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Introduction

It would be an honor for any historian of Africa to write a chapter of a Festschrift in honor of David Henige. Among African historians of my generation, trained in both Africa and overseas, especially at North American universities, the respect for Henige is deep. Some of us came to African history with packages and flavors of oral history excavated from ashes of the evening fireside histories as we sat at the feet of patriarchs and matriarchs, or had the latitudinal license to stretch the stories of court jesters, griots or jeli, and palace linguists into localized mythical stories to shape our budding historical consciousnesses. The struggles to accommodate our oral histories and localized histories did not only occur in the confines of graduate classrooms, but also in the hallowed pages of some Africanist journals. The application of oral history challenged established historiographies that had derived from colonial reports, touted as the efficacious models of contemporary Western histories.

For my part, I recall how oral history, localized histories, and "Africanized" newspaper sources whipped up my appetite for asking new questions about the roles of Africans in abolition, and energized my efforts to feminize the history of emancipation in the Gold Coast. Among several editors of African history journals only Henige recognized the new thrust of my ideas, shaped as they were by oral history and "Africanized" sources. As a result, Henige
gave me great guidance in reworking my ideas for publication as a young and ambitious graduate student. With Henige's assistance and encouragement, I was able to publish three articles in *History in Africa*, the journal founded and edited by him. This further empowered me to hone my emerging perspectives on slavery and abolition and the feminization of post-proclamation unfree labor in the Gold Coast and Africa as a whole.

This essay is an addition to the growing body of literature on gendering abolition and emancipation in the Gold Coast. Due to the paucity of primary sources, the present chapter like the existing literature also deals with specific areas of the Gold Coast, namely the southern regions of what is today Ghana, focusing mostly on the Central Province. It examines the ways that the colonial state tried to assist former slaves, and to a smaller extent, liberated pawns. Both groups constituted mostly young females in their transition from bondage to freedom, spanning ca. 1890 and ca. 1930. Principally, the essay discusses the colonial policy of "apprenticeship" or fosterage administered by the colonial state to assist "freed slaves" in their quest for freedom.

Raymond Dumett and Marion Johnson delineated this subject in their debate with Gerald McSheffrey regarding the form that abolition took in the Gold Coast. Nonetheless the core areas of the subject remain to be fully studied. Here, I argue that the colonial apprenticeship policy, based on the Ordinance of 1890 and enacted by the Gold Coast Legislative Council, did not better the conditions of former slaves, mostly young females. As a result, the apprenticeship policy facilitated the relapse of former slave children into dependency and bondage. Among others, the apprenticeship policy in the Gold Coast provided cheap, involuntary menial labor for the elite of the colonial society, both African and European.

Divided into several sections, the first portion of this chapter, in the tradition of Henige, problematizes the sources, while the second part looks briefly at the aspects of the literature relevant to the present study. The third section looks at the history of apprenticeship in the Gold Coast from circa 1890 to about 1930. The fourth part is devoted to highlighting inter-regional apprenticeship between the Gold Coast and Northern Nigeria. Dealing with a biographical case study of an apprenticed former slave girl, the final section fills some gaps and further raises some questions about the efficacy of the colonial policies of abolition and emancipation as well as the nature of African responses and initiatives, especially the ways that freed slaves themselves sought to adjust to freedom.

**Problematizing the Sources**

Historians of Africa have come a long way, sometimes along difficult methodological paths, to embrace the use of oral history. Its use in the reconstruction of the African past is the work of several scholars, institutions, and governmental initiatives. Among them Henige has clearly mapped out unique methodological pathways of oral history in the writing of
African history. Henige has demonstrated that while oral history undoubtedly has its inherent challenges as an aggregate source of history, its methodological framework can be effectively scaled when it is married with other sources, for example, archeology, linguistics, and texts. Because of his work, the methodologies of gathering oral histories, including recording, indexing, storing, codifying, and distilling them are now well known and largely accepted. Certainly, the use of oral history illuminates and interrogates the written colonial sources on African history which are lopsidedly laden with the perspectives of the agents of European imperialism in Africa. Like colonial sources with their hegemonic bent, oral history with all its apparent localisms and revisionisms nonetheless restores African voices to the history of the continent and provides some epistemological balance in the reconstruction of African history.

The sources that form the superstructure of this essay, in contrast, are colonial reports written from the standpoint of colonial policies on abolition and emancipation in the Gold Coast. Some of them are first-hand account by colonial officials, but others were collected from African agents and former slaves in the fold of the apprenticeship policy. As Henige has stated,

When colonial rule still prevailed, if barely, attempts to plumb the African past were typically regarded, at best, as a means to administrative ends and, at worst, as interesting stories. Missionaries and administrators collected oral data for utilitarian purposes, caring little whether they were true so long as they were serviceable.

Here, such sources point to the ways that former slaves fared in the Gold Coast within what colonial officials framed as “apprenticeship,” but which turned out to be the feminization of post-proclamation unfree labor. Although it is difficult to categorize “freed” slaves in the primary sources, the evidence broadly refers mostly to young girls ranging in age from about eleven years to the late teens able to take on some adult tasks in given contexts. The colonial apprentice policy mandated that all “freed” slaves under colonial apprenticeship be no more than sixteen years old. In order to capture some historic moments in some parts of this essay, I use the nomenclature of the so-called “freed” slaves as it is deployed in the primary sources. In a broader sense “freed” is a designation for former or liberated slaves, or simply put, slaves who had obtained their freedoms as a consequence of the colonial abolition and emancipation policies, but “freed slaves” also refers to persons who had fled in the pre-abolition period in order to escape their bondage.

