



Slavery & Abolition

A Journal of Slave and Post-Slave Studies

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: www.tandfonline.com/journals/fsla20

Emancipation in the Gold Coast: The Abolitionist Views of James Hutton Brew

Michael Ehis Odijie

To cite this article: Michael Ehis Odijie (2023) Emancipation in the Gold Coast: The Abolitionist Views of James Hutton Brew, *Slavery & Abolition*, 44:1, 109-130, DOI: [10.1080/0144039X.2022.2095905](https://doi.org/10.1080/0144039X.2022.2095905)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144039X.2022.2095905>



© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 06 Jul 2022.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 2417



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Emancipation in the Gold Coast: The Abolitionist Views of James Hutton Brew

Michael Ehis Odijie

ABSTRACT

This article deals with the abolitionist views of James Hutton Brew who argued against the British emancipation model in the Gold Coast. Brew was the proprietor and editor of the *Gold Coast Times* and discussed the British abolition process in its editorial pages. These articles revealed his thinking on abolition. Brew not only opposed the emancipation process set out by the British, which he felt was contradictory and disconnected from the Gold Coast context, but also argued for an alternative model that involved paying compensation to slave owners and creating a program to accommodate freed slaves. The British Governor portrayed some of the arguments of African abolitionists like Brew as those of slave owners trying to retain their positions. In discussing the ideas of James Hutton Brew, this article contributes to the literature on the historiography of slavery and abolition in Africa.

KEYWORDS

Abolition; slavery; Gold Coast; Ghana; James Brew; emancipation

Introduction

In October 1874, Captain George Strahan, the first British governor of the newly created colony of the Gold Coast, invited local kings and chiefs to attend a meeting in Cape Coast. Given the scale of the forthcoming gathering, which would require some kings and chiefs to travel for a couple of days, it was discussed in an editorial in Gold Coast's first print newspaper, *The Gold Coast Times*. The editor, James Hutton Brew, theorized that the meeting had been called either to discuss the extent and limits of the new Gold Coast colony or to address domestic slavery. "If it is [domestic slavery]," Brew wrote, "we may rest assured that the Government [has] found a solution to this great difficulty – a solution we trust, that will admit no misunderstanding."¹

At the meeting, Colonial Governor George Strahan delivered a pre-prepared speech to the kings and chiefs in attendance. Through a translator, he informed those present of the Queen's desire to abolish domestic slavery (both slave

CONTACT Michael Ehis Odijie  m.odijie@ucl.ac.uk

This article has been republished with minor changes. These changes do not impact the academic content of the article.

© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

dealing and slave holding) in the Gold Coast. At the same time, however, the Governor gave the impression that slaveholding could continue as before:

The Queen does not desire to take any of your people from you [...] If they are happy and content to live with you as they do now, continuing to do for you what work is required of them and depending upon you for their maintenance and looking to you for their benefits, no change is forced upon them.²

This confused the kings and chiefs present at the meeting. On the one hand, the Governor had announced that domestic slave dealing and slaveholding would cease; on the other hand, he had declared that nothing need change and that slaveholders could keep their slaves. The traditional rulers asked for clarification, and the Governor later reported his response as follows:

As to the domestic slaves, I [...] explained to them that no forcible disruption of domestic arrangement was intended, and that it was for themselves to render the situation [...] so happy that there should not be any wish or need for separation.³

This answer provided little clarification. The kings and chiefs inferred that their slaves would only be emancipated if proof of cruelty or maltreatment against them were found, and that slave owners must therefore treat their slaves in a humane way to retain them.⁴ The British administration in the Gold Coast wanted to legally abolish domestic slavery without risking the disruption resulting from mass emancipation. This contradictory goal arose from the desire to avoid paying compensation to slave owners and to avoid providing support to freed slaves. Governor Strahan believed that under this model of abolition, few slaves would leave their masters for good. The few slaves wishing to leave their masters under the emancipation ordinance, he predicted, would find it difficult to secure their livelihoods and would therefore return to their masters, further discouraging other slaves from seeking freedom.⁵

Although the British colonial government has been credited with abolishing domestic slavery in the Gold Coast, it remains unclear whether the British colonial officials were even abolitionists at all. Raymond E. Dumett argued that the ultimate decision to prohibit slavery in the Gold Coast cannot be attributed to any strong humanitarian leanings on the part of the administration: "the facts show that the Secretary of State and his Cabinet colleagues dragged their feet until the end."⁶ For Dumett, the decision was made to appease anti-slavery campaigners in England, who skilfully used the media to show the extent of domestic slavery in the Gold Coast. He argued that behind the scenes, the Secretary of State for the Colonies went out of his way to secure support from his three predecessors for his argument against interfering with slavery in the Gold Coast.⁷ This lack of actual interest in ending domestic slavery sheds important light on the apparent contradiction between legally abolishing slavery while at the same time instructing slaveholders to treat their slaves properly in order to retain them.

On the other hand, some Africans discussed domestic slavery and had a different vision of abolition in the Gold Coast.⁸ Unfortunately, there are problems with documentation and access to resources on nineteenth-century Africa, making it difficult to document this discussion and debate at the local level. This article discusses the abolitionist views of one such African, James Hutton Brew, who argued against the British emancipation model. Brew discussed the British abolition process in the editorial pages of the *Gold Coast Times*, and his articles revealed his thinking on abolition. Brew not only opposed the emancipation process set out by the British, which he felt was contradictory and disconnected from the Gold Coast context, but also argued for an alternative model that involved paying compensation to slave owners and creating a program to accommodate freed slaves.

In discussing the ideas of James Hutton Brew, this article contributes to the literature on the historiography of slavery and abolition in Africa. Before the work of Kwabena Opare Akurang-Parry, Africans were almost entirely absent from the historiography of the abolition of domestic slavery in the Gold Coast.⁹ When mentioned at all, Africans were portrayed as resisting attempts to abolish domestic slavery. The dominant literature focuses on the abolition-related ideas of two groups of Europeans: the British administration and European missionaries in the Gold Coast.¹⁰ However, this situation is beginning to change. Akurang-Parry studied anti-slavery sentiments articulated by the African intelligentsia, mostly in *The Gold Coast Times*, using some of the articles that form the basis of the analysis here.¹¹ Subsequently, Steffen Runkel studied African abolitionist initiatives in the Gold Coast from 1841 to 1897, focusing on three core African abolitionists: Africanus Horton, David Ashante and Francis P. Fearon.¹² Runkel also wrote about Brew's arguments for compensation in the lead-up to the British abolition in 1874, but he did not call him an abolitionist.¹³ In focusing on Brew, this article complements the work of Akurang-Parry and Runkel, both of whom paid only limited attention to Brew, and contributes to the growing literature on the role of Africans in the abolition of domestic slavery in Gold Coast.

