

Groundnut Production in the Colonial Economy and Society of Kilba District of Adamawa Province in Northern Nigeria, 1904–1960

Samuel Wycliff

Department of History, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria-Nigeria.

Corresponding author: samwycliff@gmail.com

Abstract

Groundnut was one of the major export crops produced in colonial Northern Nigerian Districts, Divisions and Provinces. In view of that, this paper through historical method of data collection, and employment of primary and secondary source materials, examines groundnut production in the colonial economy and society of Kilba District of Adamawa Province from 1904 when Kilba District was occupied and then to 1960 which marked the independence of Nigeria and era of neo-colonialism. However, the paper argues that, in the pre-colonial Kilba society groundnut was initially cultivated by women, but with the advent of British colonialism, it was cultivated by both men and women due to its great economic benefit. This led to wealth creation, development of entrepreneurship and the emergence of myriad classes of intermediary agents, brokers, middlemen and clients, source of revenue to pay colonial taxes, school fees and obtain loans through a credit system to boost groundnut production. During the Second World War (1939–1945) coupled with satisfactory prices in the markets and there was availability of seed with no restriction to planting, technical advice, provision of farm implements, fertilizer, chemicals for storage, dressing seed and buying stations. In fact, groundnut production became one of the cultural identities of Kilba people during and beyond the colonial period. In conclusion, the paper notes that, locust invasion (1933/1934), malpractices of colonial firms and middlemen, exorbitant loan and credit system, lack of good roads and means of transport, forced Kilba people into extensive use of donkeys and head portage. This had indeed discouraged large scale production in Kilba District as compared to other Northern Provinces, especially Kano and Katsina.

Keywords: Groundnut, Export, Market, Middlemen, Kilba District.

Introduction

With the declaration of Northern Nigeria as its protectorate on January 1, 1900, by the British colonial administration which marked the fall of various Empires, Kingdoms, Chiefdom, Emirates and bringing about the domination of the economic and political activities of the hitherto sovereign states in the area (Lugard, 1922:233.). This development extensively set the conducive atmosphere for the establishment of colonial economic policies and practices in Northern Nigerian Districts, Divisions and Provinces. In fact, the British colonial government intensively pursued its objectives of colonial occupation through carefully designed policies determined to achieve their colonial goals of domination, exploitation and excessive transfer of surplus capital in the form of cash crops or raw materials to promote their economic advancement (Catherine, 1993:12-15; Henring, 2003:1-4 & Mike, 2009:1-10). Hence, all the colonial agricultural policies were aimed at achieving this economic goal. To achieve this goal, they transformed the existing agriculture into an export oriented one in which only the desired export crops were produced as raw materials in response to the industrial

revolution of Europe. Sequel to this, the territories were therefore required to become markets mainly for the consumption of European products and will consequently be dependent on the British economy (Alkasum, 2003:1-46 & Moses, 2008:95-127).

Besides, one of the colonial economic policies for British administration in Nigeria was the introduction of agricultural policies (Isah, 2014:1-5 & Tom, 1981:34-35). Their aim was primarily to encourage the indigenous people to produce the needed export crops (i.e. cotton and groundnuts) for the metropolis (Isah, 2014:1-5). The policies were based on exploitation and reproduction of the peasantry by promoting a peasant-based production of export crops. This ranged from the volume of production and prices, the establishment of market board and introduction of agricultural education alongside insecticide, pesticide, herbicide and chemical fertilizers. Under this system of economic exploitation, traditional land tenure was maintained, alongside with the introduction of new crops at all times. In fact, it's against this backdrop that, this paper examines groundnut production in the colonial economy and society of Kilba District of Adamawa Province in Northern Nigeria, from 1904–1960 which happens to be one of the colonial districts with fertile land for cultivation of the export crop in question.

Statement of the Problem

Since the inception of British colonial from 1900 to 1960, the history of Northern Nigeria has never remained the same. This was because the imperialists introduces different kind of policies and practices and equally implement them through their instrument of coercion such as West African Frontier Force (WAFF), Native Authority (NA), Native Courts, Native Police, Native Remuneration, imperialists firms and companies which gave birth to colonial policies and practices on land, forced labour, currency, taxation as well as agriculture which enforced production of export crops (cash crops), especially groundnut and cotton at the expenses of food crops which in turn led to food insecurity, high dependency on foreign commodities instead of the locally made commodities. It is against this backdrop that this paper examined groundnut production in Kilba District in order to ascertain its experiences in the period under review which was 1904 to 1960.

Literature Review

Every hamlet, village, town, states, region and or country has a route, watershed and or a major land. More so, every empire, kingdom, emirate and or chiefdom rise and fall for different reasons which could be internal or external, yet their history is always documented by researchers of different disciplines such as history, archaeology, political science, sociology, anthropology and lots more, but they are always limited by time and space, scope and delimitation, and or periodization. This always left a gap that other researchers need to fill. For example, the works of "Socio-Economic and Political History of the Kilba People in the Pre-Colonial Period" by A. Wajiga; "A Study of the Emergence, Growth and Fall of the Huba Kingdom from C.1500AD to 1906AD" by B.Y. Gudumbul; *The Kilba and their literature* by J.P. Hananiya; "The Establishment of a Government-General among the Kilba" by G.M. Chaskda; *Aspects of the Economic History of Kilbaland, 1820 to 1934* by J.H. Pongri; "Economic and Traditional Uses of Highlands among the Kilba Tribe of Hong Local Government Area, Adamawa State in Nigeria" by E.N. Gandapa; *Political Developments in Adamawa, 1900–1960* by J.H. Pongri; *Adamawa Past and Present: An Historical Approach of the Development of a Northern Cameroun Province* by A.H.M. Kirk-Greene; *An African Church is Born. The Story of Adamawa and Central Sardauna Province in Nigeria* by N. Margaret; *Chronicles of A Golden Era – A Biography of Aliyu Musdafa the 11th Lamido Adamawa* by Y.A. Yakubu; *Colonialism by Proxy: Hausa Imperial Agents and*

Middle Belt consciousness in Nigeria by M.E. Ochonwu; *The Emirates of Northern Nigeria: A Preliminary Survey of their Historical Traditions* by S.J. Hogben and A.H.M. Kirk-Greene (Wajiga, 2002; Gudumbul, 2006; Hananiya, 1993; Chaskda, 1972, Pungri, 2015; Gandapa, 2016; Pungri, 2017; Kirk-Greene, 1969; Nissen, 1968; Yakubu, 19997; Hogben & Kirk-Greene, 1966 & Ochonwu, 2014), among other scholarly works. It is against this backdrop that, this paper attempt to contribute to knowledge in the sphere extension of the knowledge of pre-colonial and colonial Kilba history in Northern Nigeria by detailing the groundnut production example, through the use very strong, credible primary (archival materials and oral interviews, which guarantee originality) and secondary sources, which fix the paper in existing scholarship.

