Introduction

The 1956 royal visit by Queen Elizabeth II to Nigeria, a grandiose endeavor and show of imperial might that consumed an estimated two million pounds' worth of Nigerians' money, will remain in history books forever.[1] The colorful spectacle of colonial subjects across racial and social class lines vying to catch a glimpse of the head of a fast-crumbling British Empire left an indelible imprint on human memories.[2] Nigeria gave the queen what she came to see (civilization and modernity)—the so-called gains of a century of foreign domination that manifested in the tarred roads, hospitals, factories, social clubs, hygienic-looking schoolchildren waving the Union Jack in a show of patriotism to the empire, and a European-style public arena, among other carefully curated sites and symbols of imperialism. The guard of honor and militarization of every location she visited produced an ambivalent taste—it reinforced the military might of the British Empire in an atmosphere of superfluous merriment.[3]

Yet the dominion of imperial subjecthood and public ritual of power extended beyond humans to include respectable animals like the cattle that produced the milk that the queen and her contingent drank during their stay in northern Nigeria. Photojournalism gave meaningful coverage to the nonhuman creatures of the empire as it featured the queen "admiring" the milk-producing cattle for their service to the empire.[4] She also met another respectable animal named Burtu, a hornbill and the mascot of the First Battalion of the colonial military unit—the Royal West African Frontier Force (RWAFF)—who participated in the guard of honor staged

at the Kaduna airport. Burtu, who joined the battalion in 1950 according to a short biographical note titled "Bird That Welcomes the Queen," ate lizards, frogs, snakes, and raw and cooked meat, as well as bicycle tires.[5] The durbar of 1956 was colonial Nigeria's most colorful display of equine aristocracy: 2,456 "robust, healthy and among the finest" horses, "richly and beautifully dressed," with "jingling ornaments, decorated saddled and quilted armours" belonging to local chiefs throughout the nooks and crannies of northern Nigeria, paid homage to the queen—a distinguished equine lover herself.[6] Durbar horses must have the weight, height, and temperament to carry expensive costumery gracefully. They must not be afraid of the boom of a gun, which complements the spectacle of the durbar. These durbar horses had all these qualities. We even know their names, ages, worth, breeds, facial markings, and other biographical data.[7] They were not unknown or anonymous colonial subjects. The organizers of the most expensive imperial spectacle in colonial Nigeria were convinced that the queen deserved to be entertained by the horse, the noblest animal across global cultures and one of the living machines of imperial domination. Until now, scholars of Africa did not see the involvement of animals in that visit, as in other display of imperial might, as part of the politics of curating the empire.

Just as the respectable animals and other Nigerian colonial subjects' way of life and public conduct were painstakingly ordered for the amusement of Her Majesty, so was the colony's offensive "filth" equally covered up. Counted among this were the street dogs, another important constituency of colonial subjects whose public presence was reorganized on the occasion of the queen's visit. For colonial administrators and the educated African elites, the queen did not deserve to see the "stray," "mangy," "pariah," "feral," "ownerless" canines—among other derogatory adjectives used to describe the large African dog population. Every dog found in the streets was generally a "stray" dog—even if just a few feet away from its loving owners' home. They were considered to be outlawed colonial bodies and specimens too ugly for Her Majesty's gaze. Unlike other classes of respectable modern dogs that stayed indoors in the comfort of their owners' parlors and well-confined yards, street dogs were a bad example of colonial subjects who disrespected authority by their unlawful public presence. Hence, across the big cities the queen would visit, stray dogs were either captured to be killed or shot on the spot, both day and night before her arrival. Radio announcements, laden with stern colonial law-and-order language, emphasized the dual punishment of fines and imprisonment for

dog owners who did not place their animals on leashes.[8] Yet the dog massacre on the eve of the royal visit is just one episode in the long history of public control over the Nigerian canine population—another chapter in the regular attempt to order the life of dogs in conformity to colonial ideals of hygiene and orderliness.