Methodologically, this article relies on analysis of newspaper articles from the Gold Coast press, namely *The Gold Coast Times* and *The Western Echo* as well as British colonial correspondence. The editorials for the *Gold Coast Times* were written by James Hutton Brew as the newspaper's editor. Several of his editorials in late 1874 and early 1875 discussed the emancipation question. These editorials were usually untitled and, in most cases, they considered more than one topical issue. We also find in *The Western Echo* some discussion and criticism by Brew of the emancipation of domestic slavery. This article also uses British colonial correspondence to contextualize Brew's activities and the emancipation ordinance and sheds light on the attitudes and decision making of the British Governor stationed in the Gold Coast. Colonial correspondence also aids our understanding of the portrayal of Brew by the British, especially in

the early 1870s, during the Fante Confederacy movement (discussed below), for which Brew was a spokesperson. In discussing Brew, this article also draws on the work of Margaret Priestley and Augustus Casely-Hayford. The latter had a direct familial connection with Brew, who employed his grandfather, J. E. Casely Hayford, as a journalist in *The Western Echo*. All the sources are used with careful attention to context. For example, while Brew argued for abolition in 1874, in the post-1874 era Brew became a fierce critic of the British implementation of emancipation. Examining this out of context could lead him to be incorrectly portrayed as an advocate of the continuation of slaveholding.

In the discussion, Brew is categorized as an “educated native,” a class distinct from that of native kings and chiefs (traditional rulers). Educated natives are defined here as Africans with a European education. This distinction between educated natives and traditional rulers is to some extent problematic because there is no evidence that such a clear distinction existed locally. However, the distinction was recognized by the British colonial establishment, whose members viewed men like Brew as educated natives and treated them with great suspicion. For example, the British saw educated natives as the group behind political initiatives of African kings and chiefs (for example, in the Fante Confederacy movement).

The rest of this article is organised into separate but interconnected parts. The first part is a short biography of James Hutton Brew. The second part discusses the British vision of the abolition of domestic slavery in 1874, and the third part discusses James Hutton Brew’s response as that of a practical African abolitionist. The final part concludes the essay.

Who was James Hutton Brew?

James Hutton Brew was born on July 13, 1844. His mother, Amba Opamwa, belonged to the stool family of Abura Dunkwa. His father, Samuel Collins Brew (1810–1881), was a merchant who served the British administration in the Gold Coast in different capacities from 1857 to 1879.¹⁴ The Brew name gave the family considerable influence in the Gold Coast from the eighteenth century onward.¹⁵ Samuel Collins Brew was the son of Samuel Kanto Brew, a notorious illicit slave trader with ties to the King of Ashanti after the abolition of the slave trade in the early part of the nineteenth century.¹⁶ Samuel Kanto Brew was himself the grandson of a slave trader, Richard Brew.¹⁷ James Hutton Brew travelled to England at the age of eight for his education. On returning to the Gold Coast, he began practicing law, and he received his licence at the age of twenty, becoming one of the Gold Coast’s first attorneys. His clients included his father and other prominent local figures.¹⁸ James Hutton Brew first became prominent in the politics of the Gold Coast during the Fante Confederacy project (1867–1872).¹⁹ The Confederacy movement

was one of the first self-rule movements in Ghana, in which the traditional rulers of Fanti communities worked with educated natives.²⁰ Brew came to the forefront of this movement in 1871, and according to his own account, he helped to draft the constitution of the Confederacy. The drafting process was influenced by Africanus Horton.²¹ Horton was a medical doctor and political thinker from Sierra Leone who held a position in the Gold Coast at the time, and who may have been treating Brew professionally.²²

At the first meeting of the National Assembly of the Fante Confederacy, held in Mankessim (the assumed capital of the Confederacy) in November 1871, Brew was elected Undersecretary of the Executive Council.²³ In this position, Brew became a spokesman for the Confederacy. He experienced his first clash with the British when he attempted to submit the Confederacy's constitution and related documents to the Secretary of State in London through the Acting Administrator at Cape Coast Castle, C. S. Salmon. Salmon arrested Brew and two other members of the Confederacy for high treason.²⁴ *The African Times* published materials campaigning against their arrest as well as a copy of the constitution to show that there was nothing treasonous in it.²⁵ Although Brew and his co-defendants were required to go to court, they were released on bail and were never prosecuted. The Colonial Office disapproved of Salmon's actions, and the Confederacy received a boost when John Pope Hennessy was appointed Governor in 1872. Brew visited Hennessy to discuss the Confederacy and, in his minutes, Hennessy wrote:

I have listened with much interest to the clear and able statement of Mr. Brew and the other gentlemen who did me the honour of coming to Elmina to explain their views about the Fantee Confederation. I should be very sorry to discourage any legitimate efforts of the Fantees, or other protected tribes, to establish for themselves an improved form of government; on the contrary, I should be glad to foster all efforts of the kind.²⁶

The Fante constitution and other documents were signed by Brew and sent to Hennessy who sent them on to London. However, the Colonial Office refused to approve the Confederacy, believing that educated natives like Brew exerted an unwelcome influence on African kings and chiefs. Brew came to be seen as the instigator of the Confederacy.²⁷

Another area in which Brew is considered a pioneer is West African journalism.²⁸ He founded the first print newspapers in the Gold Coast, namely *The Gold Coast Times* (in 1874) and *The Western Echo* (in 1885). Stephanie Newell argued that Brew's newspapers nurtured many later activists.²⁹ An example is J. E. Casely Hayford (a nephew of Brew's), who served as Brew's assistant and a journalist for *The Western Echo* and subsequently became its sole editor and much later the co-proprietor of *The Gold Coast Chronicle*. Brew's columns argued consistently for Africa's representation in the administration of the Gold Coast although not for total independence from colonial

rule. Broadly, Brew's conflict with the colonial project in the Gold Coast centered on the lack of proper participation or involvement of the African population in the laws and administration of the Gold Coast. Brew was especially critical of the exclusion of educated natives, whom he regarded as just as capable as the British officials and this view guided his political activities in the Gold Coast.

For example, apart from establishing the Fante Confederacy, Brew was responsible for proposing and implementing a deputation scheme which would allow Africans to elect representatives to represent their concerns to the colonial authorities. He first proposed this scheme in *The Gold Coast Times* on August 16, 1882. The deputation scheme was to cover the whole of the Gold Coast, unlike the Fante Confederacy, and Brew recruited his friend Edward Bannerman (who had married Brew's sister, Elizabeth) to organise meetings about the scheme in the Accra region.³⁰ Brew was also deeply involved in the anti-land bill campaign of the 1890s, which led to the creation of a deputation scheme and in turn to the establishment of the Gold Coast Aborigines' Rights Protection Society.³¹ Driving Brew's political arguments and activities was his belief that the policies created by the colonial regime (for example, policies relating to land in the 1890s) were disconnected from the reality of the lives of people native to the Gold Coast, and that this chasm could only be bridged by increasing the participation of native people. Brew's abolitionist stance was one expression of this belief, relating specifically to the disconnect between the reality of domestic slavery in Gold Coast and the model of emancipation adopted by the British officials.