The overall paucity of the evidence warrants some additional caveats here. As noted, the present data on apprenticeship deals specifically with the Cape Coast district of the Central Province. It should be stressed that there are major gaps in the extant documentary evidence on the period 1876–1890s and 1900–1924. Colonial abolition policies were more vigorous in 1874–75, that is, in the immediate aftermath of colonial rule, than at any other time. Indeed, after 1876, very little was done about abolition and emancipation, and for this reason comprehensive sources on abolition do not exist. Thus the colonial state’s efforts
from about 1876 through the end of the century, to abolish slavery and pawnship and to harness the transition from servile to wage labor, were dismal failures. Effective abolition of unfree labor occurred only from the 1920s forward when the colonial state assumed full political control to restructure the pre-capitalist relations of production. In spite of the paucity of the sources, some aspects of the available evidence are very helpful in illuminating essential historical processes.

The records are silent on the actual number of former slaves that fell under what may be described as ad hoc colonial policies of the 1870s and 1880s as well as the more specific policy, classified as “apprenticeship” in the aftermath of the transformative policy changes from the early 1890s forward. Exegetical readings of the spate of descriptive and qualitative colonial perspectives on former slaves suggest that the number may be several hundred, and that the so-called “freed” slave population was certainly larger than the liberated pawn population. Pawns were different from slaves as they were usually held in or close to their home regions. It should be stressed that pawns continued to be freed alongside slaves by the colonial courts throughout the post-proclamation epoch. The difference in population size was due to the fact that liberated pawns could trace their debtor-kin groups more easily. In reality, debtor-kinship groups and pawn-holders tended to belong to the same lineages. Consequently, unlike former slaves, liberated pawns were more likely to return to their families than to become the wards of the colonial state. Some pawns who were freed in the interior and brought down to the coast as the wards of the colonial state eventually managed to return to their families. As will be explained later, the policy of apprenticeship was inter-regional, involving the Gold Coast and Northern Nigeria. This made it possible to place former slave children from the Gold Coast into apprenticeship in Northern Nigeria and vice versa.

Most of the apprenticed females are simply called Ambah or Amba in the records. Ambah is a variation of Amma or Ama, an ethnic Akan common name, which means Saturday-born female. No reason is given in the records to explain why the generic name of Ambah or Amba was used for so many apprenticed former female slaves. Thus wherever applicable I have used surnames in addition to the generic name of Ambah or Amba to identify individual apprentices.

A Synopsis of the Extant Literature

The British abolition of domestic slavery and pawnship or debt-bondage in the Gold Coast (colonial Ghana) began in 1874–75 and lasted well into the 1930s. Paradoxically, the British had overlooked the Asante Kingdom, but stealthily imposed colonial rule on and enacted abolition in the very states and societies of the Gold Coast that had assisted the British to defeat Asante in 1873–74. Absolutely, the composite subject of colonial rule and abolition policy in the Gold Coast, the area designated today as the southern region of mod-
ern Ghana, has attracted an avalanche of studies. But the actual processes entailed in the emancipation of slaves and pawns in the Gold Coast, as well as their consequent evolving, congealing forms of unfree labor, compared to the colonial officials’ framing of abolition policies, are yet to be fully assessed.

At least two broad categories of literature may be noted here. The first has looked at the ways that epochal 1807 abolition of the trans-Atlantic slave trade transformed international commerce, and reconfigured post-abolition servile institutions and the lived experiences of those in the crucible of unfree labor. For example, Sandra Green describes the institution in the riverine districts of what is today the Volta Region, called *trokosi*, in which “families intimidated by the threat of continuous spiritually induced death were forced to hand over their prepubescent girls to work for and be sexually controlled by the priests.” *Trokosi* was “specifically influenced by events associated with the 1807 legislative abolition of the slave trade.” Kwabena Adu Boahen has in addition examined the shifting nature of gender and servitude in the Central Province of the Gold Coast between 1807 and 1874. He argues that along the Fante littoral an economic and social transformation expanded women’s slave-holding capacities. The conclusions of this first school concern the definitive effects of abolition in 1807, the seismic changes in the economic and political spheres which paved the way for the inception of cash crop production in West Africa, euphemistically called “Legitimate Trade.” These scholars demonstrate the ways that the 1807 abolition impacted gender and social formations in the immediate post-abolition Gold Coast.

The second school of thought looks specifically at the colonial abolition policies that date from the formative stages of colonial rule in the Gold Coast in 1874–75. It maps out the colonial state’s evanescent role in abolition and emancipation and also rehearses African responses and initiatives to the intermittent colonial abolition policies. Admittedly this body of work is very massive in the genealogies of its conclusions, but a look at a few of its interpretive signposts will suffice here. Claire Robertson shows that in the colonial capital of Accra abolition did not wholly free female slaves from bondage. Beverly Grier, whose work deals with the Eastern Province of the Gold Coast, argues that abolition increased the use of female pawn labor in agriculture, especially in the cash-crop production of cocoa. While Grier’s work concentrates on agriculture, I have also examined the use of unfree female labor in porterage services in the post-abolition Central Province. Very recently, I have looked at *aabaawa* labor and its expansion from the early post-abolition period to the contemporary era. *Abaawa*, an Akan word for a young female or a maiden, is a euphemism for exploitative kinship-based involuntary labor mostly done by prepubescent female house-helps or live-in domestic servants.