There is more to the stray-dog extermination attending the royal visit than the dialectics of seeing modernity, beauty, and orderliness. For decades colonial science and its custodians (physicians and veterinarians) held a firm belief that street dogs were purveyors of rabies, a deadly zoonotic disease that can be passed from canines to humans. So public health concerns intersected perfectly with the politics of controlling the animal body and of respectability to place the canine's existence at the mercy of the state. Because of the large international presence and massive concentrations of people in public spaces, the killing of dogs appeared to medical and political officers as an important means of preventing a rabies outbreak. Meanwhile, dog control was informed not by the possibility that hydrophobia (a former term for rabies) would kill a large number of people but by the anxiety that it could cause. Perhaps few diseases in human history have caused as much public fear as rabies, which disrupts the lives of both humans and animals in complex ways. The connection between panic and public order cannot be overemphasized—anxiety over rabies, it was feared, could lead to a breakdown of order during the visit of the most important personage in the entire British Empire. Public health concerns are intricately bound up with dominant notions of power and anxiety—two of the numerous planks on which imperialism rested. Dog exterminations throughout colonial Nigeria were more about fear of rabies than about verifiable cases of the virus in the canid population or about human victims.

Colonialism was not just about humans; animals were also colonial subjects. We may not fully comprehend the extent of imperial domination until we bring animals into our understanding of colonialism. Colonial animality went beyond being an animal under foreign domination; it encompassed unveiling human existence that manifested in animalistic tendencies. Animal behavior was not always in opposition or inferior to human attitudes—we see this in the art of Akinola Lasekan (chapter 4), whose use of contextual and situational metaphors of imperial subjectivity positions humans and animals in contradictory planes. As with humans, laws and institutions of power governed animals' everyday life. Animals were sorted, indexed, and prioritized to meet colonialists' construction of

normality, orderliness, and modernity. That a dog could be hanged, like a human, for contravening colonial regulations speaks volumes about how imperialism conceived biological bodies and affinity between its human and nonhuman subjects. The imposition of a dog or cattle tax was not just about materiality of animals—it also entailed obligation and protection derived from performing the civic duty of increasing the colonial treasury through levies. Colonial animals, like humans, were placed in the service of the empire. The donkey, the number one transport animal of British Nigeria, helped the invaders to achieve their capitalist expropriation. The horse became the insignia of imperial spectacle on the turf, performing power that fractured the tenor of interhuman politics. The idea of "animals and other Nigerians" simply suggests that "Nigerianness" (like ethnic categories) transcends the human factor. There were animal as well as human Nigerians.

COLONIAL SUBJECTHOOD AND ANIMALITY

African historical scholarship has come of age. From a discipline that focused on the history of men, written by men and for men, the theoretical breadth and discursive length of the field has expanded tremendously since the 1950s to accommodate new topics across lines of gender, race, location, and power configuration. We now know that a narrative of state and empire building that excludes women is incomplete and that the history of children, sexuality, and material culture, including guns, can help us to understand the past more fully. A history of Africa that excludes an ethnic group simply because it is categorized as a minority is as flawed as one that does not recognize core accidents of history, such as how location shaped the pattern of external contact and religious and ethnic identities. Today academic research on Africa prides itself on inclusion—that is, its capacity to write neglected communities and architecture of knowledge into mainstream history. Aided by the decolonization paradigm, scholars have continued to search for new ways of presenting old ideas in a manner that resituates people and knowledge in provocative ways. Writing about neglected communities empowers scholars to move from stale narratives and familiar cultural and political lexicons in an unending drive to reshape the landscape of knowledge.