In terms of Brew's relationships with local kings and chiefs, traditional rulers needed educated natives like Brew to draw up petitions and letters which were the main channels for communicating with the colonial administration, while educated natives needed kings and chiefs to realize their political projects such as the deputation scheme. The distinction between the two groups is to some extent problematic, not least because most educated natives were genealogically connected to stools. However, the distinction was recognized by the British colonial administrators, who saw the kings and chiefs as the only legitimate representative of the people. For this reason, the distinction was especially relevant to politically active educated natives like Brew who associated with kings and chiefs to realize their political projects. As a result, the British saw educated natives as corrupting kings and chiefs. Brew later added the appellation "Prince" to his name to denote his connection to chieftaincy and subsequently took up a stool, after which he became a local chief and labelled himself as such.³² This was very useful for his political projects, especially when he moved to England where he lived from 1888, allowing him to write directly to the Colonial Office and Parliament as a Fante Chief. The British administration in the Gold Coast later conducted an elaborate investigation inviting local chiefs and kings to discuss the legitimacy of Brew's titles of "prince"

and “chief.”³³ The king and chiefs of Abura, where Brew’s stool was located, confirmed to the British officials in a long session of questioning that Brew was indeed a prince and a chief.³⁴

Brew’s turn to journalism in 1874 occurred precisely when the British–Ashanti war was ending, after which the Gold Coast became a colony and the abolition of domestic slavery became a subject of debate. His initial discussions of domestic slavery and abolition were largely in reaction to the situation in 1874 when emancipation became an agenda in the colony at large, although he had been active in domestic politics since the late 1860s. The question remains whether James Hutton Brew should be called an abolitionist or just a journalist discussing the issues of the day. Answering this question would require much more elaboration than can be provided here. However, educated natives like Brew, who were at the core of domestic politics, gained legitimacy by associating with traditional rulers; it would have been impolitic for them to openly hold abolitionist positions that could create a rift between them and local kings and chiefs.³⁵ While this does not necessarily mean that Brew held abolitionist views in the early 1870s, 1874 seemed to be a moment at which opposition to domestic slavery could be discussed by educated natives without jeopardizing their associations with kings and chiefs, who relied on some forms of domestic slavery to maintain their positions. Such practical and contextual complexities must be factored into any attempt to study domestic abolitionists in Africa: we should not assume that all abolitionists expressed consistently abolitionist views.

Indeed, as George Shepperson argued, the aims and methods of abolitionists in the nineteenth century were largely pragmatic.³⁶ What did such pragmatism involve for an educated native in Cape Coast in the early 1870s? Such contextual complexities also extended to the very meaning of domestic slavery in the Gold Coast and the form of emancipation/abolition that was suitable. Brew’s recurrent argument was that there was a disconnect between the reality of domestic slavery in the Gold Coast and the model of emancipation adopted by British officials. The section below presents the British emancipation ordinance before discussing Brew’s stance against it.

The British Emancipation Ordinance In the Gold Coast, 1874

The Gold Coast became a crown colony in 1874 after the defeat of the Ashantis.³⁷ The change from protectorate to crown colony meant that domestic slavery had to be abolished, as the British had abolished slavery in their colonies.³⁸ But there was also a great deal of campaigning in England against domestic slavery in the Gold Coast. For example, Raymond E. Dumett observed that the large number of “articles and editorials in leading newspapers in the month of June 1874 lent support to the abolitionist cause.”³⁹ The Committee of the Aborigines Protection Society was at the forefront of the campaign, sometimes

communicating with Lord Carnarvon, then Secretary of State for Colonies, on the subject of the slave trade/slavery in the Gold Coast and also writing to newspapers.⁴⁰ The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society also presented a petition to the House of Commons that called attention to the existence of slavery in the Gold Coast and the necessity of putting an end to it.⁴¹ Dumett argued that the abolition exercise that followed was due primarily to the campaign activities in England.⁴² The colonial administration passed two ordinances at the same time (December 17, 1874): an ordinance abolishing slave-dealing and an ordinance for emancipating people in slave holding.

Administratively, the lead-up to the 1874 emancipation ordinance was documented in correspondence between Lord Carnarvon and George Strahan, then the new Colonial Governor of the Gold Coast.⁴³ Carnarvon discussed several possible ways to abolish domestic slavery and argued that the time was ripe for abolition – due to the defeat of the Ashanti – in a detailed disquisition addressed to the Governor of Gold Coast.⁴⁴ Strahan opted for one of the options discussed by Carnarvon—a model termed by researchers as the “India model,” because the same method had been used in India in the early part of the century.⁴⁵ As Carnarvon described this model, it entailed “simply forbidding slave [holding] and providing no court should take cognizance of any right over the liberty or person of a servant, otherwise than under the ordinary rules of English law applicable to contracts for service between free men.” This, Carnarvon explained, amounted to “no disturbance of labour relations,” as “where the slaves were content, [they] went on serving”; hence there was “no excitement and no reason for compensation.”⁴⁶ This method theoretically allowed slavery to continue; it posed problems only when slaves were not satisfied with their masters. Such dissatisfaction, the Colonial Governor assumed, stemmed from harsh treatment; he thus expected masters to start treating slaves with more care following the introduction of the new model:

The knowledge on the masters’ part that they have no legal hold over these people may have the effect of securing for them an immunity from any ill-treatment calculated to cause discontent.⁴⁷

In adopting this model, Governor Strahan also contemplated the question of compensation and stated that any form of indemnity would be excluded, primarily because there were not enough financial resources to administer the compensation. He added that supplying such compensation would also be administratively infeasible, because the number of slaves in each region and their distribution across regions were not known, making it impossible to identify repeated claims for compensation.⁴⁸ The Governor also argued that the British had already compensated slave masters more than enough by saving them from the Ashantis during the last campaign.⁴⁹ This argument was flawed, however, as fear of the Ashantis was localized to just one part of the Gold Coast, whereas the ordinance covered the entire Gold Coast. The

possibility of creating a set of measures to assist the freed slaves was not considered. In essence, the emancipation model conceived by Carnarvon and Governor Strahan was a continuation of the British approach of gradualism: it avoided any formal declaration of emancipation.

Governor Strahan anticipated that slaves would not immediately leave their masters in large numbers, not only because of the “influence of habit and established associations” but also because of “the difficulty in obtaining a livelihood.”⁵⁰ The colonial administration did nothing to assist slaves in seeking freedom, as this might have encouraged more slaves to leave their masters, which would not have been in accordance with the administration’s strategy. Instead, in his final proclamation, Governor Strahan encouraged slaves not to leave their masters.⁵¹ He also called on slave masters to treat their slaves well so that they would have no reason to leave.⁵² In the build-up to the ordinance, the Governor had anticipated that most of the slaves who left their masters would face difficulties in securing their livelihoods and thus would probably return to their masters, and that their hardship in the interval would discourage other slaves from seeking their freedom:

a large number, will fail, and return to seek again the means of subsistence on their masters’ farms or plantations, to talk perhaps of the privations they have undergone in the interval, which would prevent the remainder of the household from making a change until they could clearly see their way to bettering their condition.⁵³

All of this explains why the government did nothing to assist freed slaves in contrast with other emancipation cases. Brew saw this approach to emancipation as deeply ineffective and argued that slavery should be abolished once and for all. His arguments, he claimed, “utter[ed] the sentiments of the whole community.”⁵⁴