From the standpoint of the comparative literature, one major gap in the work on the Gold Coast is how the colonial government dealt with the problem of former slaves, and to some extent, liberated pawns adrift in transitioning from bondage to freedom. Certainly, the freeing of slaves is well-documented in the historiography and needs no further elaboration.
here, but the liberation of pawns or of those in debt-bondage is still seldom treated. While the subject cannot be fully tackled here, it may be stated that once abolition was put in place, some pawns certainly took matters into their own hands and deserted, while others used the colonial courts to facilitate their liberation, consequently disregarding whatever outstanding debts and arrangements had tied them to pawn-holders. Both the primary sources and the existing literature do not make clear how creditors and debtors responded to the desertions or the freeing of pawns. It is very likely that debtors unilaterally used the abolition ordinances to cancel their debts to the creditor pawn-holders. In fact, one outcome of abolition in the Gold Coast regarding debt-bondage, as I have elsewhere argued, is that human pawning increasingly gave way to the pawning of immovable property, such as land. This was not only because of the seeming efficacy of abolition laws, but also the realization that migrant and local wage labor had became cheap enough to superannuate pawn labor.  

From Freedom to Bondage: Implementation of Apprenticeship Policy

Within the available evidence are some detailed accounts of colonial policies of abolition and emancipation prior to the introduction of formal apprenticeship policies. The Gold Coast abolition ordinances of 1874–75 excluded systematic and coherent policies to assist former slaves and liberated pawns in their transition from bondage to freedom.  

In fact, prior to the apprenticeship policy enacted in the early 1890s, colonial officials had engaged in uncoordinated activities, which for want of a better word may be described as improvised measures. For example, some liberated slaves were summarily placed under the care of prison officials, while some former slaves were handed back to their former holders upon being freed. Still other liberated slaves, mostly women, were either placed in arranged marriages with colonial operatives, or lived with District Commissioners as live-in servants. These unsystematic emancipation policies illustrate the persistent undercurrent of the servile institutions in the post-proclamation period. Indeed, in the throes of the hopelessness, some liberated slaves returned to their former holders, consequently reverting to forms of dependency and bondage.

As a result of the imminent failure of the policy of custodial care in the 1870s and 1880s, the colonial government came up with a new policy of “apprenticeship” to better the conditions of former slaves. The apprenticeship policy was based on the Colonial Office’s Apprenticeship Act of 1833. Its cardinal principle “was the belief that slaves had to be ‘trained’ toward self-discipline and ‘responsibility’ deemed to be essential for ‘free’ laborers.” In fact, a dispatch sent by the Colonial Office to the colonies as a part of the Abolition Act sought to “lay the foundation in our colonies of a social system absorbed for ever from the reproach of slavery and which voluntary and effective industry shall take the place of
compulsory labor.”25 Also, according to a memorandum issued by the Colonial Office for the colonies, apprenticeship involved “training for a particular kind of skilled labor which ‘combines’ education and labor with the promise of eventual self-employment.”26 These arrangements did not better the conditions of former slaves, especially females that were the most marginalized and vulnerable because of their gender, exploitable reproductive capacities, foreign origins, and their kinlessness. As a result, such liberated female slaves suffered the most from the paradoxical colonial policies that liberated slaves, but put them into other forms of bondage.27

The evidence shows that in apprenticeship policies from the 1890s forward, the colonial state did make efforts to help former slaves in their adjustment to freedom. Specifically on September 29, 1890, an ordinance was passed by the Gold Coast Legislative Council to assist former slaves. The ordinance, referring to “apprenticeship” in the official records, sought to “provide for the Registration and Protection in certain other respects of alien Children in the Gold Coast Colony.”28 The alien children were former slave children who had not been claimed by their relatives in the aftermath of abolition in 1874–75. It should be pointed out that the Ordinance did not specifically mention pawns as a part of the package, but the institution of pawnship all the same fell under the colonial state’s efforts to root out all forms of unfree labor, however defined.

Several events paved the way for the application of the Ordinance of 1890 in the Gold Coast and its consequent apprenticeship policy of the early twentieth century. First, in 1888–89, Inspector R.E. Firminger, a former colonial operative in the Gold Coast, then recuperating in England, reported that there was endemic post-proclamation slavery in the Gold Coast.29 Second, in 1889–90, Mr. Ed. MacMunn, a former District Commissioner of Accra, claimed in England that the colonial government and the Gold Coast courts were lax in administering the abolition laws.30 Third, in the aftermath of these two allegations of post-proclamation slavery, the London-based Aborigines’ Protection Society (APS) vigorously raised the issue of emancipation in the Gold Coast with the Colonial Office. Finally, the Colonial Office put official pressure on the Gold Coast colonial government to be more vigilant with abolition and emancipation of slaves.31 It was these concatenated pressures from different constituencies that compelled the Gold Coast colonial government to formulate an official policy to assist former slaves. The gap in the evidence does not allow us to fully reconstruct how the Ordinance of 1890 was administered in the 1890s. However, the available evidence suggests that during the first three decades of the twentieth century, the colonial government somewhat implemented the Ordinance of 1890. Thereafter, “apprenticeship” in the Gold Coast involved the placement of former slave and pawn children in the guardianship of colonial officials, prominent African families, and the Christian missions.