One such community that has escaped the purview of Africanist historians is the animal inhabitants of the continent. In coming to terms with the limited attention given to animal history and human-animal entanglement in Africanist scholarship, one is drawn to the foundation of academic

history of Africa, which is deeply influenced by Western historical methodology and a knowledge system that viewed history as simply humans' past activities; therefore, human agency is central to historical research. Yet neither indigenous African knowledge systems nor colonial archives, with their barrage of prejudice, conceived of the past as an exclusively human realm, devoid of nonhuman agency. Animals have been an integral part of Africa's past—making history and shaping narratives—with significant implications for major historical events. African history was not made by humans alone.

The tendency to treat history as exclusively about humans has resulted in a paucity of scholarship on animals in African history. As Sandra Swart opined in 2016, "As a distinct and self-baptized 'turn' or 'sub-discipline' within African History writing," animal history "is there—but little studied and elusive, a creature of the liminal spaces, nibbling at the edges of the conferences and journals." But, "as a living, breathing beast, it has been grazing in full sight of everyone in the historiographical field for as long as African history has existed and the locals have often caught and consumed it."[9] Swart attempts to establish a delineation between the scholarship on pastoralism, hunting, and conservation, which began to appear from the 1940s or earlier and recent ones "focusing on the animals themselves—and reflecting upon their role as subjects, rather than objects."[10] Examples of older and newer works include Robin Law's *The Horse in West African History* and Nancy Jacobs' *Birders of Africa*, respectively.[11] The geographical imbalance of newer works, written either from the perspective of environmental history or from animal studies, is clear. They have come from southern and eastern Africa and have focused mostly on wildlife, imperial hunting, and the politics of nature conservation.[12] A few monographs on single species of animals (such as dogs, horses, and birds), also from eastern and southern Africa, have appeared in the past two decades in response to the call for historians to write animals into African history.[13] As important as these works are, they tend to focus on humans' understanding of nature and the nonhuman world—the dynamics of the relationships between humans and animals are grossly neglected or underrepresented. The "animal turn" in African history is still in its infancy.

When placed in the right perspective, humans' historical trajectory was dictated not only by intrahuman affairs but also by their engagement with nature, including animals. In writing animals into Africa's past, a historian is compelled to address the question of historical agency. If we go by the conventional definition of history as humans' past activities

alone, we will eliminate nonhuman agency and narratives in historical processes and social imaginaries. But historical agency transcends human action—animals were political actors too. Scholars may never agree on the extent of agency that animals wielded in the past, but it is undeniable that animals shaped the tenor of political and social processes, directly and indirectly. As I will show in this work, animals have taken independent actions (as they searched for social connection, water, food, shelter, and sex) that created a chain of reactions that then formed the basis of turning points in human history. Animals resisted human encroachment of their domain, violated human-made laws that undermined their livelihood, reshaped landscapes that reordered human existence, and served as subject of significant debate across multiple strata of the imperial society. From the British tabloids and Parliament in the metropole to village meetings in the colonies, animal affairs notched a place on the agendas that historians of Africa have ignored. The proanimal humanitarianism that made the question of cruelty to Nigerian animals a subject of discussion in the British Parliament and media was informed by the "savior" mentality that shaped responses to "barbaric" culture by metropolitan critics of imperialism.

Animals obviously do not document their own experience; writing about them from the text and narratives composed by humans is an effort to give them voice. In writing animals into human history, a historian must think about what animality constituted in the framing of humans' everyday interaction with the natural and built environment. It is my hope that the animal-centered narratives, ideas, and events described here indicate clearly that writing about nonhuman creatures is worthwhile—for expanding the frontier of knowledge, mainstreaming neglected narratives and colonial subjects (i.e., animals), and shaping contemporary discourse about the enduring legacies of imperialism. Instead of focusing on a specific animal, as many of the existing scholarships tend to do, *Animality and Colonial Subjecthood in Africa* broadens the historiography of animal studies by putting many species (from cattle, goats, and pigs to dogs, horses, donkeys, and even wildlife) into a single analytical framework. The thematic breadth of the book varies from the story of rabies, the animals Nigerians ate, and the discourse of cruelty to entertainment, wildlife conservation, and the representation of animals in literature and visual arts. The dynamics of race, ethnicity, class, disease and imperial science, resistance to colonialism, environment, identity formation, and urbanization (among other themes) flow through the book. No other work on human-animal relations in twentieth-century colonial Africa has attempted this.

