

# REFLECTION ON THE EVOLUTION OF WOMEN'S SUBORDINATION

PETER BISONG BISONG Ph.D

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY, UNIVERSITY OF CALABAR

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5706-6460>

---

## ABSTRACT

*The reality of women marginalization is now taken for granted. Efforts are now geared towards their liberation from the shackles that held them bound to the degraded environ they found themselves. While this effort is laudable, it is imperative that a solid foundation is erected for the philosophy of feminism. This research is aimed at erecting a justification for the feminist struggle. This will put a knife to the arguments of those who oppose feminism on the basis that women are by nature inferior to men, which is a reason, why they occupy a subordinate class in all societies. The paper argues that, though it was inevitable for women to slip to second class position in the primitive societies, it is unwarranted in the present civilized society.*

*Key words: evolution, women subordination, equality, power, feminism*

## INTRODUCTION

There are currently widespread agitations for women emancipation. This struggle for equality is today at its strongest point in the history of humanity. Women and men from all climes and works of life have joined the big struggle. The struggle grew from pockets of protests and expression of frustration over the treatment of women by the men to a well-fortified philosophy and movement.

Charles Fourier is credited as one who gave impetus to this movement and philosophy by coining the word "feminism" in 1837 for it (Goldstein, 1982:92). This coinage, served as a unifying force that has helped to project women grievances into the consciousness of the entire world. This effect has been visible in the rising standard of women life all over the globe. It has made "available to women, professions and jobs that were the exclusive reserve of men. Women now could be managers, head of departments, scientists, philosophers, directors and even presidents of countries" (Bisong, Feminist's Quest for Women Liberation, 2018: 54). Debased cultural practices like female circumcision, widowhood rites, female disinheritance, forced marriages etc. have been given serious knocks and they are speedily falling asunder.

Feminism is a movement and philosophy that agitates for equal treatment of the male and female gender. Feminists frown at and work against a culture where women, simply because they are

women, are treated differently from men, and in this difference of treatment the women are disadvantaged (Bisong, A Critique of Feminism, 2014: 34). They see this difference of treatment as unnatural and thus alterable. The nagging question now is: if the difference in the treatment of women is unnatural, how is it that in almost all societies of the world, women have a similar subordinate status? Why is it that in almost all societies women are subjugated, oppressed and marginalized? If subordination of women is unnatural, it means it started at a point in history and not from the beginning of humanity. At what point then, did women suppression, oppression and marginalization begin? These are the questions that instigated this research.

It is very important that these questions are investigated and answered appropriately, if not we may be unwittingly building the entire enterprise of feminism on sandy soil. This work therefore, aims at providing for feminism, a sure foundation, for it to build a lasting and glorious structure. The first segment of the paper, seeks to determine whether the claim of subordination of women is correct. This will pave the way for an energetic search for the basis of women subordination, which is the primary task of this research.

## **ARE WOMEN SUBORDINATED?**

The answer to this question may seem self-evidently 'yes', but on a careful reflection, one would find out that a 'no' answer is not altogether senseless. From my own point of observation, it appears to me that it is the men that are actually at a disadvantage, when it comes to the treatment of the sexes. Though, it is changing now, due to the efforts of feminism, but it is still in high practice, that the men take the riskier and most tasking jobs. Chinweizu confirms this in his description of the Yoruba culture: "zoned to men are plantation farming, hunting, fishing and long distance trading. These are activities which take place in the unsafe areas beyond the town walls. Within the safety of the town walls, women engage in food processing and local trading" (Chinweizu, 1993, 4). This is precisely why, when we hear of a thousand soldiers killed, it will be the men. When we hear of car accidents, it will be the men that will suffer more, because it is believed that it is gentlemanly for a man to sit outward in a car, while the ladies sit farther away from the doors. This reduces risk for women in cases of accident and increases it for men. The societal expectations on the men to take the riskier jobs, positions and places, seems to me a disadvantage for the men. It puts them more at risk of death, maiming, sicknesses and other forms of evil.

