

British Repression and Extermination Crimes against the Mau Mau Movement in Kenya, 1952–1960

Dr. Youcef Slimani

University of Djilali Bounaama-Khemis Miliana, (Algeria)
y.slimani@univ-dbk.m.dz (<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-4899-2488>)

Dr. Brahim Betka

University of Djilali Bounaama-Khemis Miliana, (Algeria)
b.betka@univ-dbk.m.dz (<https://orcid.org/0009-0002-8953-6938>)

Dr. Aissa Hameri

University of Djilali Bounaama-Khemis Miliana, (Algeria)
a.hamri@univ-dbk.m.dz (<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-6788-1520>)

Dr. Mahfoudh Saidani

University of Djilali Bounaama-Khemis Miliana, (Algeria)
m.saidani@univ-dbk.m.dz (<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-2344-9879>)

Dr. Abdelkarim Hamattit

University of Djilali Bounaama-Khemis Miliana, (Algeria)
a.hamattit@univ-dbk.m.dz

Received: 11/01/2026 ; Accepted : 12/05/2026 ; Published : 29/09/2026

Abstract:

This study examines the history of British repression and extermination policies against the Mau Mau rebels in Kenya, with the aim of highlighting the scale of the crimes committed by Britain against the local population, whether individuals were directly or indirectly affiliated with the movement. The British colonial authorities employed some of the most brutal methods of repression against these populations, including killing, torture, mass arrest, and deportation, targeting hundreds of thousands of members of the Kikuyu tribe as well as other ethnic groups. They also suppressed every political activity associated with the movement. These measures were a response to the local populations demands for their rights and their resistance to colonial policies that dispossessed them of their lands and expelled them from their territories, subsequently granting these lands to white settlers for exploitation and control. Consequently, colonial repression became increasingly brutal, resulting in the killing of tens of thousands of people, the arrest of hundreds of thousands, and the starvation and interrogation of entire communities. Nor did the repression stop there; the British authorities also pursued a counter-propaganda policy aimed at distorting the image and reputation of the movements rebels throughout the world.

Keywords: Mau Mau; repression; extermination; detention; killing; Britain; Kenya.

Introduction:

The colonial policies implemented by European colonial powers in Africa during the colonial period, particularly those involving the expropriation of land and its allocation to European settlers, together with discriminatory and racist practices against Africans, led the majority of the continent's peoples to confront colonial powers and their policies from the earliest years of European presence in Africa.

The Kenyan people were among those subjected to the oppressive nature of British colonial rule. The policy of dispossessing indigenous populations of their land, allocating it to European minorities in the country, and forcing its original owners into the mountains provoked a strong reaction among the Kikuyu people in 1952. This reaction took the form of an uprising known as the Mau Mau Rebellion, which sought to defend their rights and lands.

The British colonial authorities, however, responded with extreme violence. Their response remains a stain on the history of British colonial rule because of the crimes committed, including killings, arrests, interrogations, and the expulsion of anyone connected to the Mau Mau movement.

Accordingly, this study raises the following central research question:

How did the British colonial authorities respond to the Mau Mau rebels, and what was the extent of the crimes committed against them?

A Brief Historical Overview of the Mau Mau Rebellion

The Mau Mau Rebellion was an armed revolutionary movement that sought to put an end to British colonial rule in Kenya, which had intensified its colonial practices and contributed to the deterioration of the social and economic conditions in the region. This situation resulted from policies of racial discrimination, the exclusion of Africans from the administration, and restrictions imposed on their social lives. All of these measures were regarded as means of consolidating white control over the economies of the colonies. Since agriculture constituted the fundamental component of the economic system, the question of land acquired paramount importance for both the European settlers and the indigenous population¹.