Laying Down the British Colonial Economic Infrastructure in Kilba District

With the proclamation and declaration of Northern Nigeria as a British Protectorate on January 1, 1900, Yola (Adamawa Emirate) fall in 1901 followed by Kilba Kingdom in 1904 through the British colonial forces popularly known as West African Frontier Force (WAFF) under the leadership of G. N. Barclay (Adeleye, 1971:205-219). In fact, the colonial conquest and domination were necessitated by the industrial revolution of the 19th century, which forced European nations to move elsewhere in search of raw materials to feed the new machines in their factories, get markets where their products could be sold and areas of investment (Heussler, 1968:18-19). To further intensified it colonial economic structures, especially its policies and practices, the British colonial administration, installed *Til* (King) of Kilba as District Chief while the Kingdom was reduced to the status of a Colonial District and placed under the Adamawa Emirate (Kirk-Greene, 1969:177-178), which hitherto had no hand in the political affairs of Kilba except for socio-economic inter-group relations (NAK/YOLAPROF/114/G2.B, 1935-1944; NAK/YOLAPROF/B2C, 1913/14 & NAK/YOLAPROF/, 1916.). Interestingly, with the colonial re-organization between 1908 and 1909, and especially 1926 Adamawa Emirate was to be known as Adamawa Province. Kilba District was unfortunately placed under Emirate Pagan Division with headquarters in Pella (Kilba District) (NAK/YOLAPROF, 1905-1931). This signified the incorporation of Kilba Kingdom into British colonial system of administration and capitalist economy (Chaskda, 1972: 51-57). In fact, according to the Tax Assessment Report of 1914 and 1931 the financial years indicated that Kilba taxable adult population was 16,075 and 27,718 respectively, while in 1937/38 and 1952 it was 28,388 and 88,058 respectively (Population Census of 1952). This indicated demographic changes in the district owing to colonial push and pull factors of migration like schools, new settlements, Christian missionaries, road networks and communication, health care services, imperialist companies, employment opportunities at colonial administrative sectors and a lot more.

The Nomenclature Groundnut

Groundnut is an important export (cash) crop and a good source of vegetable oil to resource-poor farmers (Bathon, 2016:1-9). Groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L) also known as earthnuts, peanuts, gobber peas, pinders, manilanuts is a member of the genus *Arachis* in the family *Leguminosae* which has replaced the traditional bambaranut (*Vigna subterranean*) in many areas of the country (Beghin, 2003:1-3 & Wabolamanyi, 1998:1-15). It is ranked 13th most important food crop in the World and also the World's 4th most important source of vegetable protein (26%), and the second largest source of vegetable oil (45%) (ICRISAT, 2001:39-41). The Food and Agriculture Organization (FOA) reported

that groundnut is grown on 26.4 million hectares of land worldwide with a total productivity of 36.1 million metric tons and an average productivity of 1.4 metric tons/ha (FOA, 2004:22).

In the case of Nigeria, which is blessed with a large expanse of land, tremendous potential resources, favourable climate for producing food, other raw materials for export and domestic industries. Groundnut yields in the country are however generally low, averaging about 800 kg/ha less than one-third the potential yield of 3000 kg/ha (Zekeri & Tijjani, 2013:42-50). Similarly, Okolo and Utoh estimated that Nigeria's cultivated area in respect to groundnut production is about 1.0 to 2.50 million hectares annually and yields in the range of 500-3,000 kg/ha (Okolo & Utoh, 1999:14-22).

Colonial Agricultural Policy and Practice

The term agriculture here denotes both the production of crops and the raising of livestock, large or small. This was by far the most important industry in the colonial empire (NAK/SNP/17 11703. Volume III). Lord Frederick Lugard admitted at the outset that European brain, capital and energy were not meant to be expended in developing the resources of Africa, including that of our area of study, from motives of pure philanthropy but also for the mutual benefit of her industrial classes (Lugard, 1922:16-21 & Mamman, 1993:111). The British colonial government wanted raw materials, markets and areas of investment from her acquisition, including Kilba District. It, therefore, adopted concrete measures including the creation of the Native Authority System in its bid to satisfy its economic interests. In fact, the whole of the British colonial policies were geared and targeted towards the provision of these raw materials.

The colonialists realized that for any efficient system of agriculture there had to be a satisfactory system of land tenure. This was put as follows:

By virtue of its importance for the well-being of the community, agriculture has a prior claim on land which is suitable for cultivation or the raising of livestock... colonial government should exercise their influence and authority to the extent that their legal powers permit to ensure that all land in colonial territories is put to the use for which it is best suited, and in particular cultivation for other purpose...(NAK/SNP/17 11703. Volume I).

The imperialists were also of the view that the agricultural land of colonial territories was their most valuable assets and every endeavour should be made to preserve and if possible, increase its fertility (NAK/SNP/17 11703. Volume I). One of the first measures taken by Girouard, the Acting High Commissioner, was to settle the issue of land tenure in our area of study. This issue was of crucial importance because it was both to determine the system of agriculture to be used in exploiting the resources of Kilba District as well as the question of native revenue (Orr, 1965: 244-245).

Nonetheless, the series of policies made by the colonialists as it affected labour, land and agriculture were geared towards ensuring that the existing pre-colonial production was tactically dis-oriented or forcefully directed towards achieving the colonial goals. Thus, these policies were solely directed at the developing and expanding production of raw materials to the detriment of even food production and other indigenous industries.

The Land Policy seized agricultural lands from the peasants and only rendered them as sources of labour for colonial production. What to produce, where to produce, how to produce and when to produce became the sole function of the colonialists through their agents. The kind of taxes that were imposed made these peasants to embark on export crop production so as to pay them. The measures that were put in place for the collection of these taxes were so harsh that the class of landless peasantry had no option than to be producing for export. The handicraftsmen also had to abandon their local industrial production for export crop production (NAK/SNP/17 11703. Volume I).

For example, cotton and groundnut were the most important colonial agricultural export crops in Kilba District and the whole of Adamawa Province, to the detriment of staples like Guinea-corn which had been in cultivation since the 1850s. In fact, Adamawa Province contributed almost one-third ($\frac{1}{3}$) of such commodities in Northern Nigeria (Alkassum, 2003:132-133). Table 1 below gave the expression of the cotton lint and groundnut tons of exports from Northern Nigeria with effect from 1900 to 1937.

Table 1: Expansion of the Major Exports from Northern Nigeria, with effect from (w.e.f) 1900–1937

Year	Cotton Lint 100 cwt	Groundnut 100 tons
1900	0.2	0.6
1902	0.1	0.3
1903	3.0	0.5
1904	10.0	0.8
1905	12.0	0.8
1907	37.0	2.0
1908	20.0	2.0
1913	114.0	19.0
1915	113.0	9.0
1920	100.0	5.0
1921	114.0	51.0
1925	113.0	127.0
1927	100.0	91.0
1929	117.0	147.0
1931	70.0	160.0
1932	24.0	188.0
1933	88.0	205.0
1937	192.0	326.0

Source: Adesimi, A. A. (1973:22-23) *"The Prospects and Potentialities of Groundnut Cultivation as a means of Enhancing Economic Opportunities in the Rural Economy of Northern Nigeria."* PhD Thesis, University of Wisconsin and Perham, M. (eds.). (1945:8-9.) *Native Economics of Nigeria*. London: Oxford University Press.