In theory, the apprenticeship policy in the Gold Coast sought to equip former slaves with skilled labor to make them independent in the long term. But as in other British colonies, for instance, the Cape Colony and the British Caribbean, where apprenticeship policies
had been implemented earlier, the apprenticeship in the Gold Coast became a means of exploiting the labor of former slaves.\textsuperscript{32} For example, Nigel Worden has explained that apprenticeship in the Cape Colony deviated from the objectives set by the Colonial Office in that it arbitrarily placed children in the guardianship of colonists.\textsuperscript{33} The same can be said for the Gold Coast. However, in the aftermath of the First World War, as result of international anti-slavery pressures, attempts were made to reform the pre-existing apprenticeship policy. In spite of this, apprenticeship continued to be a source of cheap labor for the elite of the colonial society.\textsuperscript{34} Former slaves in apprenticeship in the Gold Coast provided involuntary labor for their individual upkeep. Unlike in Northern Nigeria, apprentices in the Gold Coast were not paid for their labor as house servants, farm-hands, carriers or porters, and traders. In fact, the productive labor of the apprentices benefited the Gold Coast apprentice-holders.\textsuperscript{35} In the long-term some apprentices acquired certain skilled labor from whatever work it was that they performed, for example, masonry and carpentry, but it should be stressed that the acquisition of such skilled labor by apprenticed former slaves, though theoretically intended as a colonial policy prescription, was an accidental by-product of the apprentice-holders’ exploitation of apprentices under their tutelage. In other words, apprentice-holders did not set out to help apprentices to acquire skilled labor that would facilitate their transition from bondage to freedom.\textsuperscript{36} Thus apprenticeship in the Gold Coast was a source of cheap labor for the apprentice-holder and hence fits Alain Morice’s view that the usefulness of apprenticeship “depends largely on the intentions” of the apprentice-holder.\textsuperscript{37}

Former slave children were apprenticed through several methods. One was through a written application to the colonial administration. The application form included specifications of the number of apprentices that an applicant wanted, gender sought, and how long an applicant intended to keep a prospective apprentice.\textsuperscript{38} Upon the acceptance of an application by the colonial state, an applicant had to make a written undertaking by filling out and signing the apprenticeship form. Among other things, the form demanded that an apprentice should “obey [the] lawful commands and not absent herself [sic] by day and night from the service of an [apprentice-holder].”\textsuperscript{39} The undertaking also stated that an apprentice-holder would

provide... sufficient good meat and drink and lodging, and suitable clothing, and medical advice and medicine, and will instruct her or cause her to be instructed in the employment necessary for future life and will cause to be sent regularly to school until he [sic] is certified to have passed out of Standard IV., and will bring her to the District Commissioner... on the First Monday in January, April, July and October in each year.\textsuperscript{40}

Whether these measures, especially the education of the apprenticed children, were fully carried out remains ambiguous in the sources. The statement of undertaking that informs the application stipulates that apprentice-holders should equip female apprentices with basic skills for domesticity and marriage, while male apprentices should be trained for employment
in the public sphere. The second approach, which appears to have been the norm, however limited in practice, especially from the 1920s, was the colonial policy of apprenticing former slave children to the Christian missions. In a unique case the colonial government granted sums of money to the Roman Catholic Mission at Cape Coast for the upkeep of an apprenticed former slave girl, but it is doubtful whether the colonial state did so for all the liberated slaves apprenticed to the Christian missions. The evidence shows that the Christian missions had to depend on their own resources, at times woefully inadequate, to cater to the needs of apprentices. Notwithstanding a well-documented case that will be discussed below, the evidence suggests that the colonial policy of apprenticing former slaves to the Christian missions was selective and ad hoc in nature, or at best evanescent without fruitful results.

The apprenticeship policy stipulated that only children under sixteen years of age were apprenticeable, and at least in 1908 this age limit was enforced. In that year, Mr. H. Bryan, the Colonial Secretary, directed Mr. E.C. Elliot, the Commissioner of the Central Province, as follows:

I have the honour to draw your attention to sections 19 and 20 of Ordinance No. 8 of 1893 and to request that as the girl appears to be 16 years you will inform me under what arrangement she has been apprenticed. How did the girl come to be in the possession of Superintendent Simmons?