Therefore, when the colonial settlers arrived in Kenya at the beginning of the twentieth century, they began to appropriate land from the indigenous population or from the East Africa Company and transfer it to European settlers through ordinances whose foundations were laid by Sir Charles Eliot beginning in 1900² Five or six years after the establishment of colonial rule, large numbers of European settlers began arriving in the country. At this point, Africans were confronted with a disturbing reality: vast areas of their land were being handed over to newcomers by a government whose role had become largely confined to protecting the settlers and allocating land to them.

In this manner, extensive areas of land belonging to the Kikuyu, Kamba, Nandi, and Wanyika tribes along the coast were progressively appropriated and transferred to European settlers. Although the colonial government claimed in some instances that it had obtained the consent of the local inhabitants, the reality was quite different. In practice, it issued a series of ordinances that enabled it to appropriate increasingly large areas of land and subsequently allocate them to European settlers³.

Accordingly, the question of land was one of the most significant factors underlying the revolutionary situation that emerged among the Kenyan people. This situation was not the result of events that developed overnight; rather, it was the outcome of economic policies that had been pursued in Kenya for half a century. There is little doubt that placing these vast stretches of some of the country's richest, most fertile, and most productive land in the hands of a relatively small number of European settlers meant, in effect, that economic power was concentrated in the hands of the white population⁴.

Based on the foregoing, it can be argued that the Mau Mau Rebellion was a popular uprising in which psychological factors played a prominent role, as reflected in the extensive popular mobilization carried out by its leaders and organizers. This was further compounded by political, economic, and social factors, most notably the dispossession of the indigenous population from their lands and the implementation of racial discrimination across various aspects of life in Kenya⁵. Alternatively, the rebellion may be viewed as a struggle directed against a relatively small group of European settlers, while simultaneously coinciding with another prolonged conflict against irregular fighters in the Malaya region⁶.

Returning to the meaning of the term "Mau Mau," its origins have remained obscure and uncertain, and numerous attempts have been made to explain its meaning and etymology. One interpretation attributes the term to a geographical location in Kenya, namely the Mau Forest, which is situated near the lands of one of the earliest European settlers in the region, Lord Delamere⁷. A second explanation suggests that "Mau Mau" is a corruption of the expression "Uma Uma," meaning "come up" or "rise up," and was therefore understood as an expression of the well-known nationalist slogan "freedom, freedom" or "withdrawal, withdrawal⁸." A third view holds that the term derives from the Swahili word "Muma," meaning "oath." Another interpretation attributes the term to a Kikuyu princess who was reportedly the daughter of a man named "Mūrumbi," regarded in Kikuyu tradition as the legendary ancestor of the tribe⁹.

It is possible that the term was coined by the insurgents themselves, who roared like lions in the mountains during their attacks on targets in the area, with the aim of instilling fear in their enemies. Most accounts maintain that the term has no basis in the local languages and that it was the Europeans who applied it to the Kenyan insurgents¹⁰.

British Responses to the Mau Mau Revolt

On 20 October 1952, the British authorities in Kenya declared a state of emergency¹¹. The following day, Governor-General Evelyn Baring delivered a speech before the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council, stating: "Certain stringent measures will be taken against the leaders who are leading the Mau Mau movement." Following this declaration, the British colonial authorities launched a deadly campaign aimed at eliminating any Kenyan who dared to threaten the British colonial presence. The British colonial press played a significant role in influencing the British government in Nairobi to adopt ruthless military plans to suppress the Mau Mau Revolt. The headlines of these newspapers expressed

deep concern over the emergence of a movement known as Mau Mau¹², a movement whose objective was to drive the white man from the Kenyan Highlands¹³.

Given the government's policy towards Kenya, it was practically impossible to accept the political character of the revolt, and a positive response to the demands for the restoration of land and the transfer of power to the African majority was unlikely, as long as the British regarded the European community as the driving force behind the colony. London had no intention of granting the Mau Mau insurgents any recognition or legitimacy for their movement. It denied the political dimension of the movement, portraying its members as nothing more than backward, anti-modern terrorists, and regarded their oath-taking as evidence of the organisation's brutal character¹⁴.