Meanwhile, the food and sylvan crops like the guinea-corn needed for further or promotion because, they were long cultivated and tatted for collection since the early arrival of European merchants. In fact, these crops, nevertheless remained in the background as alternative export crops for both local and international consumption while cotton and groundnut became the most important colonial agricultural responsibilities in Adamawa Province, which Kilba District was part (Abba, 1976:132-133). In Kilba District, the major export crop that was emphasized was Groundnut. It was the predominant crop that was produced in Kilba District throughout the colonial period. In fact, the bulk of this crop came from Kilba District when compared to other districts of Adamawa Province. Hence, groundnut production continued to flourish among the Kilba people throughout the colonial period till date. On this note special attention would be given on groundnut production in the study area.

Groundnut Production in Kilba District

Groundnut production in Kilba District was never introduced by the British colonial administration. Hence, traditions have it that groundnuts were introduced in Kilba land by Borno traders since C.1500–1850AD. Another version held that Borno traders came with groundnuts at one time and distributed about one measure (*Mudu*) to the resident '*shalls*' (Provincial Governors who were Prince and sons of Kilba King) in each village to cultivate. Some Kilba people asked them where they got groundnuts, and they were told from Masar in Egypt and from that point, groundnut was given the name *Masar* in Kilba, literally meaning Egyptian groundnuts. Another version had it that a seed of groundnut was found under the stall of a Borno trader and was planted, but the nut was not eaten and only used to dress horse ulcer. Some Kilba people asked them where they got groundnuts, and they were told that it was from *Masar* (Egypt). From that point, groundnut was given the name *Masar* in Kilba, literally meaning Egyptian groundnuts (Pungri, 2015:55-56 & Chaskda, 2018 & 2019). Another version had it that a seed of groundnut was found under the stall of a Borno trader and was planted, but the nut was not eaten and only used to dress horse ulcer. Also, having tasted that the nut was nice, they might have requested the Borno traders to bring more for them. It was also then that Borno traders brought plenty of it and distributed one measure (*Mudu*) to each '*shall*,' and from the '*Shalls*,' it spread to the rest of the population (Pungri, 2015:55-56 & Chaskda, 2018 & 2019).

In respect to groundnuts production, its demand rose in Europe between 1906 and 1914 which subsequently affected Northern Nigeria, including Kilba District. It was necessitated by the manufacture of margarine – the consumption of which doubled in Britain and Germany. The invention of the technique of hydrogenization in which liquid oils were made firm, deodorized and turned into fluid like margarine further stimulated the production and export of groundnuts in our area of study (Mcphee, 1926:10-107 & Adesimi, 1973:1-5). Also, in France, the demand for animal fats, vegetable oils such as groundnuts, palm and coconut oils arose in the soap industry. When the French Government imposed high duties on the oil nuts, the Marsailles nut crushers explored some variety of nuts that were either untaxed or lightly taxed. They found the answer in groundnuts. Hence this engineered the presence of the French merchant firms or their representatives in not only our area of study, but also in many parts of Northern Nigeria to buy groundnuts (Mamman, 1993:173-173, Adesimi, 1973:1-5, Hogendorn, 1981:378-381 & Hogendorn, 1978:1-190).

However, groundnuts in colonial Kilba District was produced in large quantity besides the natural resources of any other place which influenced the pattern of economic activities to be found there. This would also help us to understand why human beings provided for their material needs the way they did. To some extent, the natural resources of a place could make some economic activities possible or impossible but might not in itself necessarily dictate the type of economic activities in which the people were engaged. Their location, abundance and/or scarcity did however affect economic activities and their development. This also explains why groundnuts was best grown in the savannah region and why some crops do well only in regions of high rainfall while some do not.

According to oral testimonies, it was the Borno traders who first introduced groundnuts into Kilba land (Pungri, 2015:55-56 & Chaskda, 2018/2019). Nevertheless, before the advent of colonial rule, groundnuts was only cultivated by women who used it in preparing food, for example in making of various types of soup, porridge and gruel (Chaskda, 2018/2019). It was also eaten i.e. raw, roasted or boiled. During the beginning of colonial rule, large scale cultivation of groundnuts was not yet the practice. This was due to the lack of sufficient means of transport which was mainly donkeys, the distance involved and the lack of attractive prices being paid for the crop. It was not until about 1915, that a groundnut buying station was opened by the John Holt Company at Wuro Boki (also called

"Kwampin" by the people) when groundnuts started to be cultivated on a large scale (Pungri, 2015:55-56). British agricultural policy in Nigeria was an integral part of an economic policy aimed at developing the resources of the country through the medium of the local people for the benefit of Britain and the colonial economy (Udo, 1977:1-15). However, the main interest of the colonial government in the country was the exploitation of the agricultural and other economic resources of the land. The farmers were encouraged to continue cultivating the soil to produce the crops needed. Export crop production was thus encouraged to supply raw materials for feeding British industries and to provide the producers with the cash to pay colonial taxes.

In fact, more and more farmers in Kilba District preferred to plant groundnuts to cotton or other export crops. This was for a number of reasons. In the first place it provided satisfactory prices. In fact, the good prices were meant to encourage farmers produce more of it. It could also be used as food if required and did not depend so much on the rainfall. Similarly, there was no difficulty in obtaining the seed and its planting had no restrictions.

Nonetheless, to enhance large scale production of groundnuts and in order to meet up the industrial need of the imperialists' firms abroad, British imperialist provided fertilizers, technical advice, and implements such as ploughs, chemicals for storage, dressing seeds and lot more (Udo, 1977:1-15). With this development, Kilba people sold their groundnuts at Wuro Boki on the Bank of the river Benue which was about 100 miles away from Kilba District where John Holt Company opened a groundnut buying station from 1904 to 1960 (Udo, 1977:1-15 & Pungri, 2015:57-58). In fact, during this period, Kilba transported their groundnuts to Wuro Boki on donkeys and by head portorage. In fact, a donkey could carry about 60 *mudus* of groundnuts from Kilba District to the buying station where it was sold at one penny (Id) per *Mudu* and often through or with the aid of their middle men (Pungri, 2015:57-58). Meanwhile, those who did not have donkeys to transport their groundnut, carried them on their heads. Sources further revealed that as human beings, they could only carry about 30 *mudus* on their heads to Wuro Boki. Thus, the price of groundnuts in Kilba District ranged between $\frac{1}{10}$ of a penny and half a penny per *Mudu* for quite some time, especially from 1904-1960 (Pungri, 2015:57-58). But subsequently, the price became a good one owing to the establishment of a groundnut buying station in 1935 at Gombi in Gan'anda District about 15 miles near the Kilba District. This development paved way for Kilba people to sell their groundnuts on higher prices than before since they no longer transported them to a far distance. In fact, the cost of transport was reduced and the Kilba men and women could carry more groundnuts to the buying station from 1904 to 1960.