It is not clear in the records whether the age limit of sixteen years old was rigorously enforced in the early twentieth century. Even if it was, given the uncertain origins and familial backgrounds of former slaves it would have been undoubtedly difficult to determine every exact age. The evidence illustrates that most of former slaves in apprenticeship in the Gold Coast were females and it is likely that the majority had originated from the Salaga slave trade. Although such former slaves had been given “southern” Akan, Guan, and Ga-Adangbe names, they were still collectively referred to as “Wangara,” an ethno-geographical designation laden with derogatory connotations synonymous with the “Northern” regional backwater, specifically, the slave trading axis of Salaga. Some of the liberated slaves were also from the immediate interior or protectorate states. For instance, in 1880, Acting Inspector General, Mr. Cecil Dudley, “captured King Akwasi Baidoo [of Denkyira in the interior] and the principal offenders” for slave-holding and jailed them in the Elmina castle prison. Consequently, the “released slaves[,] . . . mostly women and young children,” were placed under the care of the “Authorities at Elmina pending the trial” of the king and his chiefs.

As noted there is a paucity of evidence regarding the actual number of apprenticed former slave children. However, one of the recorded lists show that between 1908 and 1913 fourteen liberated slave children were apprenticed to the elite of the colonial society, both African and European in the Cape Coast District. Undoubtedly the true figure may be higher: among other things, records were not properly kept, especially between 1902 and 1905. In 1910, the returns submitted by District Commissioners for some parts of the
Central Province indicate no apprenticeships, and it is possible that the apprenticeship policy was tapering off.51 Also in 1911, the Acting Commissioner of the Central Province sent memoranda to District Commissioners reminding them to furnish returns on apprenticed children in their respective districts to the office of the provincial government. In response, all the District Commissioners reported that no one had been apprenticed in their respective districts.52 This suggests that the decline of apprenticeship in the Gold Coast, at least, in the Cape Coast district, may have coincided with the end of apprenticeship in Northern Nigeria, which according to C. N. Ubah, occurred between 1907 and 1911.53 The reason given for the abolition of the policy in Northern Nigeria was that it had become unproductive and failed as an effective agency of adjustment for former slaves, and the same may be said for the policy in the Gold Coast.54

Nonetheless the evidence suggests that the apprenticeship policy survived in the Gold Coast, although it was overshadowed by the demands of the imperial war effort in the Gold Coast during the First World War from 1914 to 1918, and continued in the 1920s through some major transformations in policy.55 From about 1920 forward, various Christian missions, in addition to apprenticing freed slave children to the elite of the colonial society, assumed significant apprenticeship roles in concert with the colonial state, although their cooperation with the state was not always harmonious.56 The apprentice-holding role of the Christian missions was sometimes made difficult by the intervention of colonial officials. Writing to the Colonial Secretary in 1909, for instance, the Commissioner of the Central Province explained that the “Mission [the Vicariate of Elmina] is willing to take charge of the girls provided they are allowed to deal with them in their own way.” This included only an “elementary” education especially in “domestic matters,” and marrying them off “when old enough and with their consent to suitable men.”57 For its part, the colonial government wanted “older” children apprenticed, but the Vicariate of Elmina demurred, on the grounds that older apprentices were too difficult to retrain in the ways of the church.58 It is likely, though further research is needed, that the Christian missions did educate some of the apprenticed children in basic literacy, and equipped them with social skills.59 At least one biographical account subsequently used here as a case study illustrates as much, even though, as noted, the education of apprenticed former slave girls mainly prepared them for domesticity and marriage.60 This mirrored the colonial norms in the Gold Coast by the early twentieth century.61 It is therefore not surprising that marriage was a recurring theme in a substantial number of official reports on apprenticed females.62

The evidence, inadequate as it may seem, suggests that apprenticed children also suffered abuse at the hands of their apprentice-holders.64 For example, four freed slave children, one from Gambaga in the Salaga slave trading axis, and the rest from around Lokoja in Northern Nigeria, apprenticed to the wife of Willoughby Osborne, the Attorney-General of the Gold Coast and subsequently the Chief Justice of Southern Nigeria, were brutally maltreated. Although the specific charges are not discussed in the source, the abuse of the four
apprentices became a subject of concern at the Colonial Office in London and was debated in the British Parliament, and appeared in newspapers, including the *Morning Post*. Nor did those apprenticed to the Christian missions necessarily fare any better: they too were exploited as menial servants and put through harsh, regimented daily routines.

That apprenticed females were sexually exploited may not have been the norm, but it is not in dispute either. In 1908, A. B. Josiah of Cape Coast in the Gold Coast applied for “5 female slave children” from the Freed Slaves’ Home in Zungeru. Unfortunately for Josiah, this occurred just as the “Visiting Committee of the Home” ruled that “no girl wards should in future be sent out to anyone other than European ladies and religious missions.” Similarly “boy wards” were not to be sent outside the Zungeru region. The fact that the authorities streamlined the policy confirms the abuse experienced by apprentices, especially females, at the hands of apprentice-holders. Additionally, on June 21, 1909, the District Commissioner of Saltpond wrote to the Acting Commissioner of the Central Province that:

I have the honor to inform you that I was at Mankessim on the 7th instant when I visited Mr. Taylor at his house and saw the 3 slave children (sic) at present with him... Ambah, a girl of 16 years...has a child about 2 weeks old; Mr. Taylor is the father of this child.