Following the declaration of the state of emergency in the country, the first measure taken by the colonial authorities in Kenya was to reinforce their military forces. They recalled experienced veterans who had served in Korea, Malaya, and other regions, in addition to soldiers who had completed six years of active service during the Second World War. All these measures were intended to destroy the Mau Mau's strength once and for all.

The first British military force to confront the Mau Mau movement was the 1st Battalion, Lancashire Fusiliers, followed by the Black Watch and the Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers. Throughout the British conflict against the Mau Mau forces, the total number of British battalions deployed reached 55,000, although the number did not exceed 10,000 battalions at any one time¹⁵.

The colonial authorities resorted to violent methods, reinforcing their forces with additional personnel, military equipment, and aircraft, and proceeded to attack the nationalists by every means at their disposal. For the first time, British aircraft dropped bombs on the Mau Mau. Three Harvard aircraft that had recently arrived in Rhodesia dropped eight 20-pound bombs on an area inhabited by approximately 10,000 people. The attack was not confined to aerial operations, however, as a general offensive had also been planned, with the aircraft providing support to large ground forces in their assault on the area situated between the Aberdare Mountains¹⁶.

The colonial authorities began carrying out a series of mass arrests of members of the Kenya African Union (KAU), who were accused of being members of the Mau Mau organisation. Jomo Kenyatta¹⁷, a leader of the national liberation movement, was arrested on 21 October 1952 on charges of leading the Mau Mau organisation. He was brought to trial in November, and the proceedings lasted for more than five months. On 8 April 1953, he was sentenced to seven years' imprisonment. Other leaders of the Kenya African Union were likewise sentenced to lengthy terms of imprisonment and hard labour, and were exiled to remote areas of the country. In June 1953, the authorities declared the Kenya African Union an illegal organisation¹⁸.

Alongside the campaign of political arrests targeting members of the Kenya African Union (KAU), the British colonial authorities in Kenya also mobilised substantial financial and human resources to confront the Mau Mau Revolt. In June 1953, the colonial authorities deployed 5,000 African personnel serving in the British armed forces, 7,500 British troops, 20,000 Kikuyu who became known as the Kikuyu Guard, and 21,000 armed police officers. These forces were equipped with both heavy and

light weapons to confront approximately 12,000 Mau Mau fighters, who had established hideouts and bases in the forests from which they planned operations against the colonial forces and devised the military strategies necessary to achieve victory¹⁹.

A wave of terror and repression was then unleashed against the Kikuyu, the largest population group in the country. Under the pretext of eliminating and crushing the Mau Mau, tens of thousands of members of the national liberation movement were imprisoned in jails and internment camps²⁰. The repression was not confined to political leaders or members of the Kenya African Union; it extended to the arrest of anyone suspected of having collaborated with the Mau Mau fighters, beginning with women from the Lang'ata area and including every individual suspected of having links with the insurgents²¹.

Armed police units carried out raids on African villages, arresting innocent civilians and confiscating their possessions, livestock, and other forms of wealth. In response, African inhabitants, fleeing this brutal persecution, sought refuge in the forests, where they gathered together and formed guerrilla units that came to be known as the Mau Mau. Thus, the Mau Mau was no longer merely a fictional or mythical organisation; rather, it became a genuine armed force that launched attacks against British rule.

Some writers and researchers maintain that the Mau Mau Revolt was essentially a spontaneous movement of peasants and agricultural labourers whose lands had been forcibly seized and who had been compelled to live lives of displacement and hunger. According to this view, the movement sought to expel the colonizers from the country and reclaim the land that had traditionally belonged to tribal communities.

Kenneth Ingham argues that the Mau Mau was a resistance movement formed by the Kikuyu against foreign powers that had begun treating Africans as inferior beings, depriving them of their lands and reducing them to agricultural laborers on other men's farms. Although Ingham considers the origins of the movement to be obscure, he traces its revival in its modern form to 1947, when a group of members of the Kikuyu Central Association began operating secretly and established the Mau Mau movement. Its members swore oaths of obedience and secrecy and pledged to work towards expelling Europeans from Kenya.