More importantly, societal expectations and demands on the man to be the one to make advances on the woman, is another seemingly clear disadvantaged position of the man. It makes him work harder to gather money, in order to make himself more appealing to women. They work hard in order to maintain their women. They exert themselves mentally and physically in order to put themselves in a position of attraction to the women. This struggle could inadvertently lead some

of them to robbery and other irregularities that corrode their morality. It could lead to calamities of all sorts, including death, stroke, mental ailments etc. on the men.

There are other arguments that could be raised to demonstrate that men could claim marginalization. Men, therefore could justifiably claim to be disadvantaged, with regards to the treatment of the sexes. This is why Bisong, advocates malinism. Malinism is a doctrine that emphasizes the need for the liberation of the men alongside the female from patriarchy (2018:161). He argues that patriarchy inhibits both the female and male, implying that all need liberation. However, that is not the focus of this research. The point here is that, women can genuinely claim marginalization in many areas of their lives. The areas and spheres of life that women justifiably feel marginalized and ill-treated could include:

### **Economic sphere**

Though, the condition of women economically is gradually improving, but many women in different places of the world, still experience inequality in employment opportunities. This as Dorothy Olu-Jacob asserts is as a result of socialization, where the female is groomed “to be submissive, to be domestic, be a good wife, be moral, play motherly roles and take care of her husband and children when she marries” (2018:186). Traditionally, in almost all societies of the world, the woman is socialized into believing that her primary role is tending children and keeping the home, while the men go out to exploit and explore for food, shelter, clothing and other essential needs. This trend continues to date, making the woman to be at a disadvantage, economically. Men, right from their cradle are socialized to be outward going, adventurous, creative, courageous, enterprising and economically minded. These are qualities that are very essential for a robust economic life. This means, right from their childhood, men are groomed for success in economic adventures, while the female is groomed to be a good wife and house keeper. In my society (Boki, Nigeria), most times women are verbally advised not to get too rich, so as they could marry. This means, the female is made to believe that the wealthier she is, the more difficult it would be to be married. She is made to believe that men search for women who are good wives, and good wives are good house keepers. This sermonizing obviously reduces her economic escapades and consequently her aspiration for wealth creation..

Differences in social orientation of the woman and the man, for the feminists, puts the woman at a disadvantage economically and thus must be corrected. This economic disadvantage is widened by inheritance culture of many societies. Many societies do not see women as qualified to inherit properties. It is the men that get it all. Mary Philips captured it vividly in her article “Teaching Women History: The Marginalization of Women” where she exposed the marginalization explicit in the will of a twentieth century English farmer. The farmer Joseph Grover with a son and five girls, following his English tradition that women are not to inherit properties, willed all his lands and properties to his son, in total neglect of his daughters and wife (<http://www.womenatthecenter.nyhistory.org/>)

This practice, though, waning gradually to the demands of feminists, still holds sway in many societies of the world. In my society (Boki, Nigeria), the practice is still very much alive. Girls can only share in inheritance of current assets, like money, clothes, household utensils etc. This inheritance culture no doubts put man at an economic advantage, for he is placed on a more favourable ground to takeoff economically, while the female has to start her economic life almost from the scratch. The economic gab between the male and female has remain wide because of the ever present economic marginalization of the sexes.

### **Religious Sphere**

One sphere, where feminists cry foul is the marginalization of women in religion. This, many feminists see as the life-strength of all other forms of marginalization. This is because, religious beliefs guides almost all aspects of adherents' culture and ideologies. It is even argued that marginalization still persist in the world today, due to the continuous religious belief, in the inferiority of the woman. Almost all human religions clearly give second place to women. This is visible in the teachings of Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism and other religious sects in the world.