The opening of the groundnut buying station at Gombi (also known as Little Gombi) helped immensely at reducing the monopoly of middle men (Hausa, Kanuri and some Kilba) in the groundnut trade. This is because people could now carry their groundnuts directly to the buyer. This development did not last long as the middle men were indispensable in the groundnut trade because the company was not in touch with the growers who were unorganized. So, an intermediary was required to act as a link between the growers and the merchants. This was provided by the middle men (NAK/YOLAPROF/1495/3045; NAK/YOLAPROF/2375/5478 & NAK/YOLAPROF 1478/3063). The middle men were given money to go and buy groundnuts for the company. When they came to Kilba District, they used bigger measuring bowls so that they could take in more groundnuts. When they carried the groundnuts back to the company, they sold it using the standard measuring bowls. Whatever remained became part of their profits in addition to the commission they were given by the company for their purchases (NAK/YOLAPROF/1495/3045 and NAK/YOLAPROF/1962/4634).

Sometimes the middlemen falsified weights by either spraying the groundnut with some water to make it swell up or added some sand particles and thus claimed any extra price caused by the false weight. Some middlemen also tried all they could to divert part of the money into their pockets. Some also traded with the money to make some profits before they bought the groundnuts they were meant to buy with the money (NAK/YOLAPROF/1495/3045 and NAK/YOLAPROF/1962/4634). In Kilba District, they bought the groundnuts at very low prices (between $\frac{1}{10}$ d and $\frac{1}{2}$ d per *Mudu*) compared with the 1d per measure at the company's buying station. This high price differential was entirely their own creation, designed to enrich themselves at the expense of both the growers and the company. For example, they bought groundnuts at about 20–24 measures per shilling in Kilba District and sold it at nine measure per shilling to the company. Shortage also occurred as a result of these malpractices of the middlemen and it was usually impossible to prove that any specific sum had been converted into their own pockets. Sometimes, they disappeared with both the money and the goods, some said the goods were lost or the money was stolen such that action at civil law became only a waste of time. In short, the atrocities of these middlemen proved detrimental to both the growers and the merchants interests such that a new measure was devised whereby money was advanced directly to the growers, most of whom were those whose work was based on slaves which broke down with the abolition of slavery and so had to get money to keep their estates going (slaves owned by noble and rich men worked on large farm estates before colonial rule). Some also received advanced payments from Licensed Buying Agents (LSAs) and European firms to carry out festivities like marriages and needed money to buy new clothes especially in the rainy season when almost all the groundnuts were sold and there was no more source of cash income (NAK/YOLAPROF/B2C). This practice turned out to be a direct exploitation of the growers because they would give the groundnuts to the company at the harvest season when the price of groundnut was low unlike in the rainy season when the price went high due to scarce supply of the groundnut by then. Therefore, this new strategy only succeeded partially as it was eventually subjected to abuses by the farmers themselves. Hence, this kind of practice had three consequences. Since much of the farm work was hitherto slave labour dependent, the abolition of slavery meant that big farmers had to pay for labour, a situation that translated into spending more money in order to keep their estates going (Pungri, 2015:61-63 and Pungri, 2017:215-216). Some of the farmers who collected advance payments as additional labour misused the money on things like marrying new wives and buying new clothes when rainy season came, almost all the groundnuts were already sold out and there was no other sources of income, and the practice also gave undue advantage to the companies because growers would give the groundnuts to them at the harvest season when prices were low compared to the rainy season. The practice also prevented farmers from storing their groundnuts in order to sell in the rainy season when prices were high because the merchants demanded the groundnuts only during the harvest season when the price was low. Furthermore, when Kilba groundnut farmers realized that they were at a disadvantage, they began to engage in similar malpractices of the middlemen. Some Kilba men carried their groundnuts to Kobchi, a Cameroon town south of Mubi and some 40 miles west of Kilba District where the French had their own groundnut buying station and were paying higher prices than the John Holt Company. In fact, throughout the period under review, half of the groundnuts produced in Kilba District went to the Cameroons (Pungri, 40-45 & 61-63). Consequently, in the period under review, when the John Holt agents saw that a lot of Kilba groundnuts went to the French in the Cameroons, they decided to

open up buying stations at Gombi in 1935 and Mubi in 1945 to cut off the middle men and to reduce the long treks to the Benue (Watt, 1980: 1-2 & 37; NAK/YOLAPROF/B2C; NAK/SNP17/2/13210 and NAK/YOLAPROF/ACC3049).

Commenting on the middle (NAK/YOLAPROF/B2C) men in our area of study, Michael Watts proffered that:

The buying of groundnuts from the rural peasant producers in remote areas far away from railroads or motor roads was done through middlemen or appointed licensed buying agents (representing the various trading firms) just like the Native Authority bureaucracy, most of those buying agents were Hausa, Beriberi, and Fulani, that is the same set of people who were regarded by the indigenous communities as 'aliens.' These people were also mainly Muslims. These middlemen or agents became "indispensable" gatemen in the groundnut trade (just like the unpopular administrative policy of imposing Fulani heads over non- Fulani districts) because the trading companies were not in direct touch with the growers who were largely unorganized and scattered in rural localities (Watt, 1980: 37).

Looking at the factors involved in the production and marketing of groundnuts during the period under study, one could see that the lack of attractive prices, malpractices by the middlemen, lack of good roads and available means of animal transport (considering the fact that donkeys at that period were not many in the area of study as compared to towns such as Zaria, Katsina, Sokoto, Kano and Zamfara provinces. These combined, discouraged large scale cultivation of groundnuts. The amount of groundnuts carried to Wuro Boki to be sold was severely limited due to the long distance involved, thus forcing growers to sell their groundnuts at low prices to the middlemen for most of the period in question. The construction of the Yola- Mubi motor road started in the late 1930s, the opening of groundnut buying stations at Gombi and Mubi coupled with the supply of fertilizer, the introduction of ploughs, together combined to encourage large scale cultivation of groundnuts from the mid 1930s onwards. Table 2 below gives a graphic information on the prices of groundnuts in Kilba District from 1930–1937 and Table 3, the prices of other crops in the 1930s. Table 4, the prices of Groundnut from 1927–1936 in the colonial Adamawa Province where it was shown that 1933/1934 groundnuts production was affected by locust invasion which in turn led to poor crop harvest. This situation halted economic progress for some time in the whole province which our area of study was part of and that is why the column was presented with a dash (-) symbol. Even though, Kilba District Native Authority did all it could to encourage the production of groundnuts, the demand for groundnuts and its prices increased particularly during the World War II (1939–1945).