Colonialism and colonial subjecthood are the foundations on which this book is built. Right from the early 1950s, when academic study of Africa began, scholars have been preoccupied with what it means to be a colonial subject. Early scholarship on colonial subjecthood engages with the politics of indirect rule, which Mahmood Mamdani termed "decentralized despotism," that succeeded in British Africa "by tapping authoritarian possibilities in culture, and by giving culture an authoritarian bent" and association to underscore the creation of institutions and laws that defined political obligations and rights.[14] Embedded in colonial political systems are the principles of law and order, classification of "tribes" into "friendly" and "unfriendly," "civilized" and "primitive," and "docile" and "martial," among other uncanny indexing.[15] What constitutes subjecthood and citizenship of the colonies vary across location. Yet they are united by their insistence on positioning colonialism as benevolent to Africans. The early scholarship on African colonial subjecthood was later complemented by studies focusing on colonial capitalism and expropriation. Labor and taxation were central to the running of the colonial state,[16] but they also extended to control of human's reproductive and productive power. This accounts for why some of the biggest resistance to colonialism started as labor and tax unrest.[17] The rise of social history, which uses marriage, gender, women, and sexuality as points of analysis, considerably expanded the studies of colonialism. Matters like marriage and sexuality that colonial subjects would consider private, scholars have argued, have significant public ramifications on how colonialism framed morality, labor, and capitalism.[18]

When carefully appraised, the paradox of colonial subjecthood that scholars have studied with specific focus on humans is also evident in the experiences of animals. I posit that all the core dichotomies of human colonial subjecthood—indispensable yet disposable, both good and bad, violent but peaceful, saints and outlaws—are embedded in the identities of Nigeria's animal inhabitants. If class, religion, ethnicity, location, and attitude to imperialism determined the pattern of relations between human Nigerians and the colonial government, species, habitat, material value, threat, and biological and psychological character (among other traits) also shaped imperial attitudes toward animal Nigerians. Aside from being colonial subjects and "natives," nonhuman Nigerians were also ethnic bodies. What does it mean to be an Igbo, Yoruba, Tiv, Idoma, Hausa, or Fulani dog? In what sense do animals take on the unstable ethnic, racial, class, and other modulated identities of their human owners or their environment?

Service and labor are among the peculiarities of colonial subjecthood or what it means to be a colonial subject. In maximizing the gains of foreign domination, imperialism redirected the roles of animal colonial subjects. Precolonial roles either became obsolete or were expanded in new directions. Thus, the horse and donkey, who played an active part in the conquest of Nigeria as symbols of military expansion, became the primary means of transportation needed for the establishment of colonialism as well as insignias of leisure and athletic power among Africans and Europeans. The donkey, Nigeria's commonest pack animal, was integrated into the colonial labor force in a different fashion. While the direction of precolonial trade was northward, connecting humans and goods with the Saharan and Sudanese worlds, the colonial donkey's movement was mostly within the region that would later become northern Nigeria. Donkeys helped to courier the colony's wealth to the railway lines for onward shipment abroad. This same redirection of importance and role to meet the demands of capitalist enterprise also happened to cattle, which became the chief meat of the colonial state needed to feed the expanding population and generate wealth. The story of how beef changed Nigeria's history is being told for the first time here.