The Judeo/Christian scripture made it clear that the woman is a weaker vessel; she brought down God's wrath on mankind by eating the forbidden fruit and luring the man to do same and thus has continually been blamed for reducing the world to its immoral state. Women by virtue of being women, therefore share in this fault of Eve. St. Augustine, the respected church father made it clear where women are placed in the early church. He writes: "what is the difference in whether it is in a wife or a mother, it is still Eve the temptress that we must beware of in any woman. I fail to see what use women can be for man, if one excludes the function of bearing children" (quoted from Ogabo, 2018: 83). Another notable Father of the Church, St. Thomas Aquinas as if to lay credence to what St. Augustine said, enthuse: "as regards the individual nature, women are defective and misbegotten, for the active force in the male seed tends to the production of a perfect likeness in the masculine sex; while the production of a woman comes from a defect in the active force"(quoted from Ogabo 2018:83). Informed by scriptural teachings therefore, women right from the early church suffered a degraded status, that hampered the full development of their religious lives. St. Paul admonition in the New Testament, that women should be silent in church added salt to injury. This means women are hindered from full expression of their religious selves. Rather than expressing it, they were expected to repress it. This is a deep wound to the religious life of the women, and as argued by the feminists, should be healed.

Hinduism and Buddhism are not less repressive of women religious selves. Hindus Manu, explicitly states:

In childhood female must be subject to her father, in youth to her husband: when her lord (husband), is dead, to her sons; a woman must never be independent. She must not seek to separate herself from her father, husband or sons. By leaving them she would make both her own and her husband's family's contemptible (quoted from Edet,2012:13).

Another passage in the Manu reads

When in the presence of the husband, a woman must not look on one side or the other. She must keep her eyes on her master to be ready to receive his commands. When he speaks, she must be quiet and listen to nothing besides. When he calls her, she must leave anything else and attend to him alone (quoted from Edet, 2012:14)

The Buddha as captured by Mesembe Edet, at first did not want to admit women into his religion. But after much pleading, he let them in but with strict and limiting instructions. He commanded that a priestess of Buddhism, of even a hundred years standing, would salute, rise to greet and obey a priest, even if he is a day old. She would not be allowed to reprove the priests officially, but the priests could reprove the priestess officially (Edet 2012:50).

Allah command, as regards women is explicit in Islamic Quran and Hadith. Women do not have as much right as men. The testimony of one man is equal to that of two women. The punishment for adultery for a woman is much more than that of a man. The husband can beat his wife to correct her. A man can marry more than one wife but a woman cannot marry more than one man. The paradise for a martyr for a male Muslim is replete with many virgins but not much is said for that of a woman.

It is abundantly clear therefore, that most religion downgrades womanhood. Since religion is a great influence on humanity, it is not surprising that women are relegated to subordinate positions in almost all spheres of human life. The recognition of this important role of religion to the degradation of women, has made religion the focus of their attacks.

### **Cultural Norms and Practices**

Widowhood is a phenomenon that is common to almost all cultures of the world. Some cultural beliefs and ascription for widows however, are horrendous and dehumanizing. In Africa as captured by Egbeji, some cultural practices a widow is expected to pass through include: "shaving the hair on the head. Drinking of remains of water used to bath the husbands' corpses, mourn her husband death for about three to twelve months depending on the ethnic group ...women are not allowed to bath, clean their surrounding during mourning period (136). Other practices include:

- Eating kolanut place on the corpse of the husband
- Wearing of rags all through the months of mourning
- Eating from a particular plate throughout the months of mourning
- Going into a dark forest alone
- Not to go out or mingle with people throughout the period of mourning
- Wailing and crying every morning and evening at the grave of her husband
- Marrying her deceased husband relative
- Sleep with the corpse of her husband.
- Not allowed to inherit her husband's properties

According to Imafidion, widowhood is practiced for three interrelated reasons:

First, the moment her spouse dies, she has become impure and somewhat contaminated and requires cleansing, without which she may never be viable for remarriage; second, any failure on her part to fulfill the funerary expectations is immediately interpreted within her space of dwelling as utter disrespect for the late husband and his kin, and this may quickly raise suspicions as to her innocence in the death of her spouse; third, the rituals, rites and attitude expected of her during the period of mourning is regarded as essential for the peaceful transition of the departed to the non-physical realm of existence, which is essential to protect her from being pursued by or otherwise endangered by the malevolence of the dead (2018, 96)