Therefore, Table 2 shows that from 1936/1937 prices of groundnut in Kilba District was £7.0.0 Per Ton. This was far better than what was obtainable between 1930 and 1932 which were £6.10/0 Per Ton and £2.10 Per Ton respectively. Table 3 shows the prices of other crops such as sheanuts which was £3.5 Per Ton far better than cowtail which was 3d while Beeswax, 6d. Table 4 on the other hand, shows the prices of groundnuts from 1927 to 1936 in Tons. For example, in 1927 groundnut prices Per Ton was £9.0.0 Per Ton against 1930 to 1936 price was £2.0.0 Per Ton in 1932 and rose to £7.0.0 Per Ton in 1936.

Table 2: Prices of Groundnuts in Kilba District, 1930–1937

S/No	Year	Prices of Groundnut
1	1930	£6.10/0 Per Ton
2	1931	£5.00 Per Ton
3	1932	£2.10/- Per Ton

4	1933/34	- - -
5	1935	£5.00 Per Ton
6	1936/37	£7.00 Per Ton

Source: NAK/YOLAPROF/B2C – Pagan Emirate Division.

Table 3: Prices of other Crops in Kilba District in 1930s

S/No	Crop	Prices
1	Sheanuts	£3.5 Per Ton
2	Hides	6d
3	Cowtail	3d
4	Beeswax	6d

Source: NAK/YOLAPROF/B2C – Pagan Emirate Division.

Table 4: Prices of Groundnuts in Adamawa Province, 1927–1936

S/No	Year	Prices of Groundnut
1	1927	£9.0.0 Per Ton
2	1930	£6.00 Per Ton
3	1931	£5.0.0 Per Ton
4	1932	£2.0.0 Per Ton
5	1933/34	- - -
6	1935	£5.00 Per Ton
7	1936	£7.00 Per Ton

Source: NAK/YOLAPROF/B2C – Groundnut Cultivation in Adamawa Province, 1936.

In another development, according to the Adamawa Province Groundnut Marketing Scheme, 1952/1953 (Table 5) Kilba District buying station was Gombi (also known as Little Gombi) (NAK/YOLAPROF/1952–1953.). But in the 1958/1959 (Table 6) season, the buying stations comprised of Hong (Kilba District) with Dalmare as the Riverheads followed by Gombi with Yola (Adamawa Emirate) as her Riverheads (NAK/YOLAPROF/GRO-17 Vol. I). Furthermore, the reports of 1952/1953 Kilba District from Gombi had £12.53.2d (Table 5) as the approved differential per ton net compared to 1958/1959 where Kilba District (Hong) had £13.511.6d as approved differential per ton net and then £29.55.0d as the gazette minimum buying price (after deduction of the £1 tax). In the case of Gombi, the District's second buying or purchasing station, it had an approved differential per ton net as £12.518.6d while the gazette minimum buying price (after deduction of the £1 tax) was £29.518.0d (Table 6) (NAK/YOLAPROF/GRO-17 Vol. I). As for 1960/1961 (Table 7) Kilba District (Hong) had £32.513.0d as price per ton fixed by the Northern Regional Marketing Board and then £31.513.0d as the price per ton fixed by the board less Produce Sales tax against Gombi which had £33.56.0d and £32.56.0d respectively (NAK/YOLAPROF/GRO-14 Vol. I).

Interestingly, the British colonial firms (UAC, Holts, CFAO and VYB) controlled the buying or purchase stations of the River Area Groundnuts – Season 1952/1953 (Table 8) in not only Kilba District but the Adamawa Province as a whole (NAK/YOLAPROF/5285B). Even though progress was recorded in the Northern Regional Marketing Board, there was a deterioration in the production of

groundnuts in the 1958/1959 season as noted in the Table 9 showing percentage deterioration compared with total stock purchased (NAK/YOLAPROF/GRO-17 Vol. I).

Table 5: Adamawa Province: Groundnut Marketing Scheme 1952/1953 – Rivers Area

S/No.	Adamawa Province Buying Station	Total Quantity of Groundnuts purchased and evacuated to nearest ton.	Approved Differential per ton net. £. s. d.	Amount Claimed
1	Najubure		8.14.3	
2	Banjiram		9.11.8	
3	Dalmare		8.14.3	
4	Gamadio		8.14.3	
5	Gassol		4.18.0	
6	Gen		8.14.3	
7	Gidan Usumanu		8.14.3	
8	Jada		12.8.11	
9	Jalingo		10.2.9	
10	Lukumna		9.12.3	
11	Lankoveri		9.10.9	
12	Lau		8.14.3	
13	Little Gombe		12.3.2	
14	Mayo Belwa		11.4.10	
15	Michika		15.3.5	
16	Mubi		13.19.11	
17	Numan		9.14.9	
18	Shellen		8.14.3	
19	Wafango		9.12.7	
20	Worno Bokki		8.14.3	
21	Yola		8.14.3	
22	Zinna		12.8.11	

Source: NAK/YOLAPROF/ Groundnut Production and Buying, 1952–1953.

Table 6: Adamawa Province: Groundnut Marketing Scheme 1958/1959 – Rivers Area

S/No.	Adamawa Province Buying Station	Riverheads	Approved Differential per ton net. £. s. d.	Gazette Minimum Buying Price (after deduction of £1 Tax) £. s. d.
1	Banjiram	Numan	10.9.6	32.7.0
2	Beli	Kwatan Nanido	9.6.6	33.10.0
3	Dalmare	Dalmare	10.4.0	32.12.6
4	Dunne	Dalmare	12.0.3	30.16.3

5	Gamadio	Numan	10.13.3	32.3.3
6	Gassol	Kwatan Nanido	7.5.3	35.11.3
7	Ganye	Numan	12.13.0	30.3.6
8	Gidan Usumanu	Gidan Usmanu	9.9.9	33.6.9
9	Hong (Kilba District)	Dalmare	13.11.6	29.5.-
10	Jada	Numan	11.13.6	31.3.0
11	Jalingo	Kwatan Nanido	9.3.0	33.13.6
12	Jalingo Maika	Wuro Bokki	14.0.9	28.15.9
13	Jen	Jen	9.11.9	33.4.9
14	Karlahi	Yola	11.14.3	31.2.3
15	Kunini	Lau	9.15.3	33.1.3
16	Kwatan Nanido	Lau	6.2.0	36.14.6
17	Kwojji	Kwatan Nanido	10.17.9	31.18.9
18	Lankoveri	Lau	10.1.9	32.14.9
19	Lau	Lau	9.8.6	33.8.0
20	Little Gombi	Yola	12.18.6	29.18.0
21	Lukumno	Numan	10.10.9	32.5.9
22	Mayo Belwa	Numan	10.15.3	32.1.3
23	Michika	Yola	15.5.9	27.10.9
24	Monkin	Numan	11.5.9	31.10.9
25	Mubi	Numan	14.11.0	28.5.6
26	Mutum Biyu	Yola	6.7.0	36.9.6
27	Numan	Lau	9.10.9	33.5.9
28	Old Muri	Dalmare	10.2.9	32.13.9
29	Shellen	Numan	10.16.9	31.19.9
30	Song	Dalmare	11.15.3	31.1.3
31	Sorau	Muro Bokki	12.2.3	30.14.3
32	Uba	Dalmare	14.11.9	28.4.9
33	Wafango	Yola	10.18.6	31.18.0
34	Wuro Bokki	Wuro Bokki	10.6.0	32.10.6
35	Yola	Yola	10.4.-	32.12.6
36	Zinna	Lau	11.-.6	31.16.0

Source: NAK/YOLAPROF/GRO-17 Vol. I – Ministry of Agriculture: Groundnut Marketing Schemes, 1958–1959.