Animality and Colonial Subjecthood in Africa goes beyond a material analysis of what animals did in one of Britain's most important colonies. It encompasses a symbolic and textual analysis of animal lives shaped by facts, ideology, and materiality. It is a multispecies and interspecies study of animals' encounter with colonialism in Nigeria from both micro and macro perspectives. It reaffirms that animals have their own history both independent of and deeply intertwined with human stories. Beyond writing a history that engages with animal lives and fills obvious lacuna in the historiography of twentieth-century colonial Africa, this book offers an innovative paradigm for understanding the place of nonhuman creatures in colonial Nigeria. I conceptualize Nigeria's nonhuman creatures as "colonial subjects" and "modern" animals. This approach is useful for mapping out the unstable identities of animal inhabitants of Nigeria of various species as they adapted and responded to the colossal sociopolitical, economic, and structural changes ushered in by British colonialism. It transcends the notion of subjectivity; rather, it engages with the ways in which animals negotiated, dictated, resisted, and fractured new regimes of power under imperial rule. Being a nonhuman colonial subject does not automatically translate to lack of agency or powerlessness—rather, it is a state of existence and identity of a creature under foreign domination. Much of

the acrimony about wildlife invading farms and settled communities and cities stems from the criminalized beasts. It was a form of resistance that reaffirmed or reclaimed agency over ecosystems that humans tried to monopolize through their unending desire for towns and built environments.

Humans and animals experienced colonialism in similar ways. Laws were enacted to regulate not only the activities of humans but animals' lives across changing physical and cultural landscapes. Yet animals' experience under colonialism was also shaped by the natural environment as well as by all the socially and historically constructed identities of their owners. Because animals were influenced by both nature and humans, their experiences tended to be complex and wide-ranging. Colonialism involved governance of and through nature; colonial possessions included not just the human inhabitants but also the nonhuman creatures and the environment as a whole. It is not possible to write the history of humans under colonialism without reference to the environment; the discourse of nature is all the more inevitable in a study that places animals at the center of human history. While humans only had to deal with standards and obligations imposed by fellow humans, animals as colonial subjects had to negotiate relations among similar and dissimilar species in their own "kingdom" as well as with fellow human colonial subjects and with the British invaders. Aside from transcending and crossing figurative and literal borders of the colonial state, conceptualizing animals as colonial subjects places them at the center of imperial ideology. It both challenges and reinforces the meaning of colonial power for nature.

Colonial animal subjecthood thus involves oscillating between the wild and the tame, culture and nature, order and disorder, and everything in between. It entails defining what animal power and agency mean and then attempting to reconcile political contradiction—one of the numerous planks on which colonialism rested. For instance, horsemen at a durbar, an equine-centered spectacle of imperial power through which colonialism enhanced its self-proclaimed legitimacy, knew that the success of the event would be determined by the conduct and cooperation of their gorgeously dressed horses as much as by the quality of their horsemanship. In this way, colonialism created new sites through which the horse affirmed its significance as a respectable colonial subject. So, too, is the racehorse, whose performance on the turf helped solidify racing as a national sport and exposition of imperial might. While colonialists considered it decent for horses to perform power at durbars and in racing, they viewed as dishonorable their ritual sacrifice by Africans for spiritual cleansing. British

colonialists thought that the horse, as a colonial subject, should be protected from "primitive" religious and cultural practice, while they simultaneously exploited its physical and biological identities for events they favored.

What is true about the contradictory existence of the horse as a colonial subject is correct about the conflicted place of the dog in colonial Nigeria. A thoroughbred canine, who complemented humans' lives as a pet and received justice from the colonial courts when her owner's neighbor beat her with a stick, would be an outlawed body if found in the street during an outbreak of rabies, a disease that imperiled humans. One must view canines as colonial subjects to understand the contradictions in how the colonial state perceived them as creatures to be protected by law if unjustly treated by a fellow (human) colonial subject or as criminals to be punished by death if found in the street suspected of carrying disease. What is more, modern animal husbandry that increased the production of livestock to feed expanding human populations may be viewed as humans' material exploitation of animals for meat, milk, and skin; it also affirmed the significance of livestock to human survival. When colonial officers and leading African elites published in the newspapers a photograph of themselves with a massive bull, a product of imperial science and experimentation aimed at improving livestock yield, they depended on the beast to support their political credibility. Visual images of animal or agricultural shows served to highlight the gains of foreign veterinary science—just as those of then-popular baby shows emphasized the superiority of Western biomedicine and maternity care.[19]