Brew’s Response

When Governor Strahan called for the October 1874 meeting with the kings and chiefs of the Fante region at which he planned to inform them of the Queen’s decision to abolish domestic slavery, he kept the reason for the proposed meeting secret. This led to speculation among educated natives of the Gold Coast. Brew took to the local press to discuss the prospective gathering of the region’s traditional rulers, expressing his views on slavery and vision for emancipation and abolition. Although “no one has any idea [of] the cause of the gathering,” he wrote, two possible reasons stood out for him. The first related to the geographical extent and limits of the colony, which he felt were too vague and ill-defined. The second was the “slave question,” which, according to Brew, was “uppermost in the minds of all.” He stated that “the general opinion is that it is principally, if not solely, on that account that the chiefs and kings have been assembled here.”⁵⁵ This article

went on to reveal not only Brew's abolitionist impulse but also his support for a particular model of emancipation—one that would solve the issue of slavery. After guessing that the meeting would address the problem of slavery, he added that he hoped that that the government had found a clear solution that would “not leave scope for the existence of slavery in any shape, degree or form”.⁵⁶ Africans at this time were keenly aware that the British operated a poorly defined administration and of the many resulting local problems. Brew saw the question of slavery as one that “must be dealt with most completely and thoroughly, so as not to lead to misapprehension in the minds of the ignorant and admit of evasion by the more intelligent of the community.”⁵⁷ This forthright position was unlike the India model which had been designed specifically to allow domestic slavery to continue by encouraging slaves not to seek freedom, at least initially. Brew's position, in contrast, was that anything short of total freedom was merely “trifling with the question.”⁵⁸

A month before the publication of his article (that is, a month before the Governor called for a meeting with the traditional rulers), Brew had entered into a debate with the editor of *The African Times*, Ferdinand Fitzgerald, over the question of emancipation/abolition of domestic slavery in the Gold Coast.⁵⁹ In the August 29, 1874 edition of *The African Times*, Fitzgerald argued that abolition should proceed in the Gold Coast without the provision of compensation for slave owners. He opined that the compensation demanded by and paid to slave owners in the West Indies following the abolition of slavery had been justified, because slavery in the West Indies was an institution that had developed under the direct guardianship of the state and had a labor value due to the use of slave labor on plantations, which was not the case in the Gold Coast. In the Gold Coast, Fitzgerald argued that the absence of British state support for domestic slavery and the lack of a plantation system like that of the West Indies made compensation an unsuitable approach. Fitzgerald also noted that slavery in the Gold Coast had no plantation use that would enable the state to set a concrete value on the loss of labor following abolition.⁶⁰ Brew's response to Fitzgerald's position in *The African Times* reveals that Brew understood contemporary domestic slavery in the Gold Coast as a by-product of the transatlantic slave trade that had brought slaves to the West Indies.⁶¹ Brew argued that the protection of the state in the West Indies extended to the Gold Coast, because some of the slaves that had been taken to the West Indies were originally from the Gold Coast, where the British had been forced to build forts to protect the trade. “It was as necessary,” Brew wrote, “to protect the source whence the labor was obtained, as to protect the labor when so obtained; the only pity is that when slavery was abolished in the West Indies some more decided step was not taken as regards all Settlements in which British rule was predominant, especially in those parts where it had fostered, encouraged, supported and protected it.”⁶²

Brew saw Fitzgerald's argument against compensation for slave owners as part of a broader argument in favor of gradual emancipation based on the

assumption that those opposed to compensation believed that slaves should be freed gradually rather than all at once. Brew argued that such “gradual extinction” faced “difficulties arising from the [fact that] the vested interests of people are not lessened with time, [but] strengthened.”⁶³ By this, Brew meant that the interest of slaveholders in holding slaves would not lessen over time. He further maintained that the full emancipation of domestic slaves should be the ultimate goal, without allowing the practice to continue but argued that there was a cost associated to it that could not be avoided: “by all means emancipate the slaves; compensate the owners; and let us date from that period the era when the chains of slavery shall be no more known on the Gold Coast.”⁶⁴ Additionally, Brew argued that while education would tilt public opinion in favor of the extinction of slavery over time, some pecuniary costs would still be incurred for issues other than compensation. Here we find the full thrust of Brew’s argument, calling not only for compensation for slave owners but also for programs to help the freed slaves. He expanded on this argument in subsequent writings, suggesting that the colonial government should purchase land from traditional rulers to be given to the freed slaves, allowing them to be productive.⁶⁵ Fitzgerald, in contrast, did not discuss the question of creating a scheme for freed slaves.

In advocating total emancipation, Brew saw himself as following in the footsteps of the celebrated abolitionists of Britain’s anti-slavery movement. Highlighting the hypocrisy of anti-compensation arguments against compensation, he asked, “what has become of the spirit that animated your Wilberforce, your Clarkson, your Buxton? [...] it is clear that the same spirit no longer pervades her foremost men; they will truckle and haggle over the expenditure of a twentieth part of what their fathers expended on the attainment of that which they profess to abhor.”⁶⁶ He argued that abolitionists like Wilberforce had fully understood the cost of abolition such as the loss of the economic benefits of transatlantic slavery and the cost of paying compensation to slave owners after the 1834 abolition. According to Brew, the cost of abolition also included that of setting up a program for the transition to a post-slavery society. He was troubled by the idea that emancipated slaves should remain under the influence of their masters—the desired outcome of the British emancipation model, which involved neither compensation nor post-emancipation measures. For Brew, it would be unfair to place freed slaves at the mercy of their masters in the absence of substitute livelihoods.⁶⁷ Here we find deeper insights into the question of the mildness of slavery. While the Colonial Governor assumed that most slaves would choose to remain with their masters if they were well treated, Brew argued that gradualism was structured so that slaves would have no choice but to remain with their masters or to become criminals, creating problems for society. For Brew, the issue was not maltreatment but the social stigma associated with being called a slave.⁶⁸ He argued that “people here are not fond of being called slaves,” and contended that once

emancipated by the government, no slave would return to his master's service if he knew that his master had been compensated and he himself had a means of survival.⁶⁹ Brew saw the argument against paying compensation and establishing a transition program to support former slaves as a set of "excuses set up for the purpose of avoiding the expenditure of public money on a matter on which the public have made up their minds to see accompanied".⁷⁰ Nonetheless, Brew called for "delicate handling" of the slavery question; while the public might be willing to support emancipation alone, emancipation without compensation would lead to an explosion of public feeling.⁷¹

Brew set out his position before it was confirmed that the British would indeed avoid paying compensation to slave owners or develop a program for former slaves: this became obvious at the meeting held between Governor Strahan and the traditional rulers, at which the Governor made known the intention of the Queen to abolish slave trading/holding in the Gold Coast. In his commentary on the meeting, Brew not only criticized the organization of the meeting and the lack of negotiation with the traditional rulers but also asked "why these half measures?"⁷² In the meeting, as Strahan himself reported, the Governor refused the traditional rulers' request to consult amongst themselves before responding to the Governor's statement, thereby denying them input into the abolition process.⁷³ This became the focal point of Brew's criticism; he stated several times that "we are under a paternalistic government" and questioned the Governor's decision to ask the traditional rulers to travel from their villages to Cape Coast only to refuse their input.⁷⁴ At this point, not knowing that the colonial regime was indeed preparing an ordinance, Brew turned his attention to the need to create an ordinance for abolition rather than merely holding a meeting: "why not pass an Ordinance at once abolishing slavery and discharging all pawns instead of [finessing] over the point?"⁷⁵ He argued that the failure to create a program to accommodate the freed slaves was a mistake that would be discovered before long. "Slaves who have thus obtained their freedom," he argued, "will be pariahs of society," because they "will not be able to find home nor resting place as they will be driven from village to village, from plantation to plantation, until they find their emancipation an incubus on them, and some of them as they travel inland will find themselves transported across the frontier and resold to the Ashantis from whom they were originally bought."⁷⁶ While the British Governor had also anticipated this problem, the Governor came to the conclusion that the slaves would return to their former masters.⁷⁷ Brew, on the other hand, urged the government to "purchase land or acquire some territory by treaty with the kings and chiefs on which it could keep, maintain and support the slaves emancipated by it, before it talks of the abolition of slavery."⁷⁸