Table 7: Northern Regional Marketing Board Second Schedule River Area Buying Stations, 1960/1961

	Approved Buying Station	Price per ton fixed by the Northern Regional Marketing Board	Price per ton fixed by the Board less Produce Sales Tax
	Column I	Column II	Column III
S/No.	Adamawa Province	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
1	Banjiram	35.15.0	34.15.0

2	Beli	37.0.0	36.0.0
3	Dalmare	36.0.6	35.0.6
4	Dunne	34.4.3	33.4.3
5	Gamadio	35.11.3	34.11.3
6	Ganye	33.11.6	32.11.6
7	Gassol	38.14.3	37.14.3
8	Gidan Usumanu	36.14.9	35.14.9
9	Hong (Kilba District)	32.13.0	31.13.0
10	Jada	34.11.0	33.11.0
11	Jalingo	37.1.6	36.1.6
12	Jalingo Maika	32.3.9	31.3.9
13	Jen	36.12.9	35.12.3
14	Karlahi	34.10.0	33.10.0
15	Kunini	36.9.3	35.9.3
16	Kwantan Nanido	40.2.6	39.2.6
17	Kwojji	35.6.9	34.6.9
18	Lankoveri	36.2.9	35.2.9
19	Lau	36.16.0	35.16.0
20	Little Gombi	33.6.0	32.6.0
21	Lukumno	35.13.9	34.13.9
22	Mayo Belwa	35.9.3	34.9.3
23	Michika	30.18.9	29.18.9
24	Monkin	34.18.9	33.18.9
25	Mubi	31.13.6	30.13.6
26	Mutum Biyu	39.17.6	38.17.6
27	Numan	36.13.9	35.13.9
28	Old Muri	36.1.9	35.1.9
29	Shellen	35.7.9	34.7.9
30	Song	34.9.3	33.9.3
31	Sorau	34.2.3	33.2.3
32	Uba	31.12.9	30.12.9
33	Wafango	35.6.0	34.6.0
34	Wuro Bokki	35.18.6	34.18.6
35	Yola	36.0.6	35.0.6
36	Zinna	35.4.0	34.4.0

Source: NAK/YOLAPROF/GRO-14 Vol. I – Ministry of Agriculture: Groundnut Marketing Gazette Notice, 1960–1961.

Table 8: River Area Groundnuts – Season 1952/1953: Adamawa Province Purchase Station

Province. Adamawa		Companies				Total
S/No.	Station	UAC	Holts	CFAO	VYB	
1	Banjiram	329	–	–	–	329
2	Dalmare	253	353	–	–	606

3	Gamadio	–	–	–	–	–
4	Gassol	216	–	–	–	216
5	Gidan Usman	950	–	–	–	950
6	Jalingo	322	–	–	–	322
7	Jada	–	723	–	–	723
8	Djen	389	–	–	–	389
9	Lankoveri	601	–	–	–	601
10	Lakuna	–	625	–	–	625
11	Lau	226	–	–	–	226
12	Little Gombi	492	1192	–	140	1824
13	Lamurde	–	90	–	–	90
14	Michika	993	–	–	288	1281
15	Mubi	1445	1738	–	426	3609
16	Muri Beach	–	–	–	–	–
17	Mayo Belwa	–	712	–	–	712
18	Numan	64	101	–	–	165
19	Shellen	1040	–	–	–	1040
20	Wafango	143	–	–	–	143
21	Wori Bokki	–	1019	–	–	1019
22	Yola	426	389	–	–	815
23	Zinna	–	886	–	–	886
	Total	7889	7828	–	854	16571

Source: NAK/YOLAPROF/5285B – Groundnut Production and Buying, 1952–1953.

Table 9: Northern Regional Marketing Board: Deterioration of Groundnuts 1958/1959 season showing percentage deterioration compared with total stock purchased

S/No.	Licensed Buying Agents (LBAs)	Tonnages Deteriorated	Percentage Deterioration	Purchase
1	U.A.C	77 ⁵	.050	130921
2	J. Holts	8 ⁵	.034	46050
3	P.Z.	6	.055	27866
4	G.B.O	4	.20	35672
5	S.C.O.A.	–	.018	9302
6	C.F.A.O	1 ¹⁰	.020	20826
7	RACCAH	–	–	6008
8	L & K	–	.068	19102
9	P.S.M	–	–	652
10	K. Maron	–	–	652
11	A.J.K	5/12	.001	33070
12	W.S.E	–	.007	7118
13	ANKLE	5/12	.006	9515
14	CALLIL	–	–	–

15	OLUDE	11/12	.021	4301
16	A.G.L.	13 ¹¹	.061	30750
17	V.Y.B	3 ⁶	.050	7929
18	A.D.S	12	.055	37070
19	ABED	—	—	2188
20	S.D.S	10/12	.007	12430
21	GASHASH	—	—	425
22	BORODO	—	—	2195
23	H.H.	22 ¹	.040	59126
24	C.ZARD	5/12	.047	1543
25	S.NA'ABBA	—	—	1213
26	A.ALBISHIR	—	0.14	2480
27	A.BABA	—	—	1047
	Total	152 ²	.02	522,863

Source: NAK/YOLAPROF/GRO-17 Vol. I – Ministry of Agriculture: Groundnut Marketing Schemes, 1958–1959.

Commenting on the general situation in respect to groundnut production and the role of middle men in Northern Adamawa Districts (Pagan Emirate Division), Pongri noted that, production and marketing of groundnuts throughout the colonial period was seriously hampered by factors such as the malpractices of middlemen, unattractive prices, lack of good roads unavailability of adequate means of transport This is because only animals and head portorage were the available means of transport, coupled with the great distance between the Northern Adamawa districts (Pagan Emirate Division) and the buying stations on the Benue. These factors forced the people to sell their groundnuts at low prices in their localities. Some of these difficulties were gradually counteracted by the smuggling of their produce across the Cameroun border to places like Kobchi, Garua and Marua where they fetched higher prices for their products than they could get from the trading firms (Pungri, 2017:171-172).