The Kenya African Union (KAU) was the legitimate, mass, and public political organization, within which a secret organization was formed to prepare for a national revolution, not merely among the Kikuyu but throughout Kenya as a whole.

Before the Mau Mau movement turned to violence, its members took a special oath, declaring: "May this oath kill me if I disclose the secrets of this organization, and may this oath kill me if I dispose of or sell any piece of Kikuyu land to a foreigner" Nevertheless, from a purely military perspective, the Mau Mau uprising was poorly organised and lacked the necessary weapons and military commanders. By contrast, the British Army stationed in Kenya was fully equipped. Despite the imbalance between the two forces, Kenyan guerrilla fighters continued to struggle with exceptional courage for four years in pursuit of their country's freedom and independence.

In 1953, British forces launched a series of military operations aimed at crushing the Mau Mau forces operating in the highland regions. These campaigns nevertheless failed, as the Mau Mau received extensive support from the local population, and information about British military movements reached them in advance. This enabled them not only to preserve their fighting strength but also to launch successful counterattacks.

The Mau Mau fighters soon acquired experience in waging war against an enemy superior in weaponry. The scattered groups became increasingly united, and their numbers grew substantially between 1953 and 1954. The “Land Freedom Armies”, as they called themselves, came to consist of three formations: one led by Dedan Kimathi, operating in the Aberdare Mountains; a second in the Mount Kenya region; and a third in Nairobi.

In 1954, the British Government dispatched additional troops and aircraft from Britain and Rhodesia. It also encircled and bombed the forest areas that served as cover for the guerrilla fighters²². On 24 April 1954, the police arrested 16,500 members of the Kikuyu community in Nairobi, some of whom were taken to detention centres for interrogation²³. Supported by colonial settlers, the British security forces employed various forms of torture and killing²⁴. The white settlers expected hunger to force the rebels to surrender. Nevertheless, the guerrilla fighters continued to fight courageously against the better-armed British forces until 1956²⁵.

In an attempt to completely eliminate the Mau Mau fighters, the British colonial forces established an anti-Mau Mau military organisation in 1955 known as the Home Guard. Its principal objectives were to isolate the population from the insurgents and to facilitate the large-scale detention of fighters and suspected supporters believed to have joined the Mau Mau movement²⁶.

Alongside the implementation of the policy of repression against the Mau Mau fighters, and in the face of attacks by the British press against British colonial officials, whom it described as incompetent and inhumane, as well as growing condemnation of this policy in Kenya by international public opinion, the British colonial authorities attempted to give the appearance of adopting a policy of reform. In 1954, the British Secretary of State for the Colonies, Oliver Lyttelton, introduced a new constitutional framework that provided for the establishment of an Executive Council consisting of 15 members and chaired by the Governor-General. For the first time, an African representative was appointed to the Council alongside European and Indian representatives.

This was regarded as a victory for the Mau Mau, as Britain had been compelled to retreat from its hard-line policy towards the African population, which had previously had no representation in this body²⁷.

As a result, the colonial settlers began to oppose these measures and the moderate political reforms towards the African population adopted by the authorities in London. They intensified their pressure on the Governor-General to suppress the Mau Mau Revolt, particularly as the settlers’ profits declined, especially in the tourism sector²⁸.

British statistics indicate that 11,500 Africans were killed during the liberation struggle between 1952 and 1956. In reality, however, the death toll was considerably higher, with at least 20,000 people

reportedly killed during the struggle. Furthermore, approximately 80,000 Africans were confined in detention camps during the period in which the state of emergency was in force²⁹. This figure remains disputed: historian Caroline Elkins has written that at least 160,000 Africans spent time in detention camps³⁰.