For Brew, the British wanted to claim to have abolished domestic slavery in the Gold Coast without following through. Brew fell short of accusing the British of not being abolitionists or of not being truly concerned about the

emancipation of domestic slaves; instead, he accused them of being too niggardly and willing to impoverish the Gold Coast for the sake of carrying out a pet idea.⁷⁹ On the slavery question, Brew claimed to be uttering “the sentiments of the whole community; perhaps not half so forcedly as they would wish.”⁸⁰ However, this is difficult to verify; however, some correspondents wrote in to criticize not only the absence of compensation for slave owners but also the absence of a program of jobs or land for former slaves.⁸¹ The Governor would later argue that it was the “educated slave holder” who held some of the positions espoused by Brew, especially regarding compensation.⁸² As already hinted, according to the report of the meeting convened by Governor Strahan, the Governor told the traditional rulers (representing slave masters) that although they should stop buying slaves, they could keep on holding slaves if the slaves remained satisfied.⁸³ This was understood by the traditional rulers to mean that slaves could only leave their masters if they were maltreated, which was basically the same position as that taken on domestic slavery in the 1860s and early 1870s, when the British administration intervened only in cases of maltreatment. When this claim was reported in the English press, Carnarvon and Governor Strahan sought to limit the damage by stating that the claim that slaves could only leave their master if there were proof of maltreatment was erroneous.⁸⁴ The Governor blamed educated natives for sowing the seeds of the misunderstanding.⁸⁵

The people of the Gold Coast wrote three petitions to the Queen weeks after the Ordinance (two from traditional rulers and one from the Ladies of Gold Coast Protectorate) condemning the manner in which the emancipation was being conducted and requesting compensation for the emancipation of slaves.⁸⁶ In submitting the petition to the Colonial office, Governor Strahan suggested to the Colonial Secretary that the petitions originated from the educated natives seeking to protect their own interests (that is, slave owners looking to continue slavery), and advised the Colonial Secretary to ignore the petitions.⁸⁷ One of the cruxes of the Governor’s argument that the petitions came from educated natives was that traditional rulers would have been unable to attain the level of English contained in the petitions. This was an opportunistic argument, because there was a well-established tradition of traditional rulers’ employing educated natives to help them write letters and petitions. In the edition that marked the one-year anniversary of the *Gold Coast Times*, Brew responded to the claim that the petitions had been written by educated natives and did not reflect the positions of kings and chiefs. For Brew, it was natural for traditional rulers to “seek to have their views expressed in such English as would be intelligible [...] and because this is done we have Captain Strahan [the Governor] libelling a class of educated natives, numbers of whom are in no way inferior to him in all that makes a man, and some of whom are in no way his inferiors as regards intellectual attainment [...] Were the kings and chiefs to forward to Her Majesty some unintelligible

rubbish written in the Anglo-Saxon tongue before it could be accepted as emanating from them? [...] what other medium of communication could they have had on such an important question than the educated natives?”⁸⁸ Brew did not deny that educated natives had written the petitions on behalf of the traditional rulers, but he argued that this was normal practice. It would later be revealed, as was suspected by some at the time, that Brew himself had helped the traditional rulers to write the petitions.⁸⁹

Governor Strahan also suggested that the educated natives who authored the petition possess a “smattering of education”, they are “without industry or character” and have “no real influence either with the native rulers ... or with the population.”⁹⁰ Brew may have taken Strahan’s comments somewhat personally. “As a rule,” Brew responded, “the educated native occupies a position in his country which is not filled in Great Britain by the fifth-rate officials (of course, there are exceptions) generally imported here.”⁹¹ For Brew, however, the main issue was the lack of local involvement in the laws and administration of the Gold Coast. Indeed, while arguing that the petitions represented the voice of traditional rulers, he insisted that many educated natives “could occupy stools as chiefs and kings ... if this is what is required before they can be held to be entitled to a voice in the affairs of their country, then the Government had better let it be known, and it will then be discovered that they are not without authority.”⁹² This discussion is important for researchers seeking to understand the trajectory of James Brew’s activities in the post-abolition period, when he first added the appellation “Prince” to his name.⁹³

The 1874 emancipation ordinance created numerous social and economic problems in the Gold Coast. Most of the resulting economic problems were related to the depression of trade owing to the lack of portage. Therefore, some supporters of the idea of abolition were highly critical of the form taken by emancipation. Educated natives called attention to the fact that the government had not created a transitional program or apprenticeship scheme for freed slaves to allow economic activities to continue as before. Some of these natives added that despite their criticism, they were indeed abolitionists and not opposed to emancipation as an idea; as one educated native put it, “on the contrary, we are thankful for it, for we sincerely affirm that it [slavery] has been one of the greatest curses of Africa. But we most certainly hold that unless something is done trade will continue to dwindle until it is entirely ruined.”⁹⁴ However, these important nuances were not registered by the British Colonial Office; educated natives who criticised the emancipation exercise were viewed simply as slaveholders mourning the loss of their slaves. The depression of trade, which was mostly trade with the Ashantis for which the Fantes were the middlemen, may have been partly a function of the internal conflict in the Ashanti region that followed the defeat of the Ashantis in 1874.⁹⁵ However, the emancipation was blamed instead.

In the post emancipation years, Brew was at the forefront of the argument that the emancipation model of 1874 was the origin of so many problems in the Gold Coast. For Brew, the problems created by the emancipation ordinance were due to the absence of domestic participation in the process. His writings against the 1874 emancipation could easily be construed—as they were by the colonial administration—as opposing the abolition of domestic slavery. Again, we find Brew arguing for local participation to solve problems created by emancipation. He proposed a deputation scheme as the solution to these problems, envisioning that local representatives would liaise directly with the Colonial Office.⁹⁶

In a deputation meeting attended by several traditional rulers and convened by Brew, he argued as follows:

Prince Brew invited you here this afternoon to come and elect men who could go down to Anumabo as our representatives to meet with the kings and chiefs; for at that meeting, the representatives of each town in the country must be present. So these men [...] will represent Cape Coast at the meeting. When the meeting is held, the representatives will consider about the grievous manner in which our Rulers [the colonial administration] here deal with us; how they deprive us of our rights; how they deprive us of our privileges [...] Take for example the subject of emancipation of slaves in this Colony. The authorities in England did not say that our slaves should be emancipated as they were. They did not say so at all. [...] When the [emancipation] happened and knowing the nature of the English people, prince Brew advised the kings and chiefs to send a memorial to the Queen [...] It went through the Governor, who subsequently misrepresented to the Colonial Office the facts therein stated. Hence no good results issued from that action.⁹⁷

Brew also connected the emancipation exercise to the rise of poverty in the Gold Coast. He stated that he did not oppose emancipation itself but the manner in which it had been carried out in the Gold Coast, since it was not accompanied by a program to support the freed slaves.