The treatment of widow is very barbaric, as it deepens their sorrows and sufferings. Though, widowers also undergo some rite, but it is nothing compared to that of the women. As described by Okorie, a widower

Is not expected to wail openly like a woman. His facial courage is supposed to be a first aid condolence, comfort and hope for the children who are psychologically broken down. After the burial of the wife, the widower is expected to mourn for at least six months or one year. In strict traditional obedience, the man may mourn for only twenty eight days. This is based on the idea that the absence of the woman makes her unimportant to the surviving husband except through her children and kin. Hence, it differs from that of a widow who undergoes intensive rituals at the hands of the *umuada* (1995. 82)

Just a few days mourning is enough for the man to marry another wife.

Another horrendous cultural practice that degrades and violates the fundamental rights of a woman is circumcision. Female circumcision otherwise referred to as female genital manipulation, is the removal of an essential sexual organ of a woman, without medical necessity

and without due recourse to its harmfulness (Ekanem 2018:381). The purpose, it is believed, is to reduce sexual drive in women, so as to promote virginity and chastity. This practice debases the woman, making her a mere sex tool to her husband. It inhibits the full expression of a woman's sexual life. Most times circumcision leads to infection, which will disrupt the comfort, happiness and productivity of women.

In most cultures too, women do not have a choice of husbands. The family chooses a man and a woman is forced into marriage. This culture is outmoded but still holds sway in few societies. Women are also discriminated against politically. Men are still unable to set aside the religious tenets that put the man as the leader. It is therefore, disturbing for many, when women lead in politics, religion, finances. I have overheard discussions, where it was concluded that it was not right for wives to be richer or more influential than their husbands. It is also widely held that it is not right for wives/women to lead or head their husbands/men. This belief is surely the reason why women representation in politics is still very low. It is arguably the reason why U.S.A preferred to vote a black man Barack Obama instead of a woman (Hilary Clinton), even though she is White. Here, blackness apparently became a lesser evil than womanhood? This disregard for womanhood is very evident in Nigeria. Since Nigeria reverted to democracy in 1999, no woman has contested and won a governorship seat in any of the 36 states of the country

### **The origin of Women Subordination**

There are no historical records to educate us on how women became subordinated in almost all communities of the world. We have no choice than to take a rational journey to the beginning of time, in attempt to rationally unravel the factors that contributed to women becoming second class citizens of the world. To successfully do this, we have to first understand what factors separate people into the different classes of people we have in the society today. From the resources we gather, we can venture into the past to understand how the female became subordinated.

Reflecting on the contemporary world, it is indubitable that people are divided into classes. There is the upper class, the middle class and the lower class. We even have the first world, second world and third world countries. What exactly is the line that separates these individual categorization?The distinguishing element that map individuals into classes is power(brute/military power, economic power and knowledge power). The measure of power possessed by an individual or country determines whether she is lower class/third world, middle class/second world or upper class/first world. United States of America for instance, has a respected military power, a robust economy and men of great knowledge, who have helped in discoveries and inventions. Nigeria is a third world country because she lacks that respected military power, has no enviable economy and invents and make almost no scientific discoveries.

From the above, it is clear that being in a particular class is not a given. It is not natural, in the sense that people are not naturally born destined for one class, it is the eventual accumulation of power that marks this one, for this class and the other for another class. This means one can switch classes, depending on the accumulation or reduction in power. China is a notable example, she is speedily gaining the status of world power via technological exploits which has tended to increase her power and influence tremendously.

It is also clear from this analysis, that being in one class is not a societal arrangement. The world has at no point met to agree to allow China move to the stage of world power. The world did not elect United States of America to be a super world power. It did not also elect the male above the female. It is the ability to accumulate and wield power that arranges people and nations into classes.