THE MODERN ANIMALS OF NIGERIA

The idea of imperial modernity in African historical scholarship is clear to scholars. At the center of the colonial enterprise was the notion that imperial modernity would help obliterate the backwardness of Africa's institutions and political processes. Thus, civilization was expected to create modern societies and people. Scholars may not agree on whether Africa was already modernizing before the second half of the nineteenth century when colonialism began to take root, but few would disagree that the vocabulary of modernization was central to colonial propaganda—it justified and legitimized imperialism.[20] Modernity was ubiquitous in mainstream rhetoric and the practice of power and identity formation. Its artifacts and symbolism were everywhere—in particular schools, hospitals, communities, and neighborhoods, as well as in the general political economy. The

outcome was the modern African—a new breed of human who epitomized or was expected to uphold all the positive gains of colonial domination. African nationalists opposed the notion that Africans could not rule themselves and thus were in need of foreign domination; however, they never underestimated the significance of modern infrastructures, biomedicine, urban planning, market economy, and political processes bequeathed to them by their colonial overlords. To a large extent, political decolonization was never packaged as a complete return to precolonial institutions and power structures; critiques of colonialism of the 1950s and 1960s acknowledged this was impossible. Rather, decolonization was about selective appropriation of the colonial heritage to meet an African-centered agenda of progress and development to benefit Africans.

Colonial modernity, this book argues, was not just about humans; it encompassed animals. It operated at two overlapping levels: colonialism sought to produce modern animals while also using the notion of modernity to shape human-animal encounters. Animal bodies and identities were sites and symbols through which modernity found expression as a viable alternative and solution to African "primitivity." Animals, like human colonial subjects, were also expected to be modern. New urban sanitation laws, which became inevitable because of the transformation of precolonial settlements into colonial cities and modernist ideologies of "proper" urban planning, changed the habitat, ecosystem, and sociolegal constructs of the public presence of domesticated animals. The notion of desirable and undesirable urban animals drew parallel lines between pets and livestock and domestic and wild animals. While the domestic/wild distinction insisted that the true wild is beyond city boundaries, the pet/livestock division saw the city as the natural home of pets and undervalued the significance of livestock in humans' everyday survival.[21] Urban "rewilding"—that is, the occasional "straying" or "intrusion" of wild animals into the built environment of the city designed only for human habitation—criminalized their bodies in response to the real or imagined danger of competition for space. Yet livestock found in the inner-city tarred roads would be impounded or "arrested" for disobeying the law aimed at turning them into a modern being, because the farm, not the modern street, was their "rightful" home.

I argue that city, one of the citadels of colonial modernity in Africa, is more than human. The colonial city, no doubt, was a quintessential human achievement and a product of human desire, preference, bias, obsession, and impression. However, animals were omnipresent, shaping how humans defined failure and progress. Some of the biggest debates

about modern urban planning and aesthetics of everyday life in the city were defined by humans' contradictory impression of the material and symbolic roles of a wide variety of animal species. The opposing notions of "good" and "bad," "loyal" and "rebellious," "ugly" and "beautiful," and "clean" and "dirty" animals were framed by how humans would like to see and enjoy urban modernities. From public health and pollution consideration (which informed slum-clearance schemes), extermination of rats, and rearing of goats to how dog fancying defined social class and racial hierarchy, the story of city animals should be an important theme in African urban studies. Colonial urban planners disliked the presence of domestic and wild animals, even though modern human settlements were built on the latter's natural habitat. Modernist notions about what constitutes desirable and undesirable urban animals were a weighty domain of tension, as Chapter 1 demonstrates. This tension itself should be seen beyond humans' consistent attempt to challenge draconian colonial policies. Rather, it must be viewed from how animals' symbolic and material value shaped the inconsistent notions of urban desirabilities.