Now this enactment as to the emancipation of slaves extended to Lagos also; but the English rulers subsequently [passed] an ordinance there by which persons are taken under a system as apprenticeship. Why is that boon denied us? [...] On this account the people of Lagos do not complain of the emancipation of their slaves [...] Why can we not take apprentices under a like enactment?⁹⁸

For the colonial establishment, the deputation scheme was nothing other than a surreptitious attempt to revive domestic slavery which thus failed. At this point, Brew was writing in the post-emancipation era, when his activities called attention to some of the negative effects of emancipation, especially in the context of the creation of other seemingly disconnected laws by the British. When the colonial administration created the basis for a land law in 1896, Brew was at the forefront of the debate; the anger he had felt during the abolition era resurfaced and he called for domestic participation through a deputation scheme.⁹⁹

He called for the deputation to be sent to England to present the grievance instead of going through the Colonial Governor stationed in the Gold Coast. The deputation that was eventually sent to England formed the basis of the Gold Coast Aborigines' Rights Protection Society.

Conclusion

The British scheme to abolish domestic slavery in the Gold Coast did not involve compensation for the loss of slaves or a program to provide former slaves with means of making a living. Instead, the Colonial Governor anticipated that most slaves would remain with their masters and those who left would be forced to return due to hardship. The British did not consult with local Africans when preparing the abolition law. James Hutton Brew, on the other hand, argued for the payment of compensation to slaveholders and urged the colonial government to acquire land for freed slaves before abolishing domestic slavery. At the core of Brew's political and other campaign activities was his belief that the policies created by the British were detached from the lives of the people of the Gold Coast. His stance on abolition was an expression of this criticism. Brew also argued that the emancipation process should be conducted in a way that admitted no ambiguity. For Brew, "the problem had better be left untouched" than the half-hearted solution that was proposed.¹⁰⁰ Brew may have anticipated the British model of abolition, which he linked to the ill-defined nature and extent of the British territory in the Gold Coast. After the publication of the emancipation ordinance, Brew became one of the biggest critics of the British model of emancipation. He advised kings and chiefs to campaign against the emancipation of their slaves without compensation by sending petitions to the Queen. Although Brew seems to have been more concerned about emancipation and the transition to a post-slavery society than the British, the British colonial administration portrayed some of his arguments as tied to those of slave owners trying to retain their positions.¹⁰¹

There are some important similarities and differences between Brew and contemporaneous African abolitionists. Speaking in abstract terms, Africanus Horton criticised domestic slavery in the Gold Coast and set out a vision for abolition.¹⁰² Like Horton, Brew felt that the duty to abolish domestic slavery lay with the British, but he argued for consultation with African representatives. For Brew, the abolition of the transatlantic slave trade and the subsequent abolition of slavery in the West Indies were incomplete, because the British had not also taken such steps in the Gold Coast, where it had fostered, encouraged, supported, and protected a trade that created a domestic economy. This view was also held by Carl Christian Reindorf who felt that slavery in the Gold Coast started in 1517 and ended in 1874.¹⁰³ Like Horton, Brew thought that providing access to land for freed slaves was essential to the abolition of domestic slavery

in the Gold Coast. However, Brew was much more nuanced and situational in his writings. For example, he discussed slavery precisely when there was a debate about models of emancipation. His argument for compensation was developed in response to arguments against compensation in *The African Times*. A few years after the emancipation ordinance, which had created numerous economic problems including the depression of trade, Brew recommended establishing an apprenticeship system similar to that established in Lagos following the abolition of slavery.¹⁰⁴

Notes

1. *Gold Coast Times Editorial* October 20, 1874, 50.
2. PP 1875 (C.1139), Inclosure in No. 11, Governor Strahan to Earl of Carnarvon, November 3, 1874.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Shipping and Mercantile Gazette* "Slavery on the Gold Coast" February 8, 1875, 2.
5. PP 1875 (C.1139), No. 5 Governor Strahan to Earl of Carnarvon, Cape Coast, Castle September 19, 1874.
6. Raymond E. Dumett "Pressure Groups, Bureaucracy, and the Decision-making Process: The case of slavery abolition and colonial expansion in the Gold Coast, 1874." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* (1981), 9, no. 2, 193–215.
7. *Ibid.*, 205.
8. See Kwabena O. Akurang-Parry "We Shall Rejoice to See the Day when Slavery shall Cease to Exist": The Gold Coast Times, the African Intelligentsia, and Abolition in the Gold Coast." *History in Africa* (2004), 31, 19–42; Steffen Runkel "The Perspectives of African Elites on Slavery and Abolition on the Gold Coast (1860–1900): Newspapers as Sources." In Jana Gohrisch and Ellen Grünkemeier, *Postcolonial Studies across the Disciplines*, pp. 243–261 (New York: Brill, 2013); see also Steffen Runkel *Von Sklaverei und Freiheit: Afrikanische Initiativen zur Abolition an der Goldküste (1841-1897)* (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag GmbH, 2019).
9. Akurang-Parry "We Shall Rejoice to See the Day when Slavery Shall Cease to Exist."
10. See Peter Haenger "Reindorf and the Basel Mission in the 1860s. A Young Man Stands up to Mission Pressure." In Paul Jenkins, *The Recovery of the West African Past: African Pastors and African History in the Nineteenth Century—CC Reindorf & Samuel Johnson* (Basel: Baseler Afrika Bibliographien, 1998), pp. 19–29; Dumett, "Pressure Groups, Bureaucracy, and the Decision-making Process"; Gerald M. McSheffrey "Slavery, Indentured Servitude, Legitimate Trade and the Impact of Abolition in the Gold Coast, 1874–1901: a Reappraisal." *The Journal of African History* (1983), 24, no. 3, 349–368; Trevor R. Getz, *Slavery and Reform in West Africa: Toward Emancipation in Nineteenth-century Senegal and the Gold Coast* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2004).
11. Akurang-Parry "We Shall Rejoice to see the Day When Slavery shall Cease to Exist."
12. Steffen Runkel *Von Sklaverei und Freiheit: Afrikanische Initiativen zur Abolition an der Goldküste (1841-1897)* (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag GmbH, 2019).
13. Steffen Runkel "The Perspectives of African Elites on Slavery and Abolition on the Gold Coast (1860–1900)."
14. Margaret A. Priestley. *West African Trade and Coast Society: a Family Study (West African History S.)* (London: Oxford University Press, 1969).