If the above analysis is correct, then we can conclude that, it is not the society that subordinate women; it is also not nature or destiny that marks them as second class. Rather, it is the power play between the sexes, that has tended to put one first and the other second, in the same way that power play in the society makes one individual high class and the other lower class and one country first class and the other, third class.

In the beginning, the male and female were equal in status – they were in the same class. There was no society; they had one common enemy, which is nature. There was just one way to survive – to conquer nature. This quest to conquer nature is where the male started exhibiting more power than the female and by that a line between the two sexes began to be drawn. The male had more brute strength than the female and thus was able to combat wild animals. Since this era depended more on brute strength for security, food and shelter, the male because of higher brute power excelled better than the female, making the female more or less depended on the male and consequently becoming a subordinate. The male as a result of his higher physical power consequently adopts the role of protector and provider – this is the earliest role-setting. He kills wild beasts first to protect himself and the woman from death and secondly for food and clothing. The role of a man became that of a protector/defender, provider of food and shelter and more importantly leader/head, for a provider and protector is naturally the leader figure in the society. By assuming the role of a protector and provider in the early age, the man inadvertently got a quantum leap in power. As a provider and protector, the man found himself in a position of leading, directing and even educating the woman. His vast experiences with wild beasts gained him a comparative advantage in knowledge as regards the best defense against attacks by wild beasts on other humans and also on fighting skills. The early man thus could be said to have quickly risen above the woman in terms of brute power, knowledge power and economic power, starting a history of domination.

The earlier woman aside from not being gifted with the same strength of a man, find herself unable to do the things men did, like hunting and fighting other human enemies because of



menstrual pains, pregnancy and child birth. These inhibited her from accumulating the same power as the man and by that maintained the same level of power status that was a given at the beginning of human existence. Unfortunately, because of these strings, the power of a man became higher than hers and she fell into a subordinate class. This is how men became heads in all primitive societies. This is the reason, I feel, if the world was to be reversed and allowed to start afresh, men will still rise above the women. His brute strength gives him an initial advantage – an advantage that would later bring forth other power advantages (economic and knowledge). Adventures with this brute strength ushers him into a wealth of experiences (which is another advantage), experiences that translates into production of hunting and warring tools and eventually machines and computers. Production of tools, furthers the economic powers of men and thus completing their power cycle. Women because of their physical defect in strength were less adventurous and thus limited them to less risky roles; tending to children, cooking (after the discovery of fire) and doing house chores. This is the origin of the roles of women in the society.

In the primitive age, the men ensured their survival through brute strength but in a more civilized age, military power replaced brute strength. Knives and guns were invented, which aided in hunting and wars. Brute strength gave the primitive man an edge over the woman, while military strength kept him higher than her in the more civilized society. As we have noted already, the brute strength translated to economic power (ability to provide food and shelter) and knowledge power (experienced gathered in the various fights with wild beasts and human enemies), military power also brought in economic power for the man (the war loots) and knowledge power (discoveries and inventions of war tools). Thus, brute strength that later translated to military strength placed the man at an advantage economically, educationally and politically in the civilized world. The men planned wars, execute wars, and decide whether or not to surrender to the other nations, decisions which bound the women also. This is how, the men became decision makers, (for themselves and for the women), for sometimes it is at the battle field that decisions that would affect the entire society are made, since the women are not there, they are eventually not part of decision making and thus become irrelevant not just militarily but politically also. Women being left out of decision making may have been given impetus by their absence at the battlefield, but was later extended to other spheres of life

The physical power a man possesses is eventually what set him apart from the woman right from the primitive time till today. The physical power he has, set him aside not just as a protector and provider but also as a safety and economic planner. This early culture of a man as a planner, protector and decision maker percolated to today's world through socialization, indoctrination and education.

As I have noted already, since it is power that differentiates people into classes, the female gender became a second class citizen of the world while children occupy the third rung. The men as of old, sit at the top not necessarily fighting as it was their primary duty, but making policies and

laws that bind all. These decisions most times become traumatic for the female, which makes them cry foul. The cry has been growing steadily and now is becoming deafening, making even the most impudent men to look twice at the women and their demands.

