kamiriithu, to be conscious of the economic exploitation that they were undergoing after independence. As a result, theatrical practices at Kamiriithu were banned and many artists and activists involved with the community theatre, including Ngugi wa Thiong’o, were detained by the government of Kenya (Chakraborty 2018: 164). It can therefore be contended that Ngugi does not use indigenous songs for the sake of developing a contrast between the pre-colonial past and the post-colonial present. The discourse of indigeneity which Ngugi formulates through his works rather aims at establishing continuity between the past and the present. For the purpose of critiquing neocolonialism, an ideology that bolsters systematic economic exploitation of the subaltern majority by the elite minority in post-independence period, Ngugi reworks the indigenous in accordance with his Marxist politics.

**Conclusion**

It can be concluded from the above discussions on Ngugi wa Thiong’o’s works that indigenous elements do not appear in his works as mere aesthetic devices—overly apolitical rhetorical elements that blindly idealise the past. Instead, Ngugi politicises the indigenous to critique (neo)colonialism. The Marxist discourses that animate his works somewhat subsume the aesthetic dimension of indigenous elements. He incorporates Gikuyu songs and dances into his creative writings in order to transform them into critical tools that supplement his Marxist, postcolonial politics. Thus the indigenous rituals, songs and dances do not become relics of a pristine past, remnants of a lost world to be preserved. Nor does indigeneity appear as an essentialised identity category that is predicated upon an international divisive politics which has been set in motion by the UN-recognised global fora. The indigenous elements in Ngugi’s works are endowed with a subversive potential that enables his readers/audience to re-evaluate the present anomalies with nuance.
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