These detainees were subjected to a brutal regime of hard labor. The shameful facts surrounding the deaths of eleven detainees at the Hola Camp (Coast Province) were revealed to the world, and the subsequent investigation shed light on the prevailing cruelty and brutality within the camp; it emerged that detainees were beaten with clubs—either to force them to work or as punishment for refusing to do so—a practice that constituted the established rule in Kenya’s detention camps. Consequently, the beatings at the Hola Camp resulted in the deaths of eleven detainees from their injuries, while 77 others sustained permanent injuries on March 3, 1959³¹.

Among the methods adopted by the British Government in dealing with detainees was that, immediately after insurgents or suspects were arrested, the first step in initiating the process of indoctrination or interrogation was to determine whether they had taken the oath referred to earlier: “May this oath kill me if I disclose the secrets of this organization, and may this oath kill me if I dispose of or sell any piece of Kikuyu land to a foreigner” Official policy required detainees to be transferred first to more restrictive camps, and then, once they had cooperated, to less restrictive camps, before ultimately being transferred to camps closer to their homes, where they could receive regular visits from family members and friends. This process became known as the “Pipeline.”³²

The interrogation process, also known as “screening,” was conducted mainly by African loyalists or former detainees who had defected and joined the European side. Following screening, suspects were classified and marked according to their perceived level of militancy. Those classified as “white” were returned to African reserves or to the emergency villages, as they were known. The “grey” and “black” detainees remained in reception centers, after which those classified as “grey” were transferred to labor camps, while those classified as “black” were sent to special detention camps reserved for hard-core detainees and political prisoners³³.

Women were subjected to particularly severe abuse, notably at Hola Detention Camp. This is attested to by eyewitnesses who lived through those tragic events, as well as by British historians such as James C. L. R. James, who noted that torture resulting in death was common during this period. Police officers and their Kenyan auxiliaries were reportedly paid five pounds for killing a Mau Mau fighter. Such perpetrators sometimes mutilated the bodies of their victims as proof that they had carried out the assigned task, while the Kenyan press remained largely silent³⁴.

Among the brutal methods employed by the colonial authorities in Kenya during the Mau Mau Revolt were severe forms of punishment against those who refused to acknowledge having taken the oath or admitted to supporting the Mau Mau movement. At the Kwa Nyangw’ethu centre, one man was subjected to severe physical abuse. Researcher Caroline Elkins highlights the abuses inflicted upon Mau Mau suspects by the colonial police and loyalists to the British Crown, noting that electric shocks were

widely used, alongside other forms of physical torture and coercion. Detainees were also subjected to various forms of sexual and physical abuse in an attempt to force them to confess³⁵.

Other methods included shooting, burning, and physical mutilation. There were also cases in which colonial agents subjected detainees to sexual violence and forced them to humiliate one another. Other interrogation techniques involved forcing detainees to repeatedly utter degrading statements about the Mau Mau movement, such as “Mau Mau is bad” and “Jomo Kenyatta is a dog.”³⁶

The testimony of Michael Gerard Sullivan, the colonial officer in charge of Hola Detention Camp, before the commission of inquiry into the deaths of detainees revealed the existence of strict instructions issued by Compell, the Deputy Commissioner of Prisons, to torture Mau Mau detainees and deprive them of drinking water for prolonged periods. They were also forced to remove weeds from the rice fields with their bare hands, while truncheons were used against those who refused to cooperate³⁷.

Among the testimonies of those who were subjected to torture was that of Josiah Mwangi Kariuki, popularly known as J. M. Kariuki. In his book *Mau Mau Detainee*, he states that he was held in fourteen detention camps between 1953 and 1960. He described his experience at Kwa Nyangw’ethu Detention Camp as the worst, noting that the camp was notorious not only for beatings but also for other forms of severe abuse. He recounts: “I saw with my own eyes that Kungu Chuma, whom I had first met in Nakuru before his arrest and who now lives in Kianga in Embu County, had been subjected to severe abuse. He had not been in such a condition when he was in Nakuru. However, when we met at the detention camp at Athi River, he told me what had been done to him by those conducting the screening at Kwa Nyangw’ethu. He also told me that soft-drink bottles were opened and used against some of the women to force them to confess.”³⁸