## **IS THERE A JUSTIFICATION FOR THE FEMINISTS' STRUGGLE?**

The answer is yes and no. The feminists are justified in demanding that the societal rules and norms that marginalized and wrought unnecessary hardship on them be abolished. Female genital manipulation is barbaric; widowhood rites especially as practiced in Africa is traumatic; religious and educational discrimination of women is abhorrent and condemnable. It is right for women to fight for equality but wrong to demand for it. One can struggle to gain equality but cannot justifiably demand for it. Nigeria cannot struggle to become equal with United States of America but cannot possibly demand for it. To demand something precludes the existence of one who would grant the demands. In the case of equality, there is no one out there who grants such demands. Equality is not even a sort of thing to be granted, attempts to grant it, ends up as a fluke. If for instance, we grant Nigeria demands to be equal to United States of America, it does not guarantee in reality that Nigeria is equal to United States of America. This sort of equality only remains on papers. It is merely prescriptive and cannot reflect reality. Granting female equality tantamount to a mere prescription and would not reflect the status quo. True human equality comes from efforts in accumulation of power. Inequality is clearly a given by nature. We see it every day and everywhere. The different plants and animals testify to this given in nature. Though, there is inequality in nature, inequality in nonhuman beings is static, while that in humans is dynamic. In other words, in non-human beings, a lion is always superior to a rabbit, it is irreversible. But for human beings and societies, equality is dynamic, it changes depending on the power relations and dynamics of individuals and societies. One could be superior today but tomorrow the balance reverses. Rome was once a world power, it is now United States of America, tomorrow it could be China and the dynamism continues. It is the quantum power in one's possession that determines his/her class and this comes through efforts and not demanding.

The feminists are thus right in so far as they demand that women be treated rightly but wrong in so far as they demand equality. To demand equality is akin to a lower class individual demanding inclusion into high class. This does not come by demand but by making oneself a high class through personal efforts. To demand for inclusion in a higher class of the society invariably translates to a demand for the other to reduce his standards to accommodate you. Justice however, demands that he/she who desires a higher class makes efforts to join it and not just sit demanding for it.

It is power that marks people into classes. Man has accumulated this power, making him tower above the woman. The woman, wanting equality must accumulate power and wield it. There is no better time to do this, than in this present era.

This is an era where brute power and military power are no more defining human classes. This means that what gave men advantage in the past has been diluted. The society has grown today to the stage, where protection of lives and properties are no more individual responsibilities as such but a societal one. There are machineries on ground to protect and defend the citizens, which means brute strength of a man is no longer an advantage. It is economic and knowledge power that are the most definitive factors of class inclusion in the society of today.

This means, it is in today's world that women have the greatest chances of gaining equality with the men. If they can match the men penny for penny and wit for wit, then equality is assured. This is what I believe the feminists should set as their task and not merely clamouring for equality. To merely clamour for equality, is akin to asking someone who is ahead to wait for others who are behind. Which means, he should reduce his pace for others to catch up. This is unjust.

Feminists demand for equality is thus unjust, equality is to be struggled for and not gifted. It is not to be demanded, it is to be demonstrated. I understand, some feminists argue that their demand is not for equality but for equal opportunities. The question becomes, should unequal persons have equal opportunities? My answer is negative. One bereft of knowledge cannot have equal opportunities with one full of knowledge. A fool cannot have equal privileges and opportunities with Albert Einstein.

Power relations form classes, and difference in classes connotes difference in opportunities and privileges. Every employer for instance, has a class of employees in mind. One who wants to be employed by him/her must make effort to be in this class of people. To demand for equal opportunities is to demand for opening of the class to everybody. This tantamount to breaking of rules and standards.

My argument is that, opportunity cannot be made equal, rather individuals should make themselves available and qualified for the opportunity. It is not opportunity that should bend to include everybody, rather people prepare themselves to meet opportunities.