Even the dog, the most beloved urban animal across societies, was expected to be modern. In the diction of proper bodily conduct, urban dogs held a unique place in modernist notions of utility and companionship. They were, like urban humans, expected to be more intelligent, law-abiding, and "clean" than their rural counterparts. They were closer to "civilization" because urban communities were the bastions of advanced modernity. The stereotype of the street dog, an outlaw animal that declines control, and lives in peripatetic savagery, was only applicable in the city. Rural dogs could not be a "street" or "ownerless" dogs, not only because the modernist metaphor of the street—site of danger and disrespect toward order—was essentially urban, but also because they had a well-defined utility value as hunters in close-knit rural communities. The debate over dog taxation was vociferous partly because rural dwellers and urbanites tied dog utilitarianism to conflicting notions of modernity.

What is correct about the dog is correct about the emotional consideration that shaped the agitation led by some Europeans in Lagos against fellow foreigners who shot at birds in flight, which the former considered a "delight and pleasure to watch." Nothing like this happened in the villages, not because village people were indifferent to the destruction of nature but because of modernist framing of birds as among the beauties of the urban skyscape.[22] Hence, the fact of "senseless destruction of large number of harmless" beautiful birds by the "predatory instincts of

unscrupulous and irresponsible individuals," all of whom were Europeans, gives a racialized dimension to the idea of savagery that framed the elastic conception of cruelty to animals. The suggestion that the entire city of Lagos be declared as a "game sanctuary" to end the shooting of birds—but not leopards, lions, or dogs—fit the prioritization of animals in accordance with a skewed imagination of danger; the concern was less for animals in their ecosystem than for little White children playing in Turnbull Park of Ikoyi, a Europeans-only neighborhood in Lagos.[23] Flexible notions of nature conservation, urban aesthetics, livability and safety, and moral sensibilities to nonhuman creatures have historically occupied a contradictory status in humans' construction of positive, responsible, and safe modernities.[24]

The dichotomy between the city and villages was just one out of the countless ways of viewing modern animals. Even a beast, living deep in the wilderness, maintaining an intimate relationship with the "purest" manifestation of nature, can also be modern. There is a certain modernity in wildness. A modern lion, elephant, or leopard, among other wild animals, was both a beneficiary and a victim of the integration of Nigeria into global capitalism. These animals' material and symbolic values increased as liberalization of guns and of trade in live animals and trophies commodified their existence. Yet they would also become creatures to be protected from wanton destruction, through legislation informed by a "scientific" conservation ethos. The savior ideology that shaped wildlife conservation, which denigrated Africans as poachers for killing animals in their domains while praising Europeans who carried out the same act as "scientists," "conservationists," and "naturalists," operated within the frame of a colonial double standard. The modernist dimension to conservationism involved the affirmation that nature, as one of the gains of imperialism, can be "scientifically" preserved by creating sanctuaries for animals to breed in peace far from human molestation. Scientific conservation, like every domain of colonialism, was arrogant in its conception of sanitized progress and order for the colonial subjects of the wild.

Ethologists and naturalists developed new concepts to differentiate African animals from their counterparts in other parts of the world. To be African was to be primitive; to be an African animal was to be ultraprimitive. In animal behavior discourse, a modern racehorse was an award-winning thoroughbred equine exposed to the modern turf constructed by the British across the country and being groomed and trained and ridden by modern jockeys under the close watch of a European-trained

veterinary officer. A modern dog was a "trainable" animal that does not socialize with the filthy street dogs and instead lives within the territorial delimitation of its owner's abode. When colonial officers decried the lack of trainability of African canines, they neglected the power of language and social mores in dog-human relations. Uncritical of or neglecting the dogs' ethnic background, they blamed them for not responding to commands and instructions in their own language. This prejudice toward indigenous dogs mirrors that toward Africans. In everyday dealings with their human colonial subjects, the British associated language with intelligence. Not being about to speak or take instruction in English was framed as a sign of cranial predevelopment. The most modern of animals, like humans, were therefore those with constant contact with Europeans and educated Africans, who epitomized the best of civilization. The distinction that the cat, regardless of its breed or pedigree, of a European possessed was not limited to the beauty of its abode or the "healthy" diet offered in government stations but was the effect of its constant contact with the agents of modernity.