Pongri, further added that, most groundnuts produced in Adamawa (especially the Mandated Areas) went to the Cameroun because of the higher prices offered there (Pungri, 2017:171-172). The situation that developed in Adamawa as a result of the relationship between the various European firms and the producers was the emergence of a relatively richer myriad class of intermediary agents, brokers, traders, middlemen and clients (mostly non- indigenes of Adamawa and members of the Native authority) on one hand, and a large mass of impoverished rural peasant producers (mostly indigenes of Adamawa) on the other hand. This situation provided the salaried district, village heads, bureaucrats and the local agents with an opportunity to spread a lucrative but highly usurious credit system to the impoverished rural producers. The numerous cases of malpractices associated with the whole system deepened the already existing hostile and antagonistic relationship between the indigenous population and the Fulani groups who dominated the Native Authority bureaucracy as could be deduced from Resident G. S. Browne's report in 1922: Pagan coming into trade has to run the gauntlet of the market dues. If he rests for a moment in the market, Zango fees, extortionate ferry tolls are levied on him and finally the Jimeta dillalai (traders) who graphs his load of groundnuts etc from him and gives him half the price that he would get by going another quarter of a mile or two to the Niger Company Store (NAK/SNP/YOLAPROF/9/4106/1922).

Browne also told the Lamido that such practices had to stop as "the pagan is the greatest productive asset" of the Native administration in the province in contrast to "the less productive Fulani" and that it was his duty to instruct the district administration that the non-Fulani was protected from the time he left his house to the moment he arrived at the Niger Company store. To this end, market dues were "abolished" in all non-Fulani districts as a prelude to its ultimate "abolition" all over the division, even though he concluded that the government could not afford to do without the market dues which amounted to "nine hundred pounds annually in revenue." Because the non-Fulani was the greatest asset of the province, Browne also recommended that all efforts should be concentrated on "bringing in unsettled areas under subjugation" by peaceful persuasion or by patrols and by "getting him to trade with the firms (NAK/SNP/YOLAPROF/9/4106/1922)."

According to Browne it was only in this way that he could acquire wealth and be able to pay tax which will enable this province to secure revenue more commensurate with its importance and necessity for future development in public works and more adequate salaries for the Native Authority officials (NAK/SNP/YOLAPROF/9/4106/1922).

Conclusion

From the above discussion, it is clear that attempt was made to examine groundnut production in the colonial economy and society of Kilba District from 1904 to 1960. The study showed that groundnut production in the study area had two faces of coin i.e. negative and positive impacts. In the first place, it brought colonial policies and practices driven by the search for cheap human labor and material resources. It was also to feed the expanded industries in Europe and the Americans. As such, Kilba District was compelled to produce the groundnut export crop which was to be used to achieve that. The imperialist class and their collaborators used forced labour, taxes, colonial land, agricultural policies, credit system, colonial firms and its agents at the detriment of the peasant farmers. In fact, the implication of these unequal dialectics resulted in the direct political and economic control of resources, such that profits were repatriated to London, Paris or Berlin (Alahira, 2001:148). Thus, the assumption that the different colonial laws and policies impacted either positively or negatively on the socio-economic relations of inhabitants in Kilba District, led to an entire society being incorporated into colonial economic or international capitalist economy, from where surplus was drawn to the metropolitan, rather than the technological growth of the colonized people. Meanwhile in the second place, the production of the groundnut paved way for the emergence of petty class of indigenous entrepreneurs in Kilba District and wealth creation to farmers, indigenous agents of colonial firms and sources of revenue to pay colonial taxes and fees for children in Christian missionary and Native Authority schools and use of modern fertilizers and farm implements as modern method of crop production.

Recommendation

- Post-colonial government of Nigeria through small scale and medium enterprises should encourage groundnut production in Kilba society which is now Hong Local Government Area of Adamawa State.
- Government Agricultural institutions and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) should further it research on the nature of Kilba society soil which aided large scale of groundnut production in the colonial Kilba District.

- Government Agricultural institutions and NGOs should make provision for soft loans, farm implements, fertilizer, chemicals for storage, dressing seed and market centers to the Kilba farmers.
- Government, NGOs and wealthy individuals should establish groundnut processing industry in Kilba society in order to create more opportunities to farmers in terms of preservation/storage, extraction of groundnut oil and production other commodities in the groundnut which in turn will generate employment opportunities to Kilba society.

References

- Abba, S. (1976). "Adamawa Borno Relations in the 19th Century." BA Project, Department of History, Bayero University, Kano-Nigeria.
- Adeleye, R.A. (1971). *Power and Diplomacy in Northern Nigeria: The Sokoto Caliphate and Its Enemies*. London: NP.
- Adesimi, A. A. (1973) "The Prospects and Potentialities of Groundnut Cultivation as a means of Enhancing Economic Opportunities in the Rural Economy of Northern Nigeria." PhD Thesis, University of Wisconsin.
- Alahira, H.A. (2001). "The Role of Women in the Colonial Economy of Northern Nigeria: A Case Study of the Jos Plateau, 1960–1960." PhD (History) Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, 2001.
- Alkasum, A. (2003) *History of Yola 1809–1914: The Establishment and Evolution of a Metropolis*. Zaria: Ahmadu Bello University Press.
- Bathon, A.H. et al. (2016). "Profitability of Groundnut-Based Cropping Systems among Farmers in Hong Local Government Area of Adamawa State, Nigeria." *Global Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. Volume 15, 2016.
- Beghin, J. et al. (2003). "The Impact of Groundnut Trade Liberalization: Implication for the Doha Round" Mimeo, selected paper presented at the AAEA Annual meetings, Montreal.
- Catherine, V. (1993). "The Slave Experience in Adamawa: Past and Present Perspectives from Yola (Nigeria)." *Cahiers d'Études Africaines* Volume 34. Ohio: Center for African Studies, Ohio State University.
- Chaskda, G.M. (1972). "The Establishment of a Government-General among the Kilba." BA (History) Project, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria-Nigeria.
- Chaskda, G.M. (2018 & 2019). Age 78. Retired Director of Administration and Supply, National Commission for Museum and Monuments, Nigeria. Interviewed at Fadaman Rake, Hong Local Government Areas, Adamawa State-Nigeria on December 31 and January 3.
- Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Production Year Book (2004)*. Rome, Italy. Volume 15, (10):22.
- Gandapa, E.N. (2016). "Economic and Traditional Uses of Highlands among the Kilba Tribe of Hong Local Government Area, Adamawa State in Nigeria." *International Journal of Research in Arts and Social Sciences*. Volume 9, Number 1.
- Groundnuts Statistic and Economic Review*. (1949). Number 4, September. UAC Produce goes to market.
- Gudumbul, B.Y. (2006). "A Study of the Emergence, Growth and Fall of the Huba Kingdom from C.1500AD to 1906AD." PhD (History) Thesis, University of Maiduguri, Borno-Nigeria.
- Hananiya, J. P. (1993). *The Kilba and their literature*. Lagos: Concept Publications Limited.
- Henring, R.C. (1993). "Rise and Fall of the Adamawa Emirate." 2003:1-4. Access from afrol.com, Nigeria.
- Heussler, R. (1968). *The British in Nigeria*. London: OUP.
- Hogben, S.J. and Kirk-Greene, A.H.M. (1966). *The Emirates of Northern Nigeria: A Preliminary Survey of their Historical Traditions*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Hogendorn, J.S. (1978). *Nigerian Groundnut Exports: Origins and Early Development*. London: Oxford University Press (OUP).
- Hogendorn, J.S. (1981). "Nigerian Groundnut Exports: Origins and Early Development." *Canadian Journal of African Studies*. Volume 15 Number 2. Canada: Taylor & Francis Ltd,
- International Crop Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT). Future Challenges and Opportunities for Agricultural Research and Development in the Semi-Arid Tropic*. (2001). International Crop Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics Annual Report. Patancheru, India.