The colonial authorities did not confine their actions to the abuses committed against the Kenyan people, who were demanding their right to a dignified life and the restoration of their sovereignty. They also intensified their suppression of anything associated with the Kenyan national movement. Among the arbitrary measures adopted by the colonial authorities in Nairobi against the African population were restrictions on political activity, particularly in the province that had been the centre of the revolt. Accordingly, the British Government in Nairobi prohibited the Kikuyu, Embu, and Meru communities from engaging in any political activity. This was followed by the prohibition of political activity in the remaining regions. In March 1959, the colonial authorities also banned the publication of the newspaper *Uhuru*, a Swahili word meaning “freedom,” which was edited by Tom Mboya³⁹.

It is worth noting that these statistics did not include the losses resulting from the use of aircraft by the British colonial authorities in their efforts to suppress the revolt. Some sources indicate that approximately 30,000 insurgents were killed and 150 huts were destroyed. Among the most devastating consequences of these military operations, conducted in the context of this brutal war, was the displacement of thousands of children onto the streets, all as a result of the arbitrary and brutal practices perpetrated against the Kenyan population⁴⁰.

In an attempt to sever the links between the population and the Mau Mau fighters, the colonial authorities adopted a policy of separating communities from one another through a policy they termed

“villagisation”, particularly in the Malaya area. This programme was designed to disrupt the Mau Mau fighters’ supply network by severing the links between fighters hiding in the forests and their supporters in the reserves. Under this policy, between June 1954 and October 1955, more than one million members of the Kikuyu community were forcibly resettled in 854 villages⁴¹.

Conclusion:

The brutal response of British colonialism to the Mau Mau fighters in Kenya constituted one of the most egregious forms of colonial practice and one of the gravest crimes committed against oppressed peoples who had risen to demand their right to the lands that had been taken from them and to assert their right to freedom in their own country. The colonizers responded by resorting to killing, arrest, abuse, displacement, and interrogation. Neither men nor women were spared, regardless of age.

These practices wholly contradicted the colonial claims that Britain had come to civilize African peoples and lead them from backwardness towards progress and development. Yet, when its own interests and those of its population were at stake, the colonizer itself became the embodiment of backwardness; indeed, it became an oppressor devoid of humanity, compassion, justice, and equality. Through these colonial practices, Britain created a deeply negative image of itself, one that remains a stain on its colonial history in the African continent.

Footnotes

¹ Dylan Biggs, ‘It’s a Battle for Information’: Mau Mau as the Boogeyman of Decolonization,” *Perceptions*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (2019), p. 10.

² Rashid Al-Barawi, *Mau Mau: The Revolution of the Free People in Kenya*, 2nd ed. (Cairo: Egyptian Renaissance Library, 1953), p. 22.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

⁵ William B. Pittman, Maj, *The Mau Mau War: British Counterinsurgency in Colonial Kenya* (Fort Leavenworth, KS: School of Advanced Military Studies, United States Army Command and General Staff College, 2016), p1.

⁶ Hilda Nissimi, “Mau Mau and the Decolonisation of Kenya,” *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies* 8, no. 3 (Spring 2006), p3.

⁷ Günter John, *Inside Africa*, translated by Jalal al-Din al-‘Arusi, Vol. 2, Anglo-Egyptian Bookshop, Cairo, n.d., p. 298.

⁸ Rashid Al-Barawi, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

⁹ Günter John: *op. cit.*, p. 298.

¹⁰ Ben Faraj, Saddam, “The Mau Mau Revolt against British Colonial Presence in Kenya, 1952–1956,” *Al-Mawaqif: Journal of Research and Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 17, Special Issue, January 2022, pp. 995–996.

¹¹ Rajab Haraz, *Britain and East Africa: From Colonialism to Independence*, Institute of African Research and Studies, 1971, p. 203.

¹² Maj William B. Pittman: op. cit, p 12.