Mr. Taylor’s sexual exploitation of this Ambah, apprenticed to him by the colonial state, may fairly stand for what other apprentice-holders did to liberated female slaves under their tutelage. The available evidence does not allow us to quantify the number of apprentice-holders who were sexually exploited, but the comparative evidence suggests that a sizeable number of apprentice-holders forthrightly cohabited with apprentices. It may have been a common problem. In practice, the colonial authorities turned a blind eye to it, and in this case the District Commissioner of Saltpond claimed that “Ambah” was “quite happy and well treated,” and neither the District Commissioner nor the acting commissioner complained that Mr. Taylor had cohabited with her. Rather, the Acting Commissioner, having imputed too much freedoms and choices to apprenticed liberated female slaves, just as other officials may have done, assured the District Commissioner:

As long as you are sure that these girls and boy quite understand that they are at liberty to go away anytime they wish and that Taylor cannot call on them for any money or return anything he may have given them I think the matter may rest as it is.

In fact, the evidence adduced here supports Ubah’s position that apprentices were abused and sexually exploited by apprentice-holders, which may have been well known to the colonial authorities in the Gold Coast.

Apprenticed liberated slaves sometimes took matters into their own hands. Some fled from their apprentice-holders or eloped with their lovers. For example, an apprenticed girl, Ambah Satura, apprenticed to Pet. AW. [sic] Renner of Awoonor Chambers, Cape Coast, eloped to Kumasi with Ginadu Wangara, a police sergeant. The efforts of Mr. Renner, the
apprentice-holder, to reclaim Ambah Satura failed because the Chief Commissioner of Asante (adjacent to the Gold Coast) would not, for an unknown reason, permit her to return or to be brought back. By 1909, Ambah Satura had moved with Sergeant Wangara to Sekondi, his new station, in the Western Province of the Gold Coast. In the long run, Mr. Renner decided, it was not worth having her back, and the Acting Commissioner of the Central Province conjectured that if “she is satisfied with her present position I would suggest she might be allowed to remain.” The case illustrates how apprentices embarked on ventures, however misguided, in order to safeguard their autonomy.

Overall, poor record-keeping contributed to the ineffectiveness of the apprenticeship policy: it allowed apprenticed children to fall through the cracks of the colonial apprenticeship bureaucracy. For example, in 1908, as a result of the aforementioned abuse of the four liberated slaves in apprenticeship in the Gold Coast, the office of the Undersecretary of State for Colonies in London sought information on them from the Gold Coast officials. Unfortunately, the Gold Coast government could not trace their records at the District Commissioner’s office in Elmina where presumably their apprenticeship had been processed, and a search of the “Office of Alien Children” did not yield any information on them either. Mr. E.C. Eliot, the Commissioner of the Central Province, acknowledged that “these records were not kept up during the years 1902 to 1905.” This suggests that a considerable number of apprenticed children were forgotten by the colonial state and had to depend on the generosity or otherwise of the apprentice-holders for their transition from bondage to freedom. It is very likely that in most cases apprentices experienced neglect, exploitation, and abuse.

The period of seemingly rough-and-ready colonial policies appears to have ended by 1908. At that point the colonial government adopted a more vigilant stance toward apprenticeship and its record-keeping. There is no evidence in the primary sources or the extant literature that explains the timing and the apparent change in policy. The colonial government began to seek new apprentice-holders for apprentices whose former apprentice-holders had died or fallen into dire circumstance. The colonial government also concerned itself with the problems of apprenticeship beyond the Gold Coast, in Asante as well. When Ambah Satura eloped, for instance, the Acting Provincial Commissioner of the Central Province communicated with the Assistant Commissioner of Police for Asante and the Commissioner of the Western Province to effect her return. Additionally, letters were sent to remind apprentice-holders of their obligation under the apprentice policy to report annually to the colonial authorities, which policy apparently enabled the colonial authorities to ascertain the welfare of apprenticed freed slaves. Also, the colonial government kept a watchful eye on Northern Nigerian freed slave children who had been apprenticed to inhabitants of the Gold Coast. For example, Mrs. Maria Hutchinson had to report to the District Commissioner of Accra with two freed slave girls she had acquired from the Zungeru Freed Slaves Home in Northern Nigeria. Whether this vigilance changed the fortunes of the former slave children
in apprenticeship is difficult to determine. The evidence, however, suggests that these radical changes in policy were evanescent and were derailed by the exigencies of the First World War in the Gold Coast.

Inter-Regional Apprenticeship: The Gold Coast and Northern Nigeria

C. N. Ubah, in his study of the Freed Slaves Home in Northern Nigeria, highlights the fact that apprentice-holders were sought in the Gold Coast to apprentice liberated slaves residing in the Zungeru Freed Slaves Home in Northern Nigeria. Thus colonial officials in Northern Nigeria and in the Gold Coast cooperated regarding the apprenticeship of former slaves. The beneficiaries of this inter-regional apprenticeship policy were African and European traders, merchants, teachers, missionaries, and other professional elites. Although freed slave children were officially apprenticed to men, in reality they were kept under the tutelage of wives, consorts, or female relatives of the male elites of the colonial society.