- Isah, M.A. (2014). *The Political Economy of Rural Development in Nigeria: A Study of Rural Zaria*. Zaria: Ahmadu Bello University Press.
- Kirk-Greene, A.H.M. (1969). *Adamawa Past and Present. An Historical Approach of the Development of A Northern Cameroun Province*. London: Dawson of Pall Mall.
- Lugard, F.D. (1922). *The Dual Mandate in the British Tropical Africa*. London: William Blackwood and Sons.
- Mamman, M.A. (1993) "The Role of Native Authority in the Agrarian and Pastoral Economy of Katsina Emirate, 1903–1960." PhD (History) Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria-Nigeria.
- McPhee, A. (1926). *The Economic Revolution in British West Africa*. New York: Negro Universities' Press.
- Mike, O.O. (2009) *The Development of Cash Crop Economy in Nigeria's Lower Benue Province, 1910–1960*. Lagos: Aboki Publishers.
- Moses, O. (2008) "Colonialism within Colonialism: The Hausa-Caliphate Imaginary and the British Colonial Administration of the Nigerian Middle Belt." *African Studies Quarterly*. Volume 10, Issues 2 & 3.
- NAK/SNP/17 11703. Volume I Agricultural Policy in Northern Nigerian Provinces.
- NAK/SNP/17 11703. Volume III Agricultural Policy in Northern Nigeria Provinces.
- NAK/SNP/YOLAPROF/9/4106/1922 – Adamawa Province mandated areas in north and south Cameroun, Fulani Administration over pagans.
- NAK/SNP17/2/13210 – Hausa Enclaves in Pagan Areas, 1934.
- NAK/YOLAPROF – B2C Major D. O. R. Logan – A Survey of the History and Organization of the Kilba Tribe.
- NAK/YOLAPROF – J.I. Yola Collected Histories, 1905–1931.
- NAK/YOLAPROF 1478/3063 – Advance for purchase of Agricultural produce 1936–1959.
- NAK/YOLAPROF/ – Groundnut Production and Buying, 1952–1953.
- NAK/YOLAPROF/ B2c. Adamawa Provincial Archives Emirate Pagan Division Report by A. R. Boyle, 1913/14.
- NAK/YOLAPROF/114/G2.B – Kilba District Village Administration 1935–1944.
- NAK/YOLAPROF/1495/3045 – Middlemen employed by trading firms, 1936.
- NAK/YOLAPROF/1962/4634 – Groundnut Cultivation by mechanized means.
- NAK/YOLAPROF/2375/3475 – Groundnut Production and Buying.
- NAK/YOLAPROF/2375/5478 – Groundnut production and buying.
- NAK/YOLAPROF/5285B – Groundnut Production and Buying, 1952–1953.
- NAK/YOLAPROF/A3 Vol. III – Report for March, 1904 by G.N. Barclay.
- NAK/YOLAPROF/ACC3049 – Middlemen Employed by Trading Firms 1936. B1 and B2 A and BA Adamawa Provincial Achieves, Recurrent Reports, Northern Emirate Divisions, 1910–1941.
- NAK/YOLAPROF/B2C – Annual Report on Emirate Pagan Division S.H.P. Vereker (ADO) 1913/14.
- NAK/YOLAPROF/B2C – Groundnut Cultivation in Adamawa Province, 1936.
- NAK/YOLAPROF/B2C – Middlemen Malpractices in the Groundnut Trade, 1926–1937.
- NAK/YOLAPROF/B2C – Pagan Emirate Division.
- NAK/YOLAPROF/B2D – H. B. James (ADO) Emirate Pagan Division: Tour of the Division in 1916.
- NAK/YOLAPROF/GRO-14 Vol. I – Ministry of Agriculture: Groundnut Marketing Gazette Notice, 1960–1961.
- NAK/YOLAPROF/GRO-14 Vol. I – Ministry of Agriculture: Groundnut Marketing Gazette Notice, 1960–1961.
- NAK/YOLAPROF/GRO-17 Vol. I – Ministry of Agriculture: Groundnut Marketing Schemes, 1958–1959.
- Nissen, M. (1969). *An African Church is Born. The Story of Adamawa and Central Sardauna Province in Nigeria*. Denmark: NP, 1968.
- Ochonu, M.E. (2014). *Colonialism By Proxy. Hausa Imperial Agents and Middle Belt Consciousness in Nigeria*. USA: Indiana University Press.
- Okolo, T.O and Utoh, N.O. (1991). "Groundnut Seed Multiplication and Constraints; FAO's Experience." Aliyu, A. and Nwafor, G.O. (eds.). *Proceedings of National Workshop on Groundnut Rehabilitation in Nigeria*. FAO/FDA, Kano, Nigeria. 11th-12th May.
- Orr, C. (1965). *The Making of Northern Nigeria*. London: Frank Cass Co Ltd.
- Perham, M. (eds.). (1945) *Native Economics of Nigeria*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Population Census of 1952: Population Census of the Northern Region of Nigeria, 1952.
- Pungri, J.H. (2017). *Political Developments in Adamawa, 1900–1960*. Lagos: Bahiti & Dalila Publishers.

- Pungri, J.H. (2015). *Aspects of the Economic History of Kilbaland, 1820 to 1934*. Markurdi: Aboki Publisher.
- Smith, M. *Baba of Karo*. (1954). London: OUP.
- Tom, F. (1981). "Agricultural Policies in Nigeria 1900–1978." Heyer, J. et al. (eds.). *Rural Development in Tropical Africa*. Lagos: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Udo, R.K. (1977). "British Policy and the Development of Cash Crop in Nigeria." Seminar paper presented at the Department of History, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria-Nigeria.
- Wabolamanyi, J.S. (1988). "Groundnut Marketing in a Deregulated Economy in Three Local Government Areas of Adamawa State, Nigeria." M.Sc. (Agricultural Economics & Rural Sociology) Dissertation, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.
- Wajiga, A. (2002). "Socio-Economic and Political History of the Kilba People in the Pre-Colonial Period." MA (History) Dissertation, University of Maiduguri, Borno-Nigeria, 2002.
- Watts, M. (1980). "Peasantry, Merchant Capital and International Firms: Capitalism in Northern Nigeria." Paper Presented at Joint Committee on African Studies at the Social Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies Dakar, Senegal, December 2–4.
- Yakubu, Y.A. (1997). *Chronicles of A Golden Era – A Biography of Aliyu Musdafa the 11th Lamido Adamawa*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd.
- Zekeri, M & Tijjani, I. (2013). Resource Use Efficiency of Groundnut Production in Ringim Local Government Area of Gigawa State, Nigeria. *Agrosearch*. Volume 13, (2), 2013.