15. Margaret A. Priestley. "Richard Brew: An Eighteenth-century Trader at Anomabu." *Transactions of the Historical Society of Ghana* (1959), 4, no. 1, 29–46; Priestley. "The emergence of an elite: a case study of a West Coast family." In P. C. Lloyd, ed. *The New Elites of Tropical Africa* (Oxford: Routledge, 2018), pp. 88–103; Priestley, *West African Trade and Coast Society*.
16. John Hope Smith Governor of the Committee of Merchants of the Gold Coast from 1817 to 1822, who was a passionate anti-slavery advocate, attempted to *organise* the capture of Samuel Kanto Brew who was illicitly trading slaves after the 1807 abolition.
17. Randy J. Sparks *Where the Negroes are Masters* (London: Harvard University Press, 2014.)
18. Augustus Lavinus Casely-Hayford *A Genealogical History of Cape Coast Stool Families* (Doctoral dissertation, SOAS University of London, 1992), p. 194; Priestley, *West African Trade and Coast Society*.
19. PP 1873 (171) Enclosures in No. 1. C. S. Salmon to Sir Arthur E. Kennedy Government House, Cape Coast, December 10, 1871. Casely-Hayford, *A Genealogical History of Cape Coast Stool Families*, p. 168.
20. On the Fante Confederacy see Francis Agbodeka. "The Fanti Confederacy 1865–69: An Enquiry Into the Origins, Nature and Extent of an Early West African Protest Movement." *Transactions of the Historical Society of Ghana* (1964), 7, 82–123. On Brew and the Fante Confederacy, see Casely-Hayford, *A Genealogical History of Cape Coast Stool Families*, p. 168.
21. Priestley, *West African Trade and Coast Society*, p. 163,
22. James Brew and Horton had a complex relationship in the 1870s; for example, Brew was listed as one of the financial supporters of Horton's book in 1870 (*Letters of the Political Condition of the Gold Coast*) but by 1874 Brew was sued by Horton for outstanding medical debts. Brew, however, appeared in Horton's will. (Ray G Jenkins. "Gold Coast Historian and Their Pursuit of the Gold Coast Pasts: 1882–1917." PhD Dissertation., The University of Birmingham, 1985).
23. PP 1873 (126), (H) "At the First Meeting of the National Assembly of the Fanti Confederacy, held at Mankessim on the 18th day of November 1871, it was unanimously resolved and agreed upon." Enclosure in No. 1 C. S. Salmon to Sir Arthur E. Kennedy, Government House, Cape Coast, December 10, 1871.
24. Priestley, *West African Trade and Coast Society*.
25. *African Times* "Constitution of the Fanti Confederation (for delivering copies of which to the Acting Administrator Salmon, at Cape Coast, to be forwarded to the Administrator-in Chief and Right Hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies, for their approval, Messrs. Davidson and Brew, and Amisshah are thrust into prison on a charge of high treason!)" January 23, 1872, 77. See also *African Times* "Attack on Fanti Confederation and its Members" December 30, 1872, 67; *African Times* "Other Imprisonment and Arbitrary Search for Papers at Cape Coast" February 23, 1872, 92–93.
26. PP 1873 (126), Enclosure 1, in No. 19. "Minutes by Governor Pope Hennessy, Administrator in Chief of the West Africa Settlements." Castle of Elmina. April 11, 1872
27. PP 1873 (126), Enclosure in No. 1 C. S. Salmon to Sir Arthur E. Kennedy, Government House, Cape Coast, December 10, 1871.
28. Ray G. Jenkins. *Gold Coast Historian and their Pursuit of the Gold Coast Pasts: 1882–1917* (PhD dissertation, University of Birmingham, 1985); Sylvanus A. Ekwelie and Dympna Edoga-Ugwuoju. "Ownership Patterns of Ghanaian Newspapers: An Historical Perspective." *Gazette* (Leiden, Netherlands) (1985), 35, no. 1, 49–59; Stephanie Newell. "Literary Activism in Colonial Ghana: A Newspaper-novel by 'a Native'." *Current Writing: Text and Reception in Southern Africa* (2001) 13, no. 2, 20–30.

29. Stephanie Newell "Literary Activism in Colonial Ghana," 20–30.
30. Priestley, West African Trade and Coast Society.
31. On Brew and the anti-land bills see Casely-Hayford. *A Genealogical History of Cape Coast Stool Families*, p. 194.
32. *Gold Coast Echo* August 23, 1888.
33. Casely-Hayford, *A Genealogical History of Cape Coast Stool Families*, p. 195; *Gold Coast Aborigines*, February 26, 1898.
34. For the questioning see *Gold Coast Aborigines*, 'Notes Taken by a Friend at a Meeting Held by District Commissioner Henry Vroom C.M.G. with King and Chiefs of Abura on the 8th instant' February 26, 1898.
35. Educated natives who openly condemned domestic slavery and called for its abolition, such as Africanus Horton, were seen as quixotic and were usually unable to collaborate directly with kings and chiefs, as many kings and chiefs considered the system of domestic slavery to be vital to their positions.
36. George Shepperson "Abolitionism and African Political Thought." *Transition* (1964), 12, 22–26.
37. The defeat of the Ashantis was marked by the Treaty of Fomena in March 1874, in which, among other things, the Ashantis promised to halt the *practice* of human sacrifice; see W. E. F. Ward "Britain and Ashanti, 1874–1896." *Transactions of the Historical Society of Ghana* (1974), 15, no. 2, 131–164.
38. This was reflected in the *Draft Proclamation Defining the Nature and Extent of the Queen's Jurisdiction on the Gold Coast of 1874*, in which the British redefined their power and jurisdiction to extend to, among other things, "the abolition of slave trading" and "measures with regard to domestic slavery and pawning." See PP 1875 (C.1139), No. 2, The Earl of Carnarvon to Governor Strahan, August 20, 1874.
39. Dumett "Pressure Groups, Bureaucracy, and the Decision-making Process." For articles and editorials in the English press, see *Henley Advertiser*, "Domestic Slavery on the Gold Coast" June 6, 1874, 5; *Dundee Courier* "The Gold Coast and slavery" June 30, 1874, 3–5; *Manchester Courier and Lancashire General Advertiser* June 30, 1874, 5; *Bradford Daily Telegraph* June 30, 1874, 1; *Pall Mall Gazette* June 30, 1874, 1; *Belfast Telegraph* June 30, 1874; *John O'Groats Journal* June 18, 1874 8; *Sunderland Daily Echo and Shipping Gazette* June 13, 1874; *Morning Post* June 12, 1874, 7; *Edinburgh Evening News* June 30, 1874, 3; *Cork Constitution* June 30, 1874; *Bolton Evening News* June 30, 1874; *Daily News (London)* "Slavery at the Gold Coast" June 29, 1874, 2; *Newry Reporter* "Slavery at Cape Coast" June 17, 1874, 3; *North British Daily Mail* June 30, 1874, 5; *York Herald* June 23, 1874; *Burton Chronicle* "Slavery on the Gold Coast" July 2, 1874, 8; *Dundee Courier* July 3, 1874, 2; *Buckingham Advertiser and Free Press* July 4, 1874, 7; *Kilburn Times* July 4, 1874; *Nottinghamshire Guardian* July 3, 1874, 3; *South London Chronicle* July 4, 1874; *Leeds Times* July 4, 1874.
40. *African Times* "Slavery on the Gold Coast" August 29, 1874, 16; see also *York Herald* "Slavery at the Gold Coast" June 30, 1874.
41. See *Leeds Mercury*, petition from the Anti-Slavery Society presented to the House of Commons on July 1, 1874, 7.
42. Dumett "Pressure Groups, Bureaucracy, and the Decision-making Process."
43. This correspondence is available in PP 1875 (C.1139) Nos 1–22.
44. See PP 1875 (C.1139), No. 3, Earl of Carnarvon to Officer Administering the Government of the Gold Coast, Downing Street, August 21, 1874.
45. Kwabena O. Akurang-Parry "Slavery and Abolition in the Gold Coast: Colonial Modes of Emancipation and African Initiatives." *Ghana Studies* (1998), 1, no. 8, 11–34.