Although, official policy sought to limit the relocation of apprentices as the 1908 case of Josiah shows, in 1910 and 1911, apprenticed children were still being sent to the Gold Coast under the administrative auspices of the Northern Nigerian colonial government. For example, and as noted, in 1910, Mrs Maria Hutchinson of the Gold Coast, "a mother of a senior clerk in the service of this Protectorate [of Northern Nigeria]," was allowed to take two freed slave girls from the Freed Slave Home in Zungeru to the Gold Coast. Mrs. Hutchinson was informed that "she will be liable for the cost of the repatriation of these children, should at any time the necessity to repatriate them arise." Also, in March 1911, Mr. H.S. Goldsmith, the Acting Chief Secretary of the Government in Zungeru, informed the Colonial Secretary of the Gold Coast of the following:

Mr. J.B. Sagoe, Leatherworker, Northern Nigeria Regiment, in the Service of this Protectorate, Native of Cape Coast has been granted permission by the Acting Governor to take with him to Cape Coast an Apprenticed Freed Slave Boy and His Excellency will feel obliged if you will kindly take such steps as you consider necessary to see that the boy is not illtreated or disposed of.

Certainly, the official information above shows that official policies sought to protect the welfare of apprentices, but whether colonial officials and apprentice-holders carried out such policies is not clear from the available evidence.

Although Ubah reveals that former slave children from Northern Nigeria were apprenticed in the Gold Coast, he does not show that liberated slave children from the Gold Coast were taken to Northern Nigeria. In fact, apprenticed former slave children were allowed to accompany their apprentice-holders to and from both colonies. For instance, in 1909, the District Commissioner of Cape Coast sought information "from the Mothers Superior at Cape Coast and Elmina Roman Catholic Convents" about four freed slave girls
from the Gold Coast who had been apprenticed to the wife of the Chief Justice Osborne of Southern Nigeria.\textsuperscript{66} Also in 1910, Mr. J. Andoh, "a clerk in Northern Nigeria and a native of Elmina" in the Central Province of the Gold Coast, took with him a freed slave boy from the Gold Coast to Northern Nigeria.\textsuperscript{87} With regard to the case of 1909 above, the names of the freed slave girls were Mary, who originated from Gambaga in the Northern Territories, later a part of the Gold Coast, while the rest, namely Graney, Garthe, and Gambia, were initially brought to the Gold Coast from the Lokoja area of Northern Nigeria.\textsuperscript{88} The given names of these apprentices show how apprentice-holders renamed apprentices and so suggest the high degree of paternalism exercised over former slave children. Furthermore, the ambiguity that informs the origin of these freed slave children is a testimony to the indiscriminate manner with which liberated slave children were moved about between the Gold Coast and the Northern Nigeria.

The Gold Coast government showed keen interest in the departure of such former slave children to Northern Nigeria. The apprentice-holder and his/her apprentices were required to report to the colonial authorities on the day before departure so that colonial officials could ascertain the state of health and well-being of the accompanying apprentice.\textsuperscript{89} In spite of the official instructions, the records do not explain how freed slave children in the inter-regional apprenticeship were treated or fared in the long-term. Direct evidence does not tell us about the adjustments made by liberated slave children placed in inter-regional apprenticeships, but extrapolating from the wider evidence and the comparative literature suggests that apprenticed children became sources of menial labor for the elite of the colonial society.

A Case Study of Apprenticeship:
Amba Ata alias Grace Orleans, 1924–ca.1930

There is a major gap in the records from April 7, 1913, to February 29, 1924. Fortunately, spanning 1924 to 1928 is a composite apprenticeship biography of Amba Ata also known as Grace Orleans.\textsuperscript{90} The evidence on this former slave girl throws additional light on some of the questions raised and conclusions drawn above, fills some gaps, and points to further areas of research. Amba Ata first emerges in the official accounts on June 29, 1924: the Gold Coast Governor, P. G. Guggisberg, writing to Mr. Justice R. E. Hall of the colonial courts, noted that he had "approved of the grant of an annual allowance of £15 for the maintenance of this girl [Amba Ata] to the Roman Catholic Mission at Cape Coast until such a time, she may be restored to her family."\textsuperscript{91} While the biography of Amba Ata provides multiple perspectives on the colonial policy of apprenticeship and the responses of apprentices, there are several ambiguous strands of information. First, it is not clear what is meant by being "restored to her family." It is likely that if she had an accessible natal "family" the colonial
government would not have apprenticed her to the Roman Catholic Church. She may have been liberated by the colonial state from another family and apprenticed to the Orleans family, whose surname she bore; the Orleans family belonged to the kinship group of Chief Coker of Cape Coast, and was very powerful and influential. If so, however, it is unclear why the colonial government paid for her upkeep with the Roman Catholic Mission at Cape Coast. At any rate the available evidence shows that Amba Ata was associated with the Orleans family as an apprentice and like most apprentices was given the apprentice-holders’ family name. This did not indicate outright assimilation into the host kinship network of the Orleans. At best, it was a form of familial association that recognized Amba Ata as an inferior dependant.

Second, Amba Ata “was placed by the order of the Court” into apprenticeship, suggesting that her apprentice-holders, very likely the Orleans family, had been subjected to some form of prosecutorial demands, leading to their loss of Amba Ata to the colonial state. Yet Amba Ata referred to the Orleans as her “parents” in a letter she wrote to the colonial authorities, stating that she wanted to opt out of the Roman Catholic Convent so that she could return to them. While the evidence does not explain the circumstances entailed in the court case or the judgement of the court, when she ran away from the Roman Catholic Convent, she again sought refuge in the Orleans family home. Amba Ata’s reference to the Orleans as her parents and the fact that she sought security in their home suggest that apprentices could develop apparently strong attachments to their apprentice-holders. For her part Madam Mansah Orleans, the matriarch of the Orleans family, sought through the District Commissioner’s court to retain Amba Ata. The evidence shows that if Amba Ata had had her way, she would have chosen the Orleans as her family. This may be due to the prestige attached to the Orleans family, or simply that she came to the conclusion that her association with them was her best choice.