¹³ Bekail, Moncef, *The National Movement and the Restoration of Sovereignty in East Africa*, Dar Al-Sabil for Publishing and Distribution, 2009, p. 119.

¹⁴ Hilda Nissimi, op. cit., p. 5.

¹⁵ Madani, Amira, *The Mau Mau Rebellion and Its Influence on Kenya's Departure from Colonial Rule (1952–1960)*, Master's Dissertation in Anglo-Saxon Literature and Civilisation, University of Abdelhamid Ibn Badis, Mostaganem, 2017, pp. 34–35.

¹⁶ Rashed al-Barawi, op. cit., pp. 95–96.

¹⁷ He was one of the Kenyans who were not satisfied with the superficial education provided by the white settlers in the country. He therefore travelled to England and enrolled at the University of Oxford, where he obtained an advanced degree in anthropology. His book, *Facing Mount Kenya*, is a study of tribal life in that country. Moreover, he married an Englishwoman who did not believe that colour or race should constitute grounds for discrimination among people, and they had two sons. There is little doubt that, during his studies and residence in England, the man became imbued with the principles of freedom and democracy practised by the colonial powers in their own country. This enabled him to recognise the extent of the deterioration to which his country had been subjected and led him to decide to take positive action. See: *Ibid.*, p. 91.

¹⁸ Yannick Veilleux-Lepage and Jan Fedorowicz, "The Mau Mau Revolt in Kenya, 1952–1956: A History of Counterinsurgency," Chapter 7, Vol. 2, Bloomsbury Publishing, 2015, p. 184.

¹⁹ Bekail Moncef, op. cit, p. 120.

²⁰ Haraz Rajab: op. cit, pp. 203–204.

²¹ Gitonga, Kimani, "British Suppression of the Mau Mau Uprising in Kenya and Its Aftermath: A Critical Look at What Transpired in Detention Camps," *Msingi Journal*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 2024, Department of Educational Foundations, Kenya, p. 4.

²² Haraz Rajab: op. cit, p. 206.

²³ The following were among the most important detention centres in Kenya during the period of British colonial rule: Lodwar, Kowop, Nyeri, Othaya, Mwea, Kandungu, Lang'ata, Athi River, South Yatta, Hola, Manyani, Mackinnon Road, Mageta Island, and Saiyusi Island. See: Gitonga, Kimani, op. cit, p. 3.

²⁴ Maj William B. Pittman: op. cit, 23.

²⁵ Hélène Charton, "Acteurs, victimes et témoins de la violence dans l'histoire : l'exemple Mau Mau (Kenya)," *Cahiers d'Études Africaines*, No. 201, Varia, 2011, p. 6.

²⁶ Maj William B. Pittman: op. cit, 23.

²⁷ Bekail Moncef, op. cit, pp. 122–123.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p 124.

²⁹ Yannick Veilleux-Lepage and Jan Fedorowicz : op. cit, p. 185.

³⁰ Maj William B. Pittman: op. cit, p 34.

³¹ Haraz Rajab: op. cit, p207.

³² Madani, Amira: op. cit, p. 31.

³³ Yannick Veilleux-Lepage and Jan Fedorowicz : op. cit, p 186.

³⁴ Bekail Moncef, op. cit, pp. 128–129.

³⁵ Amon Rimamtanung Stephen, Hussaina Sani, Isa Jauro, and Augustine Raymond Lkama, “Mau Mau Experience in British Colonial and Post-Colonial Kenya,” *International Journal of Academic Management Science Research*, Vol. 9, Issue 4, April 2025, p. 571.

³⁶ Gitonga Kimani, op. cit, p. 4.

³⁷ Amon Rimamtanung Stephen et al: op. cit, p. 571

³⁸ Ibid., p. 572.

³⁹ Bekail Moncef, op. cit, pp. 128–129.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 127.

⁴¹ Yannick Veilleux-Lepage and Jan Fedorowicz : op. cit, p 186.