## **CONCLUSION**

This work agrees with the feminists that women are marginalized in various forms. And that this marginalization is unjust and has to stop. It however, disagrees with it on the issue of equality. Equality should not be demanded, rather it should be struggled for.

To demonstrate this, the researcher traces the origin of female subordination and located it on the excess of power the man has over the woman. This power dynamics as is evident in modern society, marks people for different classes. Each class is a power structure that reflects the amount of power wielded by individuals. The lowest rung of the society are ones that wield the least power and depends to a large extent on the economic, brute and intellectual power of the higher class.

The present world is a more favourable one for the women. The brute strength that has placed the men at advantage over the centuries, has been rendered ineffectual. The police has taken over the place of brute strength and has made it possible for everyone to express his/herself freely without fear or intimidation. The woman has the chance now than ever to quarry out her power for the benefit of herself and the society at large. Histories have been dominated by men as judiciously pointed out by Chimakonam, Edet, Mesima Oelofsen, Schepen and a host of others. I however, disagree with them, that it was a deliberate act to shut out women from history. Women were very low in the power structure and so were rarely captured by history. They however, stand a chance to rewrite history by bringing out their latent potentials, to contribute to societal development. For true equality to ensue, we need to hear more of women discoveries, inventions and innovations; we need to have in our textbooks theorems and laws from women; there has to be breakthroughs in mathematics, science and humanities by women. Women may claim today to have contributed to these fields. The claim is true, but the men still dominate, which is a reason why the women are still subordinated. To get even, with men, women have to make continuous intellectual and physical efforts to match the achievements of men economically, academically and politically.

## REFERENCES

- Bisong, Peter. "A Critique of Feminism". *American Journal of Social and Management Sciences*. 2014, 5(2): 33-38
- Bisong, Peter. "Feminists' Quest for Women Liberation: Successes, Challenges and Way Forward". *Essays on Feminism: In Honour of Prince Nico Mbarga*. Eds. Peter Bisong & Jerome Oko. Calabar: E2Zero Media, 2018.
- Bisong, Peter. "Malinism as a Corollary of Feminism". *Essays on Feminism: In Honour of Prince Nico Mbarga*. Eds. Peter Bisong & Jerome Oko. Calabar: E2Zero Media, 2018.
- Chinweizu, I (1993). Gender and Monotheism: The Assault by Monotheism on African Gender Darcy". Paper presented t the International Conference on African Philosophy and Feminism, Lags, 3 December.
- Edet, Mesembe. *Outlines of Oriental Philosophy*. Calabar: Jochrisam Publishers, 2012
- Egbeji, Patrick. "The Plight (pains) of Womanhood in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Africa: A Slap on the Women' Rights Struggle". *Essays on Feminism: In Honour of Prince Nico Mbarga*. Eds. Peter Bisong & Jerome Oko. Calabar: E2Zero Media, 2018.
- Ekanem, Samuel. "Female Genital Manipulation: Any Legal Link?" *Essays on Feminism: In Honour of Prince Nico Mbarga*. Eds. Peter Bisong & Jerome Oko. Calabar: E2Zero Media, 2018
- Goldstein, L. (1982). Early Feminist Themes in French Utopian Socialism: The St.-Simonians and Fourier, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol.43, No. 1.

Imafidon, E. (2018). *Dealing with the Trauma of a loss: Interrogating the Feminine Experience of coping with a Spouse's Death in African Traditions*. African Philosophy and the Epistemic Marginalization of Women. Eds. Jonathan Chimakonam & Louise du Toit. Milton Park: Routledge.

Ogabo, Godwin. "The Christian Church and the Challenge of Feminism in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century". *Essays on Feminism: In Honour of Prince Nico Mbarga*. Eds. Peter Bisong & Jerome Oko. Calabar: E2Zero Media, 2018

Okorie, A. M. (1995). "African Widowhood Practices: The Igbo Mourning Experience". *African Journal of Evangelical Theology*. 14 (2): 79-84.

Philips, Mary. "Teaching Women History: The Marginalization of Women" (<http://www.womenatthecenter.nyhistory.org/>)