Finally, the annual allowance of £15 granted by the colonial government in 1924 for the upkeep of Amba Ata was unusual. In the pre-war period the colonial government apparently did not give any allowance to the Christian Missions. This changed in the post-war period when the office of the Gold Coast governor became particularly interested in seeing to the success of policy. In fact, in 1925, the District Commissioner of Cape Coast requested a subvention of £15 because the amount “allocated for the year 1924 [was] exhausted on the 31st December,” and his request was granted. Subsequently, the amount of £15 was granted annually by the colonial government in 1926, 1927, and 1928 to the Roman Catholic Convent for the upkeep of Amba Ata. Amba Ata’s case may have been quite unusual, as the governor himself was directly involved; ordinarily a junior colonial operative would have written the letter of approval for earmarking money for an apprentice’s upkeep. In the 1920s the Colonial Office, through the instrumentality of the International Labor Organization (ILO) and League of Nations, put enormous pressure on the colonial government to abolish all forms of unfree labor, which resulted in addressing problems
facing former slaves. Governor Guggisberg's direct involvement in Amba Ata's case may have exemplified the vigorous shift in colonial policy with regard to unfree labor and toward confronting the problems facing liberated slaves.

In the end, Amba Ata sought to opt out of the Roman Catholic Convent and the letter she submitted to colonial government is worth quoting at length:

Dear Sire,

I am very sorry to write to you today that, I have now grown up a big girl, so I beg you to allow me to come home. Because I am tired of the Convent. I have also told Rev. Mother to allow me to come home, but in vain. So I am asking you to let me come home. For I am longing to see my parents. I will be very glad if you try to do so. Dear Sire, I often shed my tears about this. So try your possible best and judge my case for I am a poor girl Grace Orleans.

Amba Ata's letter above raises several questions. First, a textual analysis of the grammar, syntax, style, and the first-person narrative content of the letter suggest that she may have written it by herself. This supports the contention that some of the liberated slave children, apprenticed to the Christian missions, had received a rudimentary education. Second, the fact that she wanted to break her association with the Convent illustrates the harshness and failure of the apprenticeship policy. Third, the recurring invocation of "home" reiterates the irony that the host-kinship family was often the only place to which former slave children could return, irrespective of previous abuse and exploitation. Finally, in spite of the problems ranged against her, Amba Ata made decisions and choices to bolster her independence, and such quests for autonomy may well have been common among former slaves who struggled to break away from the constraints of the apprenticeship policy.

After Amba Ata's letter the District Commissioner of Cape Coast asked Mr. Andrew Jones, the Commissioner of the Central Province, if he could "tell me ... if the girl has any parents to whom she can go." In the end, Mr. Jones instructed that she should be sent back to the convent, and Madam Mansah Orleans complied on May 1, 1928. But Amba Ata, bent on her own choices in freedom, made good her escape from the convent: three days later, Sister Mariah, the Acting Superintendent of the Our Lady of the Apostles Convent, wrote to Mr. Jones, stating that Amba Ata "has not as yet returned to the Convent." Eventually, the Supreme Court instructed the "Police Commissioner [of Cape Coast] ... to cause the girl to be searched for and sent back to the Convent at Elmina." The remaining evidence shows that Amba Ata was not captured by the authorities. In the end Amba Ata's case, while undoubtedly unique, points to the vigilance adopted by the colonial government in the post-First World War period, and illustrates former slaves' struggles for autonomy and freedoms.
Conclusion

The gendering of abolition literature has provided insights into how abolition shaped not only the fortunes of former slaves and pawns, but also how abolition and emancipation reconfigured forms of unfree labor, in this case "apprenticeship," in the post-proclamation Gold Coast. At the inception of colonial rule in 1874, no systematic effort was made to assist former slaves. It was not until about the early 1890s that the Gold Coast Legislative Council enacted an ordinance to assist former slave children in the form of "apprenticeship," indeed, as a means to facilitate liberated slaves' transition from bondage to freedom. Overall, the policy of apprenticeship remained woefully inadequate, and was fitfully applied. Although, in 1908, colonial officials adopted a vigilant stance toward the problems of apprenticeship, the evidence illustrates that the transition in policy did not benefit the majority of former slave children. Rather liberated slave children became a source of cheap labor, and in some cases, objects of sexual gratification for the elite of the colonial society. The case of Amba Ata, alias Grace Orleans, amply demonstrates the ambiguity of the policy: she seemed to have acquired some education that could have been an engine of social mobility, but the lack of autonomy that buttressed the apprenticeship system derailed her chances for a full adjustment to freedom. In all, Amba Ata's complicated biography underscores the deficiencies in the apprenticeship policy which inevitably compelled liberated slaves to depend on the very apprentice-holders who oppressed and exploited them. It is likely that liberated slaves who sought adjustments on their own fared no better, because the choices available to them could not secure their complete autonomy.
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