The moral sensibilities that turned animals into creatures to be protected by colonial laws can best be understood by the notion that modern and civilized humans must threat animals with respect. Civilized humans must have compassion for animals. Even African modernist artists understood the status of the colonial animal as a modern creature. Animal cartoons—a modern medium of expressing visual arts—was one of the most consumed protest arts in colonial Nigeria because animal iconography gave artists the aesthetic flexibility to express modern notions of power. The modern animal as a speaking creature in cartoons stood in for humans in expressing the ambivalences of colonial subjecthood.

A modern animal was both a beneficiary and a victim of colonial veterinary sciences. Its body, physiology, and biological character would form an integral part of scientific experimentation aimed at placing the human and nonhuman creatures on the path to modernity. With the improvement of colonial science and veterinary medicine, modern animals would survive in places far away from their original habitat. Humans introduced animals to new communities where they had not existed before. Their presence in new abodes would transform landscapes and ecosystems. The central philosophy of colonial medicine—to keep subjects healthy for the benefit of colonial capitalist expropriation—is evident in veterinary medicine, which was a purely capitalist science. Efforts to control epidemics, among animals and humans, were therefore targeted toward maximizing

the materiality of the colony and its subjects. Western animal biomedicine was arrogant, not only by disrespecting vernacular science but also by constituting itself as another arm of colonial law and order. It complemented physical infrastructure that changed how humans consumed meat as well.

Movement and mobility within and across colonial boundaries also defined the modern animals of colonial Nigeria. The life history of cattle in colonial Nigeria could undergo multiple migrations that precolonial cattle would never experience. By 1950 a calf born in Kano might be herded across thousands of miles, from northern Nigeria to the South, in response to seasonal supplies of forage or to avoid animal diseases, finally to be slaughtered four years later at the municipal abattoir in Ibadan, processed into sausage at the Nigeria Cold Storage Company in Lagos, and then loaded into airtight boxes and transported back to Kano in refrigerated railway cars for sale in supermarkets. Similarly, a lion cub born in the forest of Lokoja might be captured by locals, presented to the British monarch as a gift, transported to Britain and exhibited for entertainment at the London Zoological Garden, only to become a laboratory animal, serving the scientific community. At death, the lion could assume a new life as an embalmed species exhibited in perpetuity at the Natural History Museum. The unprecedented "legal" and "illegal" transportation of colonial animals to private and public menageries outside Africa during the twentieth century challenges scholars to rethink diaspora beyond the human. Animals, I argue, were part of colonial diasporic experience.

What is more, modern animality did not represent a complete disengagement from precolonial or "traditional" identities. Rather, modern conceptions of animals coexisted with the traditional, creating a host of contradictions. Much of the animal-induced conflict between Nigerians and the colonialists is attributable to the conflicting identities that animals assumed under British imperialism. The modern animal was both a biological and sociohistorical being. The desire to expand the practical and symbolic value of domesticated animals led to the expansion of intraspecies breeding by private individuals (Africans and Europeans alike) and by the colonial government. The importation of foreign breeds of animal, as well as plants, was part and parcel of imperial expansion and carefully nurtured at veterinary and experimental stations across the country. The appearance, shape, size, and even behavior of modern animals was remarkably different from their precolonial counterparts. When urban Nigerians began to keep exotic European and mixed-breed dogs, they depended on the canine to boost their image of being modern. The history