46. PP 1875 (C.1139), No. 3, Earl of Carnarvon to Officer Administering the Government of the Gold Coast, Downing Street, August 21, 1874.
47. PP 1875 (C.1139), No. 5 Governor Strahan to Earl of Carnarvon, Cape Coast Castle September 19, 1874.
48. PP 1875 (C.1139), No. 5 Governor Strahan to Earl of Carnarvon, Cape Coast Castle September 19, 1874.
49. Ibid.
50. PP 1875 (C.1139), No. 5 Governor Strahan to Earl of Carnarvon, Cape Coast Castle September 19, 1874.
51. PP 1875 (C.1139), Inclosure 4 in No. 21 Proclamation.
52. See PP 1875 (C.1139), No. 11 Governor Strahan to Earl of Carnarvon November 3, 1874.
53. PP 1875 (C.1139), No. 5 Governor Strahan to Earl of Carnarvon, Cape Coast Castle September 19, 1874.
54. Gold Coast Times October 20, 1874, 51.
55. Gold Coast Times Editorial October 24, 1874, 50.
56. Ibid
57. Ibid.
58. Ibid.
59. See Steffen Runkel “The Perspectives of African Elites on Slavery and Abolition on the Gold Coast (1860–1900).”
60. African Times “Slavery on the Gold Coast” August 29, 1874, 19–20.
61. This *connection* arose again in his writing about eight years after the abolition of 1874; see Gold Coast Times “The Future of Gold Coast,” *serialized* from May 27, 1882 to December 23, 1882.
62. Gold Coast Times September 24, 1874, 46.
63. Gold Coast Times September 24, 1874, 47.
64. Ibid.
65. Gold Coast Times November 30, 1874, 53.
66. Gold Coast Times October 20, 1874, 51.
67. Ibid.
68. The stigma of being a slave or the descendant of a slave had always existed in the Gold Coast. In the years following the emancipation ordinance, there were cases of individuals’ applying to court to seek redress for being called descendants of slaves; see Gold Coast Times October 22, 1881, 2.
69. Gold Coast Times October 20, 1874, 51.
70. Ibid
71. Brew rightly judged that such a problem (that is, that emancipation without compensation would lead to problems) had been anticipated by the British; “hence the prohibition of the importation of arms and munitions of war.” However, Brew regarded this precaution as “ridiculous, for the people would never result to arms.” Gold Coast Times October 20, 1874, 51. The Earl of Carnarvon had proposed that the West India Regiment should remain in the Gold Coast in case of problems and ordered the Governor to use the rest of the regiment in Sierra Leone in case of emergency (see PP 1875 (C.1139), No. 6 Earl of Carnarvon to Governor Strahan Downing Street, October 28, 1874).
72. Gold Coast Times November 30, 1874, 53.
73. PP 1875 (C.1139), No. 11 Governor Strahan to Earl of Carnarvon, Cape Coast Castle November 3, 1874.
74. Gold Coast Times November 30, 1874, 53.

75. Ibid.
76. Ibid.
77. PP 1875 (C.1139), No. 5 Governor Strahan to Earl of Carnarvon, Cape Coast Castle September 19, 1874.
78. The Gold Coast Times November 30, 1874, 53.
79. Gold Coast Times October 20, 1874, 51.
80. Ibid
81. A correspondent wrote: "Let the Government pay us for our slaves, and let employment be found for them, and I am convinced very few of us will grumble." Gold Coast Times November 3, 1874, 53.
82. See PP 1875 (C.1159), No. 1. Governor Strahan to Earl of Carnarvon January 3, 1875.
83. See PP 1875 (C.1139), No. 11. Governor Strahan to Earl of Carnarvon November 3, 1874.
84. See Gold Coast Times "Abolition of Slavery" February 23, 1875, 67.
85. See PP 1875 (C.1159), No. 1. Governor Strahan to Earl of Carnarvon January 3, 1875.
86. See PP 1875 (C.1159) Nos 1, 2, 3 and 4.
87. See PP 1875 (C.1159), No. 1. Governor Strahan to Earl of Carnarvon January 3, 1875.
88. Gold Coast Times March 31, 1875, 70.
89. Western Echo, July 14, 1886, 3.
90. See PP 1875 (C.1159), No. 1. Governor Strahan to Earl of Carnarvon January 3, 1875.
91. Gold Coast Times March 31, 1875, 70.
92. Ibid.
93. Gold Coast Echo August 23, 1888.
94. Gold Coast Times October 15, 1881 "Trade with Ashanti and the Interior."
95. Gold Coast Times November 17, 1877; Western Echo July 14, 1886, 10; Gold Coast Echo July 26, 1888, 5; Gold Coast Times July 9, 1881, 2; Gold Coast Times October 15, 1881, 2; Gold Coast Times December 3, 1881, 2; Gold Coast Times September 7, 1883, 2.
96. See The Western Echo June 16, 1886, 5, "The Deputation: 'Now Or Never'. Our Manifesto"; The Western Echo August 7, 1886, 4 "The Deputation Scheme Grand Meeting at Accra"; The Western Echo August 24, 1886, 4; The Western Echo December 23, 1886, "From Our Correspondence" 4; The Western Echo January 27, 1887, 6 "The Deputation Scheme"; The Western Echo June 30, 1887, 6 "Representation in Council to the Editor of the 'Western Echo'"; The Western Echo November 30, 1887, 16 "To the Editor of the 'Western Echo'"; The Western Echo May 21, 1886, 5
97. Western Echo July 14, 1886, 3.
98. Ibid., 6.
99. Casely-Hayford A Genealogical History of Cape Coast Stool Families, p. 194; PRO CO 96/267: Letter of J. H. Brew to Marquis of Ripon, London (1895) March 22, 4; Gold Coast Express July 8, 1897.
100. Gold Coast Times Editorial October 20, 1874, 50.
101. PP 1875 (C.1159), No. 1. Governor Strahan to Earl of Carnarvon January 3, 1875.
102. James Africanus Horton West African Countries And Peoples,, British And Native. With The Requirements Necessary For Establishing That Self Government Recommended By The Committee Of The House Of Commons, 1865; And A Vindication Of The African Race.." (1868). (London : W. J. Johnson, 121, Fleet Street.),
103. Carl Christian Reindorf, History of the Gold Coast and Asante, Based on Traditions and Historical Facts: Comprising a Period of More than Three Centuries from about 1500 to 1860. (Cape Coast:Gold Coast District Book Depot 1895).
104. Western Echo July 14, 1886, 3.

Acknowledgments

I am very grateful to Benedetta Rossi and Michelle Liebst for their detailed feedback and advice on a previous version of this article. I am also grateful to Professor Gad Heuman for his feedback and guidance throughout the review process.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

The research for this article received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Horizon2020 Research and Innovation Programme (grant agreement No. 885418)

Notes on contributor

Michael Ehis Odijie is a Research Fellow, Department of History, University College London, Gower Street, London, WC1E 6